



General Purposes Committee

Date:

Monday, September 21, 2020

Place:

Council Chambers

Richmond City Hall

Present:

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair

Councillor Chak Au

Councillor Carol Day (entered by teleconference at 4:04 p.m.)

Councillor Kelly Greene (by teleconference)
Councillor Alexa Loo (by teleconference)
Councillor Bill McNulty (by teleconference)
Councillor Linda McPhail (by teleconference)
Councillor Harold Steves (by teleconference)
Councillor Michael Wolfe (by teleconference)

Call to Order:

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on September 8, 2020, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

Councillor Day entered the meeting by teleconference (4:04 p.m.)

COUNCILLOR KELLY GREENE

1. AT-HOME BUSINESS USE

(File Ref. No.)

Councillor Greene spoke to the need to analyze the City's current bylaws at they relate to permitted at-home business uses, stating that the City's regulations should not impoverish business owners during a pandemic.

Discussion took place and the following Committee comments were noted:

- the expansion of regulations to permit additional at-home businesses is concerning as it would potentially legitimize businesses who are currently in violation of the City's bylaws;
- the need for client parking, additional traffic, and an increase in unfamiliar persons would negatively impact residential neighbourhoods if additional types of at-home businesses were permitted;
- the City's regulations related to at-home business use are in need of a refresh; a staff referral could examine such uses and recommend new regulations in an effort to mitigate impacts to residential neighbourhoods such as options for limiting the number of clients per day, limiting operating hours, and requiring parking to be provided on the property as oppose to on the street;
- the Richmond Chamber of Commerce indicated that the matter of expanding in-home business use has not been an area of concern for its members;
- a primary concern with Airbnb was its traffic impacts on residential neighbourhoods; and
- a referral of this nature is complex and would ultimately alter the way in which the City is organized; the expansion of regulations to permit various types of businesses at-home compromises the City's Official Community Plan, which clearly defines commercial and residential sectors.

In reply to queries from Committee, Carli Williams, Manager, Business Licence and Bylaws, spoke to the City's current enforcement protocol as it relates to complaints on at-home businesses. Staff was requested to provide statistics on complaints regarding at-home businesses.

It was moved and seconded

To investigate and report back on feasibility and options for expanded athome business use; for example, personal services, RMTs, etc. Not to include retail or other businesses that can be expected to generate traffic, noise, or odours.

The question on the referral motion was not called as Committee members expressed their rationale in favour and in opposition of the referral, citing (i) the City's regulations are out-dated, (ii) the expansion of at-home businesses may infringe on residents' quality of life, (iii) Airbnb was not favoured as many homes were not occupied by the home owner(s), and (iv) the expansion of at-home businesses may single out some types of businesses, which would provide an unequal playing field.

The question on the referral motion was then called and it was **DEFEATED** with Mayor Brodie, Cllrs. Au, Loo, McNulty and McPhail opposed.

COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION

2. PARKING FEES FOR 8620 AND 8660 BECKWITH ROAD

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-01) (REDMS No. 6423459 v. 7)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) That Option 1 as outlined in the staff report titled "Parking Fees for 8620 and 8660 Beckwith Road, dated August 31, 2020, from the General Manager, Community Safety, be approved and implemented; and
- (2) That the neighbouring businesses be consulted for feedback on the potential impact of enforcement of time-limited street parking.

The question on the motion was not called as in reply to queries from Committee, Susan Lloyd, Program Manager, Administration, Parking Enforcement and Animal Control, advised that (i) \$46,000 represents the total investment for the parking lot, (ii) the proposed daily rate can be changed with an amendment to Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636, (iii) the proposed lot would be pay-by-plate, and (iv) there are approximately 200 free parking stalls in the Beckwith / Sexsmith area.

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

COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION

3. REVISED PUBLIC ART PROGRAM POLICY

(File Ref. No. 11-7000-09-00) (REDMS No. 6489154 v. 4)

Serena Lusk, General Manager, Community Services, provided background information and reviewed the proposed options for Council consideration as it relates to the City's Public Art Program, specifically (i) the approval of Terms of References for public art on private property, (ii) the allocation of voluntary developer public art contributions, and (iii) opportunities for local and emerging artists.

Council Approval of Terms of Reference for Public Art on Private Property

Discussion took place on the proposed options set out in Table 1 of the staff report titled "Revised Public Art Program Policy" and the following Committee comments were noted:

- the role of the Richmond Public Art Advisory Committee is diminished if Council begins to require approval of Terms of References for public art on private property; and
- Options 2 and 3 provide Council the flexibility to decline public art that does not meet their liking.

In reply to queries from Committee, Ms. Lusk and Biliana Velkova, Public Art Planner, provided the following information:

- the Richmond Public Art Advisory Committee's membership is comprised of art professionals;
- the Public Art Program (Policy 8703) was adopted by Council in 2010 with the goal of improving the public realm; as such, the City commits an amount of funds equivalent to a minimum of 1% of each Capital Project Budget whereas the public art contribution rate for the private sector was set as the equivalent to a minimum value of 0.5% of the estimated total project construction cost; and
- the value of \$250,000 as set out in Option 3 represents a single piece of public art on a private property.

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

It was moved and seconded

That Option 3, revised to reflect a cumulative budget of \$250,000 or greater than, as set out in Table 1 of the staff report titled "Revised Public Art Program Policy" dated August 20, 2020 from the Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services, be approved as the preferred option for the approval of the Terms of Reference for public art on private property and Policy 8703 – Public Art Program be revised accordingly.

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllr. McPhail

The Chair directed staff to provide Council with a memorandum on the history of the varying public art contribution percentages between the City and private developers, and comment on phased developments with respect to the cumulative public art budget of \$250,000 or greater than.

Allocations of Voluntary Developer Public Art Contributions

Discussion took place on the proposed options set out in Table 2 of the staff report titled "Revised Public Art Program Policy" and Committee commented that Option 4 provides Council the flexibility to move funds around, while Option 1 (status quo) allows Council to examine projects on a prioritized list, which provides an overall glimpse of the City needs.

In reply to a query from Committee, Jerry Chong, Acting General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services, advised that the City collected approximately \$387,000 in public art contributions in 2019 and \$178,000 thus far in 2020.

Discussion took place on the need for additional information on funds received historically for public art contributions and alternatives to raise funding for arts and related facilities. As a result of the discussion, the following **referral motion** was introduced:

General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 21, 2020

It was moved and seconded

That Options for Allocations of Voluntary Developer Public Art Contributions, as set out in Table 2 of the staff report titled "Revised Public Art Program Policy" dated August 20, 2020 from the Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services, be referred back to staff for additional information related to funds received historically for each component of the public art fund and alternatives to raise funding for arts and related facilities.

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllrs. Day Greene

Wolfe

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

4. APPLICATION BY RICHMOND SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 38 FOR A HERITAGE ALTERATION PERMIT AT 8220 GENERAL CURRIE ROAD (GENERAL CURRIE SCHOOL)

(File Ref. No. HA 20-909844) (REDMS No. 6513637)

It was moved and seconded

That a Heritage Alteration Permit be issued that would permit the following work on the General Currie School at 8220 General Currie Road:

- (a) Construction of a wooden accessible ramp;
- (b) Enlargement of the existing stair landing and replacement of the steps;
- (c) Reversing of the door swing to enable access from the ramp; and
- (d) Provision of metal handrails to match those existing.

CARRIED

5. APPLICATION BY FIRST ON SITE RESTORATION LTD. FOR A HERITAGE ALTERATION PERMIT AT 3580 MONCTON STREET (HEPWORTH BLOCK)

(File Ref. No. HA 20-890427) (REDMS No. 6518122 v. 3)

It was moved and seconded

That a Heritage Alteration Permit be issued which would permit the following repair work to a small portion of the south elevation of the building located at 3580 Moncton Street to address damage caused by a vehicle accident:

(a) removal and cleaning of a section of the existing brick façade for reinstallation, and replacement of any non-salvageable brick with new brick to match existing (as verified by City Staff prior to installation);

- (b) repair to the existing concrete window sill to match existing;
- (c) removal and replacement of a portion of the exterior wall wood framing behind the damaged brick due to existing rot; and
- (d) installation of wheel stop curbs for the north-facing parking spaces along the south side of the building.

CARRIED

ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

6. ROBERTS BANK TERMINAL 2 EXPANSION PROJECT UPDATE (File Ref. No. 10-6125-30-004) (REDMS No. 6466120 v. 4)

In reply to queries from Committee, Chad Paulin, Manager, Environment, advised that the economic impact of the project has not been examined and the rationale to oppose the project is based on the future availability of consultation. John Irving, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works, further added that the City's past experience with both federal and provincial environmental approval processes has been less than favourable and as such, a position on the expansion of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 is justified.

The Chair directed staff to reiterate the City's position and rationale in its letters to the various parties as captured in the attachments to the staff report titled "Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Expansion Project Update."

Discussion took place on the value of the Fraser River Estuary Management Program and the need for an economic impact study on the expansion of the Roberts Bank Terminal. Also, it was noted that the Prime Minister, federal and provincial Leaders of the Opposition, local MPs, local MLAs, and Metro Vancouver municipalities be included in the City's correspondence on the project.

As a result, the following **motion** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That, as described in the staff report titled "Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Expansion Project Update," dated September 8, 2020 from the Director, Sustainability and District Energy:

(1) Letters be sent to the Prime Minister, Federal Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Premier of BC, Provincial Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy, the Provincial Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure, federal and provincial Leaders of the Opposition, local MPs, local MLAs, and Metro Vancouver municipalities requesting that the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Expansion Project not proceed; and

(2) That staff be directed to work with the BC Environmental Assessment Office to develop provincial assessment conditions that protect the interests of the community, should the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Expansion Project be approved.

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllr. Loo

McPhail

7. PHOENIX NET LOFT LEAN-TO AND FIRST NATIONS BUNKHOUSE PRESERVATION COSTS

(File Ref. No. 06-2052-25-PNET1) (REDMS No. 6518831 v. 5)

Councillor Steves provided background information and read from his submission titled "First Nation 'Long House' preservation costs" (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 1).

- (1) That the staff report titled "Phoenix Net Loft Lean-to and First Nations Bunkhouse Preservation Costs", from the Director, Facilities and Project Development dated September 9, 2020 be received for information; and
- (2) That the materials titled "First Nation 'Long House' preservation costs" be referred to staff for consideration in conjunction with forthcoming staff report on the First Nations Bunkhouse and update on the Steveston Heritage Sites Interpretive Plan.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded *That the meeting adjourn (5:55 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 September 21, 2020.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie	Hanieh Berg
Chair	Legislative Services Associate