



General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, October 5, 2020

Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair
Councillor Chak Au
Councillor Carol Day (by teleconference)
Councillor Kelly Greene (by teleconference)
Councillor Alexa Loo
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 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on September 21, 2020, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

COUNCILLOR KELLY GREENE

1. **WOMEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

(File Ref. No.:

It was moved and seconded

For staff to investigate and report back on the creation of a Women's Advisory Committee; and evaluate the additional strategy recommendations of the FCM Run, Win and Lead framework and report back.

CARRIED

General Purposes Committee
Monday, October 5, 2020

ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

**2. UBCM COMMUNITY EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND
2020/2021 APPLICATION**

(File Ref. No. 10-6060-01) (REDMS No. 6526672)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the Box Culvert Repair project submission to the 2020 Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) Community Emergency Preparedness Fund for Structural Flood Mitigation be endorsed; and*
- (2) *That, should the submission be successful, the Chief Administrative Officer and General Manager, Engineering and Public Works be authorized to negotiate and execute the funding agreement with UBCM.*

CARRIED

COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION

**3. SOIL USE FOR THE PLACEMENT OF FILL APPLICATION FOR
THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 8511 NO. 6 ROAD (JIANG)**

(File Ref. No. 12-8080-12-01) (REDMS No. 6506278 v. 7)

By teleconference, Barry Mah, Westwood Topsoil Ltd., agent representing the property owner, provided background information regarding the subject site, and noted that (i) the owner has agreed to do whatever it takes to bring the soil back to farmable conditions, (ii) the application has been ongoing for approximately eight years, (iii) various professional analyses have been completed, and (iv) the owner has proposed to provide a \$30,000 bond to the City for implementation of the Farm Plan.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Mah and Thomas Elliot, Agrologist (by teleconference), provided the following information:

- the applicant is agreeable to a minimum 10-year lease between the property owner and the farm operator;
- it is challenging to assure that the soil deposited on the subject site will be sourced from Richmond as there are few opportunities to obtain it locally;
- the removal of the wood waste from the subject site would be a big undertaking and therefore, if the City were to require its removal, there is no certainty that the soil remediation of the subject site would proceed;

General Purposes Committee Monday, October 5, 2020

- the disruption of the wood waste may lead to the generation of leachate and would damage the anaerobic state of the soil, thereby having a greater negative impact on the subject site; and
- as contractor for the applicant, Westwood Topsoil Ltd. works closely with source sites to ensure soil quality.

In reply to queries from Committee, Carli Williams, Manager, Business Licence and Bylaws, advised that if approved, the permit requirements will mirror that of previous soil deposit permits (notably the Kavanagh soil deposit permit) whereby an on-site monitor will be required to inspect each load of soil prior to deposition on the subject site and maintain an accurate daily log of trucks depositing soil on the site. Ms. Williams then spoke to performance bonds, noting that the City does not have the authority to require such bond to ensure that all required mitigation and monitoring measures are completed; therefore the proposed \$30,000 bond for the implementation of the Farm Plan is at the applicant's discretion.

Discussion took place and Committee commented on future soil deposit permits and the need to know where soil to be deposited is sourced.

It was moved and seconded

That the 'Soil Use for the Placement of Fill' application, submitted by Bohan Jiang (the "Applicant"), proposing to deposit soil on the property located at 8511 No. 6 Road for the purpose of remediating the property to develop a blueberry farm, be authorized for referral to the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) for the ALC to review and determine the merits of the proposal from an agricultural perspective as the Applicant has satisfied all of the City's current reporting requirements.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion took place and Committee commented on (i) the need to know where soil is sourced from prior to Council consideration of soil deposit permits, (ii) the preference to require that soils be sourced solely from Richmond and/or Delta, and (iii) the need to apply soil permit requirements consistently.

In reply to a further query from Committee, Mr. Elliot and Mr. Mah stated that the availability of suitable top soil from Richmond and/or Delta is limited and thus it would be challenging to assure this; moreover, the anticipated two-year timeline to complete the project would likely be exceeded if soils deposited were required to be from Richmond and/or Delta.

General Purposes Committee
Monday, October 5, 2020

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

It was moved and seconded

That the main motion be amended to add “provided that the soil is sourced from Richmond and/or Delta.”

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllrs. Au
Loo
McPhail

The question on the main motion, as amended to read as follows:

“That the ‘Soil Use for the Placement of Fill’ application, submitted by Bohan Jiang (the “Applicant”), proposing to deposit soil on the property located at 8511 No. 6 Road for the purpose of remediating the property to develop a blueberry farm, provided that the soil is sourced from Richmond and/or Delta, be authorized for referral to the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) for the ALC to review and determine the merits of the proposal from an agricultural perspective as the Applicant has satisfied all of the City’s current reporting requirements.”

was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Au and Wolfe opposed.

The Chair requested that staff provide information regarding permit conditions imposed on previous applications, notably a site on Westminster Highway being referred to as the “Kavanagh guidelines.” In addition, staff was requested to advise on the process for an applicant if soil for deposit cannot be sourced from Richmond and/or Delta.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

4. **AMENDMENTS TO OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW PREPARATION CONSULTATION POLICY 5043 (UPDATE TO REFERRALS TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 38 (RICHMOND)) AND NEW POLICY ON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL REFERRAL TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 38 (RICHMOND)**

(File Ref. No. 08-4045-00) (REDMS No. 6510818; 5374035; 6401251; 6487486)

General Purposes Committee
Monday, October 5, 2020

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Council Policy 5043 “OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy” be amended to update the Board of Education of School District No. 38 (Richmond) referral process to lower the criteria for Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000 Amendment applications being forwarded to the Board of Education of School District No. 38 from 50 additional school-aged children to 25 additional school-aged children, and undertake minor administrative updates as outlined in the report dated September 14, 2020, from the Director of Policy Planning; and*
- (2) *That the new proposed Council Policy “Referrals to the Board of Education of School District No. 38 (Richmond) for Development Applications Involving Independent Schools” be approved to address referring Independent School proposals requiring a development application to the Board of Education of School District No. 38 (Richmond) as outlined in the report dated September 14, 2020, from the Director of Policy Planning.*

CARRIED

5. **REFERRAL RESPONSE: REGULATING FENCING MATERIALS**

(File Ref. No. 08-4430-01) (REDMS No. 647103 v. 12; 6404835; 6399777; 6399778; 6360541; 6400503)

In reply to queries from Committee, Barry Konkin, Director, Policy Planning and James Cooper, Director, Building Approvals (by teleconference) provided the following information:

- an amendment to Building Regulation Bylaw No. 7230 that would require a Building Permit application for all fences and elements requiring a concrete foundation would help ensure that fences – including masonry – are well built and constructed properly in all zones in urban areas; and
- dilapidated fences that encroach on City property can be remedied through the City’s bylaws, whereas such fences between two private properties are a civil matter between property owners.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10122, respecting changes to fence regulations (including the prohibition of masonry as a permitted fence material for lands regulated under Section 14.1 of the Agriculture Zone), be revised as outlined in this report;*

General Purposes Committee
Monday, October 5, 2020

- (2) *That Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10122, respecting changes to fence regulations (including the prohibition of masonry as a permitted fence material for lands regulated under Section 14.1 of the Agriculture Zone), as revised, be given second reading; and*
- (3) *That staff be directed to maintain the current bylaw regulations for fence materials – including masonry – in all zones in urban areas that permit single detached residential uses.*

The question on the motion was not called as in reply to queries from Committee, staff advised that (i) agricultural property owners and the Food Security and Agricultural Advisory Committee were not consulted regarding this matter, (ii) a typical wood fence requiring a small concrete footing would not require a building permit, and (iii) if a homeowner is committed to a particular style of fence, they may apply for one through the Development Variance Permit process.

The question on Parts (1) and (2) of the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Loo and McPhail opposed.

The question on Part (3) of the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Day, Greene, Steves, and Wolfe opposed.

6. **APPLICATION BY KULBINDER DHESI, RAJBINDER AUJLA AND PAULVEER AUJLA FOR REZONING AT 10160 WILLIAMS ROAD FROM THE “SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E)” ZONE TO THE “COMPACT SINGLE DETACHED (RC2)” ZONE**

(File Ref. No. RZ 19-881151) (REDMS No. 6525481 v. 4; 6511125; 6511133)

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10206, for the rezoning of 10160 Williams Road from the “Single Detached (RS1/E)” zone to the “Compact Single Detached (RC2)” zone, be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllr. Wolfe

7. **APPLICATION BY RAMAN KOONER FOR REZONING AT 3540 LOCKHART ROAD FROM THE “SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E)” ZONE TO THE “SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/B)” ZONE**

(File Ref. No. RZ 20-898600) (REDMS No. 6522282 v. 4; 6526719; 6526711)

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10211, for the rezoning of 3540 Lockhart Road from the “Single Detached (RS1/E)” zone to the “Single Detached (RS2/B)” zone, be introduced and given first reading.

General Purposes Committee
Monday, October 5, 2020

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllr. Greene

Discussion took place on the demolition of two-unit dwellings as it relates to secondary suites and in response to Committee comments, Wayne Craig, Director, Development, advised that the subject site is zoned for a single-family home and not a two-unit dwelling; he provided background information and remarked that if a two-unit dwelling were to be constructed, a rezoning application would be required.

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

It was moved and seconded

That staff investigate how to make non-conforming two-unit dwellings compliant where they already exist and report back.

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllr. Loo

COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION

8. **MASK WEARING IN CITY BUILDINGS**

(File Ref. No. 09-5125-01) (REDMS No. 6529829 v. 7)

Serena Lusk, General Manager, Community Services, referenced exceptions listed in Option 3 – Semi-Restricted Mark Use Requirements as described in Option 3 in the staff report titled, “Mask Wearing in City Buildings,” dated September 27, 2020, noting that an additional exception for children and caregivers in a childcare setting as per the BC Centre for Disease Control be added.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the wearing of masks in City buildings be required as described in Option 3 in the staff report titled, “Mask Wearing in City Buildings,” dated September 27, 2020 from the General Manager, Community Services, provided a further exception for children and caregivers in a child care setting as per the BC Centre for Disease Control.

In reply to queries from Committee, Ms. Lusk advised that (i) staff training will be provided, (ii) as per Option 3, refusal of service for non-compliance is recommended for those that do not fall under an exception category, however every opportunity to comply will be provided prior to refusal of service, and (iii) it is best practice to request that members of the public provide their own mask but a disposable mask will be supplied if required.

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

General Purposes Committee
Monday, October 5, 2020

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (5:46 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 5,
2020.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

Hanieh Berg
Legislative Services Associate