



Special General Purposes Committee

- Date: Monday, May 11, 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 Ken Johnston
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves
- Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

1. **RICHMOND'S COMMENTS ON METRO VANCOUVER'S DRAFT FEBRUARY 2009 REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY**

(File Ref. No.: 08-4045-01/2009-Vol 01) (REDMS No. 2613411, 2600721,)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, and Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning and Development were available to answer questions.

A discussion ensued between Committee members and staff, about several aspects of the Metro Vancouver Draft February 2009 Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), and in particular on:

- replacing all references made to “employment lands” with “industrial-employment lands”;
- the availability of a larger more readable copy of a draft map with the proposed RGS map designations. Staff advised that the subject map that may be available would not yet reflect the final details;

Special General Purposes Committee

Monday, May 11, 2009

- details related to possible revisions to several parts of the Comments on the RGS; and
- TransLink's role in assessing applications for commercial development outside of the Urban Centres.

Jim Wright, 8300 Osgoode Drive, expressed concerns related to the proposed RGS Agricultural Lands, sharing his view that the proposed RGS agricultural zone should include all lands that are either zoned agricultural by the City or the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). In particular, Mr. Wright pointed out the absence of the Garden City Lands, and encouraged City Council to specify that the Garden City Lands be added to the RGS agricultural zone. A copy of Mr. Wright's submission is attached as Schedule 1 and forms part of these minutes.

Olga T. Katcheva, #8 – 7680 Gilbert Road, expressed her belief that the Garden City Lands had been incorrectly excluded from the RGS green zone, and included in the Urban area map of the RGS. She spoke about the impact that a shortage of park land may have on accommodating and balancing growth, and suggested that the Garden City Lands be excluded from the Urban area map of the RGS. A copy of Ms. Katcheva's submission is attached as Schedule 2 and forms part of these minutes.

Jessica Lai, spoke about (i) inclusion of agricultural land; (ii) a more controlled and meticulous process of rezoning; (iii) the support and demand for agricultural farm land outlined within the Official Community Plan (OCP); and (iv) protection of land for future generations.

De Whalen, 13631 Blundell Road, stated that she was shocked that the RGS had not proposed any Richmond land within the green zone, and that since the Garden City Lands were designated as ALR lands, that they should be designated as green zone lands within Metro Vancouver's RGS.

A discussion ensued among Committee members and staff about various revisions to the Comments and the possibility of having certain land parcels included within the RGS Agricultural Lands.

It was moved and seconded

That:

- (1) ***Council approve the comments outlined in bold contained in the report dated May 7, 2009 entitled: "Richmond's Comments on Metro Vancouver's Draft February 2009 Regional Growth Strategy"; and***
- (2) ***The report and comments be forwarded to the Metro Vancouver Board with a request that the comments be incorporated into the Regional Growth Strategy.***

Special General Purposes Committee

Monday, May 11, 2009

The question on the motion was not called, as the following **amendment** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the City's comments be changed to reflect that the map of the agricultural area include the Garden City Lands and Department of National Defence (DND) Lands as designated agricultural land.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion continued, and Committee members spoke in support of or in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Staff advised that it may be beneficial for the Committee to have a closed meeting in order to ensure Committee members have received full legal advice on the impact of such a designation in relation to the Garden City Lands.

It was moved and seconded

That the main motion and amendment motion be tabled, and that Committee resolve into closed session.

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Cllrs. S. Halsey-Brandt

McNulty

Steves

At 4:59 p.m., Mayor Brodie announced that the Special Open General Purposes Committee meeting would be recessed in order to convene a Special Closed General Purposes Committee meeting.

The Special Open General Purposes Committee meeting reconvened at 5:08 p.m..

It was moved and seconded

That the main motion and amendment motion be lifted from the table.

CARRIED

Special General Purposes Committee

Monday, May 11, 2009

Following further discussion, the amendment motion was **WITHDRAWN**.

The question on the main motion was not called, as the following amendment was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the following be added as Part (3): That comments be added to Section 2E of the report to reflect that Council is still considering the future of Garden City Lands and Department of National Defence (DND) Lands as agricultural land in the Regional Plan and will report the City's position as soon as it is formulated.

CARRIED

Discussion continued about several other revisions to the Comments on the Metro Vancouver's Draft February 2009 Regional Growth Strategy. These were reviewed and it was agreed that these would be incorporated into Part (1) of the motion.

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

That:

- (1) *Council approve the comments outlined in bold contained in the report dated May 7, 2009 entitled: "Richmond's Comments on Metro Vancouver's Draft February 2009 Regional Growth Strategy", subject to the following revisions:*
 - (a) *Change all references to "Employment Lands" to read "Industrial-Employment Lands";*
 - (b) *In Part 2A after the words " Richmond proposes that at that time, it will include some", add the words "or all" ;*
 - (c) *In Part 2A delete the paragraph that begins with "There will likely be additional lands that are designated industrial...";*
 - (d) *In Part 2A in the sentence that begins with "For now, all these lands should be shown as Urban", delete the word "Urban" and substitute "Under Study"*
 - (e) *In Part 2F in the paragraph that begins with "Richmond has consistently disagreed with the above", replace the opening phrase with "Richmond disagrees with the above"; and*
 - (f) *In Part 2J in the paragraph that begins with "The draft RGS does not incorporate many of Richmond's concerns and suggestions", delete the phrase that begins with the word "despite repeated requests", as well as the following sentence that begins with "MV has not met with Richmond";*

Special General Purposes Committee

Monday, May 11, 2009

- (2) *The report and comments be forwarded to the Metro Vancouver Board with a request that the comments be incorporated into the Regional Growth Strategy; and*
- (3) *That comments be added to Section 2E of the report to reflect that Council is still considering the future of Garden City Lands and Department of National Defence (DND) Lands as agricultural land in the Regional Plan and will report the City's position as soon as it is formulated.'*

was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Cllr. G. Halsey-Brandt opposed.

LAW & COMMUNITY SAFETY DEPARTMENT

2. **LOWER MAINLAND PRETRIAL CENTRE - IMPACT OF LOCATING A PRETRIAL CENTRE IN RICHMOND, AND EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL SITES**

(File Ref. No.:) (REDMS No. 2605568)

Shawn Issel, Manager, Community Safety Policy and Programs advised that the City needed to respond by Metro Vancouver's deadline of May 15, 2009.

Phyllis Carlyle, General Manager, Law & Community Safety indicated that there had been discussion that existing pretrial facilities may be enhanced prior to the development of a new facility.

It was moved and seconded

That a letter be sent to Metro Vancouver indicating that:

- (1) *none of the 11 sites identified in Richmond in the Charmichael Wilson Study for a Remand Centre are acceptable due to circumstances set out in the staff report of April 28th, 2009; and*
- (2) *the criteria of land cost, distance to Court Houses, lack of public transit, site size, and lack of servicing and zoning and other factors preclude other sites in Richmond; and*

therefore the City of Richmond does not want to be considered as a potential host community for the Lower Mainland Pretrial Centre.

CARRIED

Special General Purposes Committee

Monday, May 11, 2009

BUSINESS & FINANCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

3. **INVEST CANADA-COMMUNITY INITIATIVES (ICCI) FUNDING**
(File Ref. No.: 03-1090-07/2009-Vol 01) (REDMS No. 2614398v2)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the City enter into a funding contribution agreement known as a Contribution Agreement for Invest Canada-Community Initiatives (ICCI) with Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister for International Trade, on the terms and conditions set out in this Report (the "Agreement").*
- (2) *That the General Manager, Business & Financial Services, be authorized to execute the Agreement on the City's behalf.*

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (5:36 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, May 11, 2009.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

Shanan Dhaliwal
Executive Assistant, City Clerk's Office

General Purposes Committee, May 11, 2009

Jim Wright, 8300 Osgoode Drive, Richmond

Mayor and Councillors,

On Agenda Item 1, I have a suggestion about the "Not Supported Regional Growth Strategy Items," specifically 2E, "Proposed RGS Agricultural Lands," on page 7 of the staff report.

I suggest that the lands in the proposed *agricultural* zone in the Regional Growth Strategy should include all lands that are either zoned agricultural by Richmond or part of the Agricultural Land Reserve *unless* council makes specific decisions to exclude some of them before passing on its input to Metro Vancouver.

I will use the Garden City Lands as an example because it is the most glaring omission from the agricultural areas in Map 4, which is on page 29 of the February 2009 strategy draft. The map shows the agricultural areas in green and the industrial or commercial areas in pink. It shows the Garden City Lands in white, not green.

The Garden City Lands are zoned AG1, Agricultural, by the City of Richmond, so I suggest that it is natural for Richmond to ensure that the property is included as agricultural in the Regional Growth Strategy. If there's a good reason why the property should not be included, then I believe it should be up to our elected *council* to rezone the property as something other than AG1 or 2, Agricultural. I am asking that this be a *council* decision, not something that slips past, buried in an 85-page staff report.

And there are further reasons why the Garden City Lands should be designated as agricultural in the Regional Growth Strategy. They are in the ALR, and they are fertile farmland. The property has always remained in the Agricultural Land Reserve despite intense challenges to that status from powerful speculators, including the fattest application the Agricultural Land Commission has ever seen. In response, the commission has *repeatedly* affirmed that the Garden City Lands are prime farmland and belong in the reserve. It has *repeatedly* stated that the lands are *capable* of agriculture and *suitable* for agriculture. There is probably no parcel of land in Metro Vancouver that has been more emphatically shown to belong in the current Green Zone and the proposed agricultural zone.

Strategy 2.3 in the Regional Growth Strategy is to “protect the region’s supply of agricultural land and encourage its use for food production,” and I encourage council to firmly support it and not go along with toothless lip service. On a more specific level, I’m suggesting that council specify that the Garden City Lands must be added to the region’s agricultural zone.

One final point. The Garden City Lands were evidently left out of the existing Green Zone. No one seems to remember how that happened. In any case, the Agricultural Land Commission’s decisions have surely shown that the property does belong in the Green Zone. I suggest that council consider asking Metro Vancouver to include the Garden City Lands in the Green Zone *immediately*. That will ensure that the property gets included in the *proposed* regional agricultural zone if it goes ahead, and it will also ensure that Metro Vancouver will treat the Garden City Lands properly even if the Regional Growth Strategy gets stalled.

Thank you.

Submission from Olga Tkatcheva,

8-7680 Gilbert Rd Richmond BC V7C3W2 604-244-1074

re. Staff report SP GP-1 May 7, 2009 re. Richmond's Comments on Metro Vancouver's
Draft February 2009 Regional Growth Strategy.

I want to point out that the Garden City Land is incorrectly included in the Urban Area
map of the report.

According to the page 71 of the document, the work on the Richmond's part of the map
was done between December 2008 and January 2009 which included clarification of the
land use boundaries and map the designations on a digital parcel base, with the last
revision in Feb.2009. By then GCL was still marked on the OCP as an area under the study
with no clear designation as the review by the ALC of the application to remove the GCL
from the ALR was still in the process. Now the land has its clear agriculture designation
and the map has to be corrected.

When the new OCP was approved by the vote of the council, there was a special reference
done to the Garden City Lands parcel being not included in the land that is needed to
accommodate the proposed growth and the record should be available in the minutes of
that meeting. It means that if the Garden City lands are added to the Urban Area and
consequently developed, any additional population of these lands in the future will be in
addition to the already approved population growth in the City Centre Area with no park
land available to balance this growth. It will result in significant amount of the money that
are needed to buy the land in the City Centre area to satisfy the park land requirements
which is unacceptable from my point of view as a taxpayer.

In conclusion,

The designation of this land as an Urban area is inconsistent with the OCP and could lead
to a huge loss of money for the taxpayers. It could also increase the cost of this land and
reduce the possibility to buy this land from the CLC.

If this land is given its proper agriculture designation, it will preserve the last option for
the people in the dense area of the City Centre to have a park or other ALC compatible
green space within the walking distance without need to drive.