

Planning Committee

Date:

Tuesday, February 2, 2016

Place:

Anderson Room

Richmond City Hall

Present:

Councillor Linda McPhail, Chair

Councillor Bill McNulty Councillor Chak Au Councillor Carol Day Councillor Harold Steves

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 Planning Committee held on January 19, 2016, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

February 16, 2016, (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room

DELEGATION

1. (1) Daylene Marshall and De Whalen, Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC), briefed Committee on the report prepared by the Richmond Poverty Response Committee regarding municipal responses to child and youth poverty, highlighting the following:

- the municipal response focused on Metro Vancouver municipalities and a comparative study of municipal responses to subsidies, housing, childcare, food security, health, transportation and recreation;
- some municipalities in the study have adopted a coordinated approach to address child and youth poverty;
- approximately 22% of Richmond's population is considered to be living in poverty;
- the report includes recommendations for the City to address issues related to child and youth poverty; and
- the Province has not implemented a poverty reduction plan.

In reply to queries from Committee Ms. Marshall noted that (i) Richmond's poverty rate was calculated using Richmond's population, (ii) the BC Integrated Youth Services Initiative receives funding from the Province, and (iii) Richmond School District No. 38 is a member of RCSAC and that RCSAC encourages more involvement from the District.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the report on Municipal Responses to Child and Youth Poverty, from the Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee, be received for information and be referred to staff for comment and report back.

The question on the referral was not called as discussion ensued with respect to the Provincial response on the matter.

The Chair noted that since 2004, the Union of British Columbia Municipalities (UBCM) has passed seven resolutions related to poverty reduction.

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

Claire Smyth, 4500 Westwater Drive, and Jenny Tune, 11291 7th Avenue, spoke on child and youth poverty and read from a submission from Fran Mitchell, Canadian Federation of University Women - Richmond President (copy on file, City Clerk's Office).

Trish Garner, Community Organizer, BC Poverty Reduction Coalition, spoke on the RCSAC Report on Municipal Responses to Child and Youth Poverty and read from her submission (attached to and forming part of these minutes as Schedule 1).

In reply to queries from Committee, Cathryn Volkering Carlile, General Manager, Community Services noted that staff can provide an update on programs available for transit assistance for low income individuals.

Deanna Ogle, First Call Child and Youth Advocacy Coalition, commented on child and youth poverty in the city, noting of the importance of advocating to senior levels of government on matters related to poverty reduction. Also, she was of the opinion that the City can take steps to address poverty by (i) committing to become a living wage employer, (ii) continuing programs supporting non-profit childcare providers, and (iii) expanding recreation services subsidies for low income families.

(2) Ms. Marshall and Ms. Whalen spoke on the BC Rent Supplement Survey for Richmond residents, noting that (i) the criteria to qualify for rental assistance is narrow, (ii) rent receipts are required to apply for rental assistance, (iii) raising income ceilings and ability to combine subsidies will aid low income individuals with housing, and (iv) the RCSAC is recommending that the letter and report be sent to the Honourable Linda Reid, MLA Richmond East and the Honourable Premier Christy Clark.

In reply to queries from Committee, Ms. Carlile advised that there have been submissions to UBCM on the matter.

In reply to queries from Committee, Ms. Whalen noted that landlords are required to issue rent receipts. She added that secondary suites and laneway housing are considered market housing and tenants of those housing types could apply for rental assistance.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the report on the BC Rent Supplement Survey for Richmond Residents, from the Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee, be received for information and be referred to staff for comment and report back.

The question on the referral was not called as discussion ensued with regard to advocating to senior levels of government.

It was encouraged that the RCSAC continue their advocacy efforts to senior levels of government on the issue of rental assistance.

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

James Caspersen, representing the Richmond Drop in Centre, spoke on rental housing and read from his submission (attached to and forming part of these minutes as Schedule 2).

COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION

2. CHILD CARE DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2015 ANNUAL REPORT AND 2016 WORK PROGRAM

(File Ref. No. 07-3070-01) (REDMS No. 4873846 v. 5)

It was moved and seconded

That the Child Care Development Advisory Committee's 2015 Annual Report and 2016 Work Program be approved.

CARRIED

3. RICHMOND SENIORS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2015 ANNUAL REPORT AND 2016 WORK PROGRAM

(File Ref. No. 07-3400-01) (REDMS No. 4879276 v. 3)

Sean Davies, Acting Community Facilities Coordinator, advised that the Newcomers Guide is available in English and four additional languages.

It was moved and seconded

That the Richmond Seniors Advisory Committee 2015 Annual Report and 2016 Work Program be approved.

CARRIED

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

4. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL (CDT1) ZONE

(File Ref. No. 08-4430-01; 12-8060-20-009284) (REDMS No. 4762142 v. 7)

Wayne Craig, Director, Development spoke on the proposed amendments to the downtown commercial zoning, noting that (i) approximately 111 sites are zoned CDT1, (ii) development of CDT1 may occur through a development permit, and (iii) proposed amendments will clarify density calculations and enhance the ability for the City to secure required road dedication on sites that do not require rezoning.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig noted that (i) only some sites may proceed to develop through the rezoning process, (ii) CDT1 zone was amended previously to provide a density bonus to secure affordable housing, and (iii) securing road dedication provides more long-term benefits for the City compared to securing roads and lanes via a statutory right-of-way.

In reply to queries from Committee, Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning and Development, noted that only a development permit is required to develop pre-zoned sites and that the approval of a development permit is subject to compliance with the City's development permit guidelines.

Discussion ensued with regard to the affordable housing threshold requirements in relation to the number of units in new developments. Mr. Craig advised that staff will examine thresholds for affordable housing as part of the Affordable Housing Strategy update.

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9284 to amend the "Downtown Commercial (CDT1) Zone" be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

PROPOSED ZONING BYLAW HOUSEKEEPING AMENDMENTS
 (File Ref. No. 08-4430-01; 12-8060-20-009488/9490) (REDMS No. 4745861 v. 12)

Tina Atva, Development Coordinator, spoke on the proposed Zoning Bylaw Housekeeping Amendments, noting that the bylaws are grouped into four categories and the amendments will make the Bylaw easier to understand by users.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig noted that the changes to single-family zoning updated in the past year are included in the housekeeping amendments so the same regulations apply to all site specific single-family zoning districts.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9490 to make housekeeping amendments be introduced and given first reading; and
- (2) That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9488 to amend the height regulations for site-specific single family residential zones be introduced and given first reading.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with respect to the proposed Zoning Bylaw Housekeeping Amendments.

Linda Terborg, 5860 Sandpiper Court, expressed concern with regard to the language used in the proposed Zoning Bylaw Housekeeping Amendments and was of the opinion that the proposed amendments will create confusion.

Kathryn McCreary, 7560 Glacier Crescent, expressed concern that allowances noted in the proposed Zoning Bylaw Housekeeping Amendments may differ from the allowances provided for special zones in the city.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig advised that the proposed Zoning Bylaw Housekeeping Amendments would take the bylaw changes Council adopted in 2015 related to single-family development and apply those amendments to all the site-specific single-family zones. He added that should the proposed amendments proceed to Public Hearing in March 2016, notification would be done through newspaper advertisements and the City's website.

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

6. APPLICATION BY SKYHIGH CONSTRUCTION LTD. FOR REZONING AT 4211 AND 4231 PENDLEBURY ROAD FROM "TWO-UNIT DWELLING (RD1)" TO "SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/B)"

(File Ref. No. RZ 14-663202; 12-8060-20-009285) (REDMS No. 4675946)

Mr. Craig briefed Committee on the proposed application, noting that the applicant has undertaken extensive measures to retain a mature tree on-site.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig noted that the site currently has a duplex and the proposed application will permit the property to be subdivided into two single-family lots.

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9285, for the rezoning of 4211 and 4231 Pendlebury Road from "Two-Unit Dwelling (RD1)" to "Single Detached (RS2/B)," be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

7. APPLICATION BY JASPREET CHUNG TO DISCHARGE THE LAND USE CONTRACT AT 9420 PARKSVILLE DRIVE

(File Ref. No. LU 15-717343; 12-8060-20-009517) (REDMS No. 4885911)

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Land Use Contract 009 Discharge Bylaw No. 9517, to discharge "Land Use Contract 009" from the title of 9420 Parksville Drive, be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

8. APPLICATION BY HARDEEP BHULLAR FOR REZONING AT 11971 DEWSBURY DRIVE FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO COMPACT SINGLE DETACHED (RC2)

(File Ref. No. RZ 15-705925; 12-8060-20-009515/9525) (REDMS No. 4877664)

It was moved and seconded

(1) That Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9525, proposing a text amendment to Section 3.6.3, Objective 4, B. Aircraft Noise Sensitive Areas, be introduced and given first reading;

- (2) That Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9525, having been considered in conjunction with:
 - (a) the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program; and
 - (b) the Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;
 - is hereby found to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act;
- (3) That Bylaw 9525, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, be referred to the Vancouver International Airport Authority after first bylaw reading, for formal comment before the Public Hearing on March 21, 2016; and
- (4) That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9515, for the rezoning of 11971 Dewsbury Drive from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Compact Single Detached (RC2)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

9. MANAGER'S REPORT

(i) No. 5 Road Backlands Information Meeting

Terry Crowe, Manager, Policy Planning, briefed Committee on a No. 5 Road Backlands Information meeting hosted by the City on January 27, 2016, noting that (i) approximately 50 people attended, (ii) the City emphasized that no land will be expropriated, (iii) interest was expressed by some property owners for the option to have the City farm their portion of the Backlands, and (iv) should the proposed policy proceed, staff will provide a memorandum to Council on the matter prior to the Public Hearing.

Discussion ensued with regard to (i) alternative options to use less land to develop the proposed farm access road along the Backlands, (ii) the effect of the proposed George Massey Tunnel Replacement (GMTR) Project and expansion of Highway 99 on the No. 5 Road Backlands, (iii) providing opportunities for property owners to farm the Backlands, and (iv) expanding Highway 99 along its east-side.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Erceg noted that the City can explore compensation options for farm management of the Backlands and discuss farm road options with property owners.

Discussion then ensued with respect to the role of property owners to farm the Backlands and support from the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) on the matter.

(ii) Application by Onni Development (Imperial Landing) Corp.

Mr. Craig advised that Onni will be undertaking public consultation on the proposed rezoning application for the Bayview Street site. He added that Onni will host four information sessions on February 18, 20, 25 and 27, 2016 and that City staff will receive a summary of the consultation process. Also, he noted that Onni will be advertising the information session through mail and newspaper advertisements.

Discussion ensued with regard to (i) reviewing the proposed amenity package, (ii) the proposed mix of retail space, office space, and Maritime Mixed Use on the site, and (iii) Onni's independent consultation process.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Erceg noted that staff will not be present at Onni's information sessions.

As a result of the discussion, staff were directed to provide Council with information summarizing the proposed application by Onni on the Bayview Street site.

(iii) Landsdowne Development

In reply to queries from Committee regarding the proposed Landsdowne development, Mr. Craig noted that staff are reviewing a proposed rezoning application for a site opposite Landsdowne Mall, along No. 3 Road. He added that for the Landsdowne site itself, there is currently no rezoning application, however, the applicant has submitted an Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment application to develop a master plan consistent with the City Centre Area Plan, and that master plan would be presented to Council in the future.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Erceg advised that staff can provide information on proposed Landsdowne master plan initiatives.

(iv) Soil Fill Activities in East Richmond

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Erceg noted that Community Bylaws staff can provide an update on the on-going soil fill activities in east Richmond.

(v) Vacant Homes

In reply to queries from Committee, Ms. Carlile noted that staff are arranging for a presentation by Chimo Community Services on their work with vacant homes in the city.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded *That the meeting adjourn (5:32 p.m.).*

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Tuesday, February 2, 2016.

Councillor Linda McPhail Chair Evangel Biason Legislative Services Coordinator



WORKING TOGETHER FOR A POVERTY FREE BC

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of Richmond City Council held on Tuesday, February 2, 2015.

Presentation in Support of RCSAC Report on Municipal Responses to Child/Youth Poverty

Trish Garner, BC Poverty Reduction Coalition February 2, 2016

I'm Trish Garner, Community Organizer with the BC Poverty Reduction Coalition, of which the Richmond Poverty Response Committee is an active member. Thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of this critical report. It speaks to the Council's commitment that they commissioned the report, and I want to recognize the comprehensive work of the Richmond Poverty Response Committee in reviewing existing programs and providing strong recommendations.

Canada, and by implication, all jurisdictions within it, has signed on to the International Covenant on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights, which promise "an adequate standard of living for all, including adequate food, clothing and shelter."

Last year, I was running a workshop in Richmond and met Clay Tang with Chimo. He told me about taking a teenager to the food bank for the first time, and that the boy had been most excited about taking back to his Mom, not food, but toilet paper.

Clearly, we're not fulfilling our human rights commitments, but this path outlined here continues the journey in the right direction. A human rights perspective to anti-poverty work is critical because it puts the dignity of all people at the heart.

I wholeheartedly support the recommendations within this report. First, I have an overall comment and then some more targeted notes. The significant feature of these recommendations is that they have two areas of focus: what the City can do; and the role of the City in advocating to senior levels of government. The second is critical given that, while the issues are felt within the community, the higher levels of government have the real means to make systemic change in tackling root causes; and this is highlighted within the report.

In relation to targeted comments, I will focus on transit because, as you read within the report, no other Metro Vancouver municipality has any programs in relation to transit so there is a leadership role for Richmond to play in providing a low income transit program. Cranbrook is the only city in BC to provide such a program but there are examples in Seattle and Calgary.

A low income transit program could also be connected to existing leisure access services so that there are less barriers for low-income people in accessing these programs. Calgary has taken this approach to provide one point of access for all their low-income services and programs. (In relation to the Councillor's earlier question about involving the School Board, there is also an opportunity here to connect these programs to a school activity fee waiver program. These fees impact low-income families and, despite saying on forms that families can opt out if they disclose their low-income status, we know that families often don't because of shame.)

In conclusion, there are human rights arguments for this approach, moral arguments that this is the right thing to do, but also very strong economic arguments that this saves money in the long run. Thank you.

Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of Richmond City Council held on Tuesday, February 2, 2015.

Speaker: James Caspersen

Organization: Richmond Drop in Centre

TO: MAYOR & EACH

COUNCILLOR

FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

To Feb 2, 2016 Planning Item # 1.

Home Address: #310 1965 W 8th ave, Vancouver Contact: jamesc@stalbansrichmond.org

Through a year and a half with the Richmond Drop in Centre, I have encountered dozens of individuals seeking housing in the Richmond private rental market. For a typical individual on Income Assistance of \$610 a month, \$375 of which is intended for rent, this greatly limits the number and types of units available. No clients in my experience have been able to secure a place on their own, which most report preferring. Instead, they have to live with roommates. This inherently denies them of the freedom of choice in where and how to live, and makes further treatment of any underlying physical or mental health issues difficult.

There are limited subsidies available through Vancouver Coastal Health via the Mental Health Team, the Homeless Prevention Program, through higher income assistance programs, such as the Persons with Disabilities benefit, and through BC housing, such as SAFER. However, the eligibility criteria, limited time of the subsidies, and low availability of some subsidies keep them out of reach of most clients, and are further limited by programs like SAFER excluding those who collect income assistance. For those who are fortunate enough to receive a VCH or Homeless Prevention Program subsidy, the time is usually limited to 6 months to a year, which is not enough time to make significant changes to help these clients not need the subsidy in the future, and can put them at risk of becoming homeless again.

There are also unluckier clients, such as a middle aged female who does not present with mental health challenges severe enough to warrant a VCH subsidy, and does not fall into the HPP criteria of fleeing violence, being a youth transitioning from foster care, being discharged from an institution, or aboriginal. Her age and physical health also mean she cannot collect SAFER or Persons with Disabilities benefits. She is currently homeless, and any housing searches she attempts are a constant decision making process about which of the things she wants in a home she is willing to live without, which does not provide a supportive environment for making any other changes in her life. As of last week, we count 53 clients in this situation of not meeting criteria.

I am hoping the planning committee will be encouraged to explore options for subsidies to be made available for Richmond residents in this situation. There is good evidence that supports the use of subsidies for individuals like this, if they are made available broadly and have a longer time period of up to three years. The evidence also shows that these are a cost effective option when compared to the cost of an individual experiencing chronic homelessness on the health, justice, and social services systems. This is also a key recommendation made by Dena Kae Beno through the report titled "Examining Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Options" presented to this committee in May of last year, which identifies the potential development of a Cooperation Agreement for a pilot project as a way to make these subsidies available to vulnerable Richmond residents for up to 3 years.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

FEB 0 2 2016