



General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, March 2, 2009

Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

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

Absent: Councillor Ken Johnston

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, February 16, 2009, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

2. **2009 CITY GRANT PROGRAM**
(Report: February 4, 2009, File No.:(REDMS No. 2568060, 2490748, 2438700, 2568532, 2570489, 2570493, 2503269, 2568485)

The Manager of Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, accompanied by Lesley Sherlock, Social Planner, indicated that the 2009 grants applications were the first to be submitted under the new City of Richmond Grant Program.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 2, 2009

A discussion ensued, and the following was noted:

- Richmond Addiction Services (RAS) was spending grant funds for the intended purposes;
- there was some duplication in delivery of mental health services between the Richmond Chinese Mental Wellness Association and other service providers. However, staff concluded that the level of duplication was acceptable due to the high volume of requests for assistance;
- school-based programs were carefully administered under a cautious set of rules; and
- the Richmond City Centre Community Association (RCCCA) was seeking funds for an early dismissal program for City Centre schools as there was no space at City Centre.

At this point, the Chair called for delegations.

Brian Wardley, Heart of Richmond Aids Society, indicated that the current grant level was very helpful for paying rent. He then highlighted an educational HIV prevention program, currently offered at the grade 11 level. The program had been well received by teachers, school nurses and students, and the Society was seeking funding to present the program at the grade 9 level.

In answer to queries, Mr. Wardley advised that the Richmond Board of Education provided facilities and staff for the HIV prevention program, but no funding towards the program. He also mentioned that the Society received funding from Vancouver Coastal Health for outreach work.

Ahlay Chin, Executive Director, Chinese Mental Wellness Association of Canada, expressed her appreciation to Committee members for previous funding, and requested an additional \$10,000 to help out, as she believed the Association may not have enough funds to cover its rental expenses. Ms. Chin also circulated a letter written by Edwin Tam, President of the Chinese Mental Wellness Association of Canada (Schedule 1).

De Whalen, Richmond Women's Resource Centre Association, thanked the Committee for the current grant, and stated the funds would help with rent and programming. Ms. Whalen then shared success stories about "Hot Ink", a creative writing program for teenage girls, and requested an additional \$800 to produce the "Hot Ink" journal, which highlights the creative writing work of the teenage girls involved in the program.

David Reay, circulated a list of projects undertaken by the Richmond Poverty Response Committee (Schedule 2), and spoke about awareness about homelessness. Mr. Reay highlighted the efforts made, and difficulties encountered by St. Albans shelter during the past holiday season, and indicated that the Shelter would be seeking assistance. He also spoke about other initiatives undertaken to help people get "back on their feet" such as assistance with dental work.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 2, 2009

In answer to a question, staff advised that late applications would not be considered as part of the grant review process, and staff would need to investigate if any money was available on an individual basis.

It was moved and seconded

That, as per the report from the General Manager, Planning and Development, dated February 25, 2009, the 2009 City Grants be allocated as follows (see Attachment 2):

- (1) The organizations in the Health, Social and Safety Services category be awarded the recommended grant amounts and cheques disbursed for a total of \$436,850; and*
- (2) The organizations in the Cultural and Community Events category be awarded the recommended grant amounts and cheques disbursed for a total of \$72,650.*

Provided that the Richmond City Centre Community Association receive funding in the amount of \$2000 to run the Early Dismissal Program.

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued about grant eligibility for RCCCA's early dismissal program, as it may be considered a school-based program. It was mentioned that the RCCCA ran programs at school facilities due to a lack of space. It was noted that a detailed definition of the term "school-based program" may be helpful in determining who was responsible for contributions to such programs.

Discussion also took place about the possibility of reducing the grant amount to the RCCCA from \$2000 to \$1200 to allow the Richmond Women's Resource Centre Association to receive \$800 for printing the "Hot Ink" publication. As a result of the discussion, the following **amendment** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the main motion be amended to state that the Richmond City Centre Community Association receive funding in the amount of \$1200 to run the Early Dismissal Program, and the Richmond Women's Resource Centre Association receive \$800 to print the "Hot Ink" publication.

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion took place about a referral to staff to investigate the possibility of having the City's Production Centre assist with the printing of the "Hot Ink" publication rather than using grant funding.

Further discussion ensued around the amendment motion, and whether it should be withdrawn or whether it should stand as-is in order to allow enough time for staff to investigate the in-kind assistance to print the "Hot Ink" publication. It was generally agreed that the amendment would stand with the understanding that a referral motion would follow.

The question on the **amendment** was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Cllr. G. Halsey-Brandt opposed.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 2, 2009

The question on the main motion as amended, which reads as follows:

That, as per the report from the General Manager, Planning and Development, dated February 25, 2009, the 2009 City Grants be allocated as follows (see Attachment 2):

- (1) The organizations in the Health, Social and Safety Services category be awarded the recommended grant amounts and cheques disbursed for a total of \$436,850; and*
- (2) The organizations in the Cultural and Community Events category be awarded the recommended grant amounts and cheques disbursed for a total of \$72,650.*

Provided that the Richmond City Centre Community Association receive funding in the amount of \$1200 to run the Early Dismissal Program, and the Richmond Women's Resource Centre Association receive \$800 to print the "Hot Ink" publication'.

was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

The following **referral** motion was then introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That staff investigate and provide comments on the following matters:

- (1) the definition of what would be considered school based versus programs in the school;*
- (2) possible City assistance that may be provided to the Women's Resource Association for printing their "Hot Ink" publication; and*
- (3) assistance for funding an early dismissal program in the City Centre area, and reporting back to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Committee.*

The question on the motion was not called, as staff advised that community centre programs are usually funded by the Community Association and Societies, and not by the City.

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

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 2, 2009

3. **PROPOSAL TO ABANDON OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AND ZONING BYLAWS – APPLICATION BY ANDREW CHEUNG ARCHITECTS INC. FOR REZONING AT 3131, 3171, 3191, 3211, 3231, 3251, 3271, 3291, 3331, 3371, 3391 & 3411 SEXSMITH ROAD AND 3200, 3220, 3240, 3280, 3300 & 3320 NO. 3 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F), 3360 NO. 3 ROAD FROM ROADSIDE STAND (CLASS C) DISTRICT (RSC), AND 8511 CAPSTAN WAY FROM AUTOMOBILE-ORIENTED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C6) AND GAS STATION DISTRICT (G1) TO SCHOOL AND PUBLIC USE (SPU), COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/181), AND COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/182)**

(Report: December 17, 2008, File No.: RZ 03-254977, 12-8060-20-7882, 12-8060-20-8117/7883/8113, SD07-375988) (REDMS No. 2545667, 2545667, 2553471, 2579311)

The General Manager, Planning and Development, Joe Erceg, accompanied by the Director of Development, Brian Jackson, advised that several meetings had taken place between the applicants and City staff since the General Purposes Committee meeting of January 6, 2009, (during which this matter had been tabled), and that sufficient progress to meet rezoning conditions associated with the application had not been made. He further advised that staff was still in support of the recommendation to abandon the bylaws related to the Rezoning Application RZ 03-254977.

Further advice was provided that the applicants had changed their proposal related to affordable housing, and agreed to provide the required affordable housing only if they would be able to re-coup the associated costs from third parties.

Peter Webb, Concord Pacific Group Inc., and one of the minority developers for Rezoning Application RZ 03-254977, expressed his belief that a good deal of progress had been made, and the applicants had sorted out their previous differences. Mr. Webb expressed concern about the economic viability of the project in the current economic environment, and stated that efforts should be made to continue the process. He also mentioned that the Development Cost Charges (DCCs) had been paid, and the applicants were committed to the project.

During the ensuing discussion, and in answer to questions, Mr. Webb shared the following views:

- matters such as affordable housing may be re-visited;
- the decline in the number of development projects across the municipalities was staggering;
- if the obligations for a third reading had been met, the process should be continued, allowing for a flexible approach to the details related to various outstanding requirements;
- the applicant had agreed to purchase a City lot at current rates;

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 2, 2009

- the developers would move forward with the project as soon as the market indicated that it is financially viable to do so;
- the applicant was still committed to providing servicing for the project, however a capital analysis would be required; and
- a new application would result in higher affordable housing requirements, lower density, and higher DCC's.

In conclusion, Mr. Webb suggested a one-year extension to allow the applicants to work with City staff to come up with an approach to meet the rezoning conditions.

It was noted that rezoning applications normally receive one year after third reading to make significant progress in meeting rezoning conditions, this application was approaching the two year mark.

The Chair then highlighted the following excerpt from the minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting held on January 6, 2009 (at which time the applicants were granted a two month extension, and the matter was tabled): *"There was general agreement amongst Committee members that this was a one time only extension. Satisfaction of rezoning conditions, including financial arrangement acceptable to the City for future contributions to the Capstan Canada Line Station must be decided upon by that time and substantial progress made on all other issues."*

In response to the excerpt from the January 6, 2009 minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting, Mr. Webb concurred that significant progress had not been made.

Staff advised that the matter would not be ratified until the next Regular Council meeting, scheduled to be held on Monday, March 9, 2009.

It was moved and seconded

(1) That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 7882, to:

- (a) redesignate 3200, 3220, 3240, 3280, 3300, 3320 & 3360 No. 3 Road, 3131, 3171, 3191, 3211, 3231, 3251, 3271, 3291, 3331, 3371, 3391 & 3411 Sexsmith Road, 8511 Capstan Way, and a portion of City Road Right-of-Way North of Capstan Way from "Mixed Use" to "High Density Mixed Use" in Attachment 1 (Generalized Land Use Map) to Schedule 1 of the Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100, and to revise the map in section 3.1, Neighbourhoods & Sense of Community, Neighbourhoods in Richmond, City Centre, accordingly; and**

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 2, 2009

- (b) *redesignate 3200, 3220, 3240, 3280, 3300, 3320 & 3360 No. 3 Road, 3131, 3171, 3191, 3211, 3231, 3251, 3271, 3291, 3331, 3371, 3391 & 3411 Sexsmith Road, 8511 Capstan Way, and a portion of City Road Right-of-Way North of Capstan Way from "Detailed Land Use Study Required" to "Mixed Use – High Density" and "Park – Configuration and location to be determined" in the "Land Use Map" in Schedule 2.10 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 (City Centre Area Plan), together with associated amendments to the accompanying "Development Permit Guidelines",*
- be abandoned;*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 8117, for the rezoning of a portion of the subject site as indicated in Schedule A to the said bylaw from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)", "Roadside Stand (Class C) District (RSC)", "Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6)", and "Gas Station District (G1)" to "School and Public Use District (SPU)", be abandoned;*
- (3) *That Bylaw No. 7883, to introduce a new "Comprehensive Development District (CD/181)" and for the rezoning of a portion of the subject site as indicated in Schedule A to the said bylaw from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)", "Roadside Stand (Class C) District (RSC)", "Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6)", and "Gas Station District (G1)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/181)", be abandoned;*
- (4) *That Bylaw No. 8113, to introduce a new "Comprehensive Development District (CD/182)" and for the rezoning of a portion of the subject site as indicated in Schedule A to the said bylaw from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)", "Roadside Stand (Class C) District (RSC)", "Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6)", and "Gas Station District (G1)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/182)", be abandoned;*
- (5) *That staff bring forward a bylaw to repeal Highway Closure and Removal of Highway Dedication Bylaw No. 8220, to close a lane right-of-way on the north side of Capstan Way between Sexsmith Road and Hazelbridge Way and portions of Sexsmith Road to allow for their consolidation with the subject site; and*
- (6) *That Subdivision Application SD 07-357988, to consolidate and subdivide 3200, 3220, 3240, 3280, 3300, 3320 & 3360 No. 3 Road, 3131, 3171, 3191, 3211, 3231, 3251, 3271, 3291, 3331, 3371, 3391 & 3411 Sexsmith Road, 8511 Capstan Way, and a portion of City Road Right-of-Way North of Capstan Way to create 8 lots (including one for use as park) and an extension of Hazelbridge Way, be closed.*

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 2, 2009

The question on the motion was not called, as Committee members expressed concerns about the lost opportunity if the project did not proceed. Comments were made about the importance of supporting the conditions set out and approved during the Public Hearing when the application had received third reading. There was general agreement that since the applicants were unable to meet the rezoning conditions, the staff recommendation to abandon the bylaws associated with Rezoning Application RZ 03-254977 should be supported.

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

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (5:40 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, March 2, 2009.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

Shanan Dhaliwal
Executive Assistant, City Clerk's Office



加拿大華人情緒健康協會
Chinese Mental Wellness Association of Canada
#250-5726 Minoru Blvd.
Richmond, BC, V6X 2A9
Tel: (604) 273-1791 Fax: (604) 273-1751
E-mail: richchin@telus.net

February 16, 2009

Hi All:

I would like to ask for your support to keep open the doors of Chinese Mental Wellness Association of Canada (CMWAC). As you know, CMWAC has been active in the Richmond community for more than a decade, and has done much to promote mental wellness among Chinese and English speaking citizens. It offers support, guidance and education for patients and families: this work needs to continue.

I understand that in these difficult times, budgets must remain balanced and demands must be prioritized. I think that mental health support groups are an important service that deserves ongoing funding. This is particularly true for a city such as Richmond with its high proportion of ethnic Chinese residents (39% in 2001) and immigrants (54% in 2001). A study of Chinese immigrants in British Columbia shows that their use of outpatient mental health resources was only 10-20% of non-immigrants. Their rate of psychiatric hospitalizations was between 8-15% of non-immigrants.¹ Notwithstanding the unlikely possibility that somehow this population is blessed with remarkable mental health, the more likely explanations are that there are cultural and language barriers to their getting help. Stigma and poor English skills can be formidable obstacles. This is where the CMWAC makes such a difference, for it directly addresses these issues through its support groups, educational events and advocacy.

Now, of concern for your administration is the question of duplication of services. However, the question implies that we are somehow saturating the population with help, when this is hardly the case, particularly in Richmond. A review of immigration showed 152, 184 Chinese immigrants came to BC between 1985 and 2000, with Richmond having the highest concentration of Chinese immigrants. However, their rate of mental health visits to GPs was lowest in Richmond compared to all other Health Service Delivery Areas (20-29% lower than neighbouring Vancouver), and their rate of visits to psychiatrists was 17-60% lower than for Vancouver.² Clearly, there is a need for mental health education and

advocacy that is not being met; and we could only wish for a significant increase in community services. The problem isn't that there might be duplication: the problem is that there isn't enough duplication.

But alas, a look at the services being offered shows little even in the way of duplication.

As per their website, SUCCESS offers a Chinese help-line that helps in "accessing social service", with "informational and emotional support". Unlike the CMWAC warm-line, it is not focussed on mental health issues. It also doesn't provide ongoing advocacy. As for counselling, it is offered with fees generally "ranging from \$25-\$110/hour". CMWAC offers counselling by donation. Finally, there is no mention of public lectures on mental health.

The CMHA promotes mental health more specifically, and according to e-mail communication, for the month of February, there will be one meeting in Richmond of the Cantonese support group that will offer information on autism, a childhood onset disorder. The rest of their education and support activities will be offered in Vancouver and Burnaby.

CHIMO offers a crisis line and referral in Richmond, but not ongoing advocacy nor peer support.

The MDA offers peer support throughout BC, but does not currently run any groups in Richmond.

Contrast the above with the many peer support activities, drop-in atmosphere and consumer volunteer opportunities of CMWAC which is headquartered in Richmond. Our services complement, rather than duplicate, those of other organizations. For Richmond residents in particular, the CMWAC is unique in what it has to offer. No other place combines the support and services for each step of the way from first time consumer navigating their way through a complex medical system, through recovery, and onto the empowering role of helper and volunteer for others just beginning their own journeys.

The top-down approach of larger organizations will always dominate the scene, but there remains a need for a home-grown Richmond grass-roots organization that was built from the people up, by consumers for consumers. Who better to be the voice of the people that we are aspiring to help? If we let fall this award-winning jewel of Richmond, this embodiment of citizen caring and volunteerism at its best, then what message do we send about our values and beliefs? The CMWAC was born in the heart of Richmond: the of Richmond deserve a CMWAC that is strong and vibrant.

Please continue to support our mission.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Edwin Tam', written in a cursive style.

**Edwin Tam, M.D.
President, CMWAC BOARD**

¹ Chen AW, Kazanjian A. Rate of mental health service utilization by Chinese immigrants in British Columbia. Can J Public Health. 2005; 96:40-51

The Richmond Poverty Response Committee has taken a leadership role in advocating for affordable housing. The list of projects that we have undertaken is quite extensive.

1. Outreach to the Richmond faith communities and the creation of the Richmond Faith Housing Group.
2. Provided support to the Richmond 2008 Homeless Count (volunteer recruitment, sanitary kits, sandwich wagon).
3. STAND. Since May 2008 we have stood for one hour a week at the corner of Minoru and Granville holding banners (HOMES FOR ALL).
4. Homeless Awareness Week. (5th year)
5. NIMBY to YIMBY project. With support from BC Healthy Communities began dialogue in housing community on response to Richmond's strong NIMBY reactions. On February 24th, we sponsored a BC Non-Profit Housing Association workshop.
6. Study Circles. In partnership with the Richmond Civic Engagement Network we have initiated a community dialogue around affordable housing.

Richmond housing projects needing support:

1. Homeless outreach worker: Richmond is one of the few communities in Metro Vancouver without a homeless outreach worker. It has been identified as a priority numerous times. The extreme weather shelter at St. Alban's has clearly identified this as a priority. The Salvation Army and other groups have been identified as possible sponsors.
2. St. Alban's homeless drop in night: Building on the trust established by the Extreme Weather Shelter, this drop-in would be an excellent opportunity to bring much needed services to the homeless community. Other than support from the Richmond Food Bank, there is no other support currently for the drop-in night.
3. Full-time drop in centre: Richmond clearly has a need for a full time drop in centre.
4. Shelters: The 2002 Homelessness study identified the need for a range of clients. A shelter for women was identified as a priority. However a project initiated by the Richmond Women's Centre and Family Services of Greater Vancouver has been stalled in Richmond's planning department for a couple of years.
5. Transition and supportive housing programs: There is a severe lack of supportive housing in Richmond. The lack of political support for the Turning Point proposal means that we will continue to export our problems. This is neither fair nor providing the best care. The importance of politicians taking tough stands cannot be underestimated in ensuring that proposals become reality. We anticipate new proposals from Turning Point and other groups in the near future
6. Affordable Housing: There are a number of projects at different levels of development. While we laud the City of Richmond's efforts in mandating new housing projects, too little effort is being given to potential housing projects in other areas. In particular our work with the Richmond Faith Housing Group has identified a number of faith communities that are interested in developing housing projects.
7. Affordable Housing Society: Richmond is one of the few communities in Metro Vancouver without a housing society. Clearly the community needs the support that a housing society can provide in expertise, advocacy and fundraising.