

City of Maple Ridge

***PUBLIC HEARING***

June 20, 2017

The Minutes of the Public Hearing held in the Council Chamber of City Hall, 11995 Haney Place, Maple Ridge, British Columbia on June 20, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.

---

***PRESENT***

*Elected Officials*

Mayor N. Read  
Councillor C. Bell  
Councillor K. Duncan  
Councillor B. Masse  
Councillor G. Robson  
Councillor T. Shymkiw  
Councillor C. Speirs

*Appointed Staff*

F. Quinn, General Manager Public Works and  
Development Services  
P. Gill, General Manager of Finance and Corporate  
Services  
C. Carter, Director of Planning  
C. Goddard, Manager of Development and Environmental  
Services  
L. Darcus, Manager of Legislative Services  
A. Gaunt, Confidential Secretary  
*Other staff as required*  
B. Elliott, Manager of Community Planning  
S. Murphy, Planner 2  
A. Kopystynski, Planner 2  
R. MacNair, Manager of Bylaw and Licensing Services

---

Mayor Read called the meeting to order. The Manager of Legislative Services explained the procedure and rules of order of the Public Hearing and advised that the bylaws will be considered further at the next Council Meeting on June 27, 2017.

- 1) **2017-115-RZ, 10181 247 Street**  
Lot 1, Section 3, Township 12, New Westminster District, Plan EPP68470

**Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No. 7321-2017**

To rezone from R-1 (Residential District) to RS-1b (One Family Urban [Medium Density] Residential) to rectify the split-zoning that currently applies to the subject property. This is not creating a new lot.

There being no comment, the Mayor declared this item dealt with.

- 2) **2016-008-RZ, 11016, 11032 and 11038 240th Street**  
Lot 5, Section 10, Township 12, New Westminster District, Plan 17613;  
South Half Lot 4, Section 10, Township 12, New Westminster Plan 17613;  
North Half Lot 4, Section 10, Township 12, New Westminster Plan 17613

**Maple Ridge Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw No. 7326-2017**

To amend Albion Area Plan Schedule 1 from Low/Medium Density Residential to Conservation and Medium Density Residential  
To add to Conservation on Schedule C

**Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No. 7218-2016**

To rezone from RS-3 (One Family Rural Residential) to RM-1 (Townhouse Residential) to permit the future development of 15 townhouse units

**Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No. 7219-2016**

To rezone from RS-3 (One Family Rural Residential) to R-3 (Special Amenity Residential District) for a future 8 lot subdivision

The Mayor called for speakers three times.

There being no comment, the Mayor declared this item dealt with.

- 3) **2016-464-RZ, 20185 and 20199 McIvor Avenue**  
Lot 102, District Lot 263, Group 1, New Westminster District, Plan 50054 Lot 40,  
District Lot 263, Group 1, New Westminster District, Plan BCP30587

**Maple Ridge Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw No. 7333-2017**

To amend Schedule "B" of the Official Community Plan from Agricultural to Urban Residential and to amend the Urban Area Boundary

**Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No. 7308-2017**

To rezone from RS-1 (One Family Urban Residential) to RS-1b (One Family Urban [Medium Density] Residential) for a future 9 lot subdivision

The Mayor called for speakers three times.

There being no comment, the Mayor declared this item dealt with.

Note: Councillor Duncan excused herself from discussion of Item 4 at 7:11 p.m. as she lives in the vicinity of the application.

4) **2015-297-RZ**

**23025, 23054, 23060, 23070, 23075, 23089 and 23095 Lougheed Highway and 11305, 11383, 11428 and 11438 232 Street**

Lot 31 District Lots 402 and 403 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 61595;

Lot 32 District Lots 402 and 403 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 61595;

Lot 27 Except: Part on Statutory Right of Way Plan 71204; District Lot 403 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 44493;

Lot 28 Except Part in Highway Plan 71204, District Lot 403 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 44493;

Lot 29, Except: Part on Statutory Right Of Way Plan 71204, District Lot 403 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 44493;

Lot 3 Section 16 Township 12 New Westminster District Plan 17222;

Parcel "M" (Reference Plan 681) District Lot 403 Group 1 New Westminster District;

Parcel "One" (Explanatory Plan 8328) of Parcel "J" (Reference Plan 3829) Except: Part on Statutory Right of Way Plan 71204; District Lots 402 And 403 Group 1 New Westminster District;

Parcel "D" (Reference Plan 1017) South West Quarter Section 16 Township 12 New Westminster District;

Parcel "L" (Reference Plan 3957) of Parcel "J" (Reference Plan 3829), Except: Firstly : Part on Statutory Right of Way Plan 4834; Secondly: Part Lying South of Road Shown on Statutory Right of Way Plan 4834; Thirdly : Part on Statutory Right of Way Plan 71204; District Lots 402 and 403 Group 1 New Westminster District;

Part (.015 Acres Plan 3041) of Parcel J (Reference Plan 3829) District Lot 403 Group 1 New Westminster District.

**Maple Ridge Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw No. 7331-2017**

To amend Schedule "B" of the Official Community Plan from Conservation and Urban Residential to Urban Residential, Commercial, Conservation and Park

To amend Schedule "C" of the Official Community Plan to remove from Conservation and to add to Conservation

**Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No. 7183-2015**

To rezone from RS-3 (One Family Rural Residential) to R-2 (Urban Residential District), RM-1 (Townhouse Residential), C-1 (Neighbourhood Commercial) and P-1 (Park and School) to permit future subdivision of approximately 89 R-2 lots and 262 townhouse units

AND

**PART 7 COMMERCIAL ZONES, SECTION 701, SUB-SECTIONS 1 AND 8**  
**NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMERCIAL C-1** is amended by adding additional site specific uses and regulations to accommodate development as proposed in Bylaw No. 7183-2015.

The Manager of Legislative Services advised that correspondence in favour of the application was received from Kiana Serr, HUB Cycling Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows, Dawnene Law, Steven Gardener and Terran Sonier.

The Mayor called for speakers for first call

**Robert Berbeck**

Mr. Berbeck stated that he and his wife are in favour of the development application as it will help to decrease the fire hazard in the area. He felt that the proposed development is a smart mix of both townhouses and stand-alone homes and allocated a sufficient amount of green space for park and recreation.

**Zachary Betts**

Mr. Betts stated he has lived in Maple Ridge for 24 years. He advised on his educational background and his future plans to return to Maple Ridge. He spoke in favour of the application in that the proposed development will allow for affordable living.

**Meryl Herberts**

Ms. Herberts advised on why she and her husband moved to Maple Ridge. She spoke in favour of the application due to its central location and its pricing structure as it will support young families to integrate into the City.

The Mayor called for speakers for second and third calls.

There being no further comment, the Mayor declared this item dealt with.

Note: Councillor Duncan returned to the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

5) **2017-231-RZ**

**Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No. 7339-2017**

To amend Part 2 Interpretation, Part 4 General Regulations, Part 6 Residential Zones and Part 9 Institutional Zones of the Maple Ridge Zoning Bylaw No. 3510 – 1985 to regulate supportive recovery homes and other care facility uses throughout the City.

The Bylaw defines a number of care facility uses which includes: “Assisted Living Residence”, “Community Care Facility”, “Supportive Recovery Home” and “Transitional Housing” and amends the existing definitions of “Elderly Citizen Residential”, “Family” and “Private Hospital” to align with the newly defined care facility uses. The Bylaw permits care facility uses in the RS-1, RS-1a, RS-1b, RS-1c,

RS-1d, RS-2, and RS-3 zones, but only on properties with a minimum lot area of 557 square metres (approx. 5,995 square feet) and where such care facility uses contain 10 or fewer residents and staff combined. The Bylaw prescribes that care facility uses where the combined number of residents and staff exceed 10 are to be located on properties in the P-2 Institutional zone.

The Bylaw establishes a set of general regulations for care facility uses with 10 or fewer residents and staff in the permitted residential zones: being contained in a single family residential dwelling; satisfying minimum setbacks from other care facility uses, schools, child care centres, and family day cares; requiring notification or approval from the applicable Health Authority; cannot be on the same property as a secondary suite use, detached garden suite use, boarding use, or temporary residential use; cannot be strata-titled; cannot be on a property in a floodplain; and requiring that a Housing Agreement with the City be completed. A Housing Agreement template has been prepared to demonstrate what an Agreement might include, such as: a set of definitions; the obligations of the owner; the requirements of the care facility use; the conditions of residency; the obligations of the operator; and other miscellaneous provisions. NOTE: The Housing Agreement does not form part of Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No. 7339-2017.

The Director of Planning provided clarification on an ad placed into the Maple Ridge Pitt Meadows News. She advised that the ad was not placed by the City. She advised on details of the current bylaw and reasons for the proposed amendments to the bylaw.

S. Murphy, Planner gave a power point presentation providing the following information:

- Background
- Assisted Living Residences
- Community Care Facilities
- Unlicensed Unregistered Unregulated Care Facilities
- Challenges
- Process
- Option 1: Regulate Use
- Proposed Zoning Amendments
- Housing Agreement Highlights
- Other Municipal Comparisons
- Capping the Number of Facilities
- Initial operator feedback
- Summary
- Table comparing the draft bylaw and the current bylaw
- Next steps

The Manager of Legislative Services advised that speaking notes were received from Jim Reilly and correspondence was received from Darrell Pilgrim of the Salvation Army terming the bylaw a positive step but expressed concern over the language used in terms of exit plan and the release of private information to the City and the RCMP.

The Mayor called for speakers at first call.

**Jim Reilly**

Mr. Reilly addressed comments provided by the Director of Planning. He advised on a letter sent to the City with a legal opinion putting forward that the existing bylaw is being misinterpreted. He also advised that a response has not been received from City Hall despite repeated requests.

Mr. Reilly read from the speaking notes provided to Council. He expressed that the matter of the location of supportive recovery homes is a land use issue and applicants should be vetted by appearing before Council at a Public Hearing.

**Liliya Rhodes**

Ms. Rhodes spoke in opposition to the bylaw. She stated that she lives next door to a supportive recovery home and outlined issues and problems she is having at her residence which she feels result from this home. She expressed concern with this particular recovery home being in the vicinity of an elementary school and a liquor store particularly in the access to the liquor store for recovering alcoholics. She asked whether checks on supportive recovery homes will be made to ensure regulations are being followed. She asked Council to think about the residents living next door to these types of facilities.

**Elizabeth Taylor**

Ms. Taylor is pleased to see that community care facilities are exempt within the proposed bylaw. She provided a history of community living facilities and compared the difficulty of opening such facilities in residential areas years ago to the current events. Ms. Taylor advised on lengths of time to go through detox and a recovery program and felt that supportive recovery homes are necessary as supports within the community. She expressed concern over the division within the community pertaining to shelters and supportive recovery homes.

**Ken Blogg**

Mr. Blogg asked how a residence can be permitted to house 10 people while being connected to a septic system which is only built to accommodate 5 people and is located beside a creek. He expressed concern that residents in Whispering Falls were not been asked about a recovery house in their neighbourhood.

**Christine MacIntosh** – Fraser River All Nations Aboriginal Society (“FRANAS”)

Ms. MacIntosh spoke in favour of supportive recovery facilities. She expressed that the type of persons who would use such care facilities would be somebody’s child, father, mother etc. and that it takes a village to raise a child. She asked for the support from the community to help those who are unable to help themselves and support facilities which will allow persons to get treatment.

**Caroline Cass**

Ms. Cass felt that a supportive recovery facility can be a welcome addition to a neighbourhood. She described the positive interaction between the neighbourhood she lives in and the Hope for Freedom Society facility and its residents. She suggested that the Hope for Freedom Society be contacted and used as example to set a standard for Maple Ridge on how such facilities can embrace all members of a community. She advised she also has someone living in Tent City and asked for all to understand the difference between a human being and their behaviour.

**Bob Asher**

Mr. Asher expressed concern with the stipulation in the proposed bylaw of a 250 m distance from specific facilities and felt this distance is not enough. He also expressed concern with the term ‘staff’ and requested clarification on the required qualifications for staff at supportive recovery type facilities. He asked whether staffing in the Bylaws Department will be increased to deal with these types of facilities and whether any action taken by the Bylaws Department will be complaint based.

Mayor Read advised that the proposed bylaw is an effort to increase regulations on supportive recovery type homes and facilities in Maple Ridge.

**Cathy Pring**

Ms. Pring asked for the success rate of the Abbotsford recovery homes versus the success rate in Surrey on capping the number of homes in the city.

Mayor Read advised that she did not know whether the City of Abbotsford is in a position to assess the success or failure of a particular recovery home.

Ms. Pring asked whether municipalities talk between themselves. She expressed concern that the City of Maple Ridge is attempting to bring in recovery homes and asked for information on issues the City is trying to regulate. She asked why the proposed bylaw was coming forward at this time when the City has another problem to deal with. She requested a definition of recovery homes.

The Director of Planning provided clarification on definitions.

**Tracy Hill**

Ms. Hill expressed concerns with a house in her neighbourhood which was bought as investment property and was then rented by a group of people taking in other people. She spoke to the many negative impacts on her home and the neighbourhood as a result. She stated that she is in favour of a bylaw to regulate such houses and would like to see heavy licensing put on these homes. Ms. Hill spoke positively about the wording in the proposed bylaw speaking to property owner approval of a facility.

**Susan Carr**

Ms. Carr spoke in favour of the intent of the proposed bylaw. She cautioned that should Maple Ridge pursue the bylaw further, the City will have to ensure that staffing in Bylaws to enforce the new regulations is appropriate. She stated that there are many supportive recovery homes and treatment facilities throughout Maple Ridge and that these need to be regulated. Ms. Carr felt that further work is needed prior to third reading being given to the proposed bylaw by speaking with successful recovery homes, obtaining more input to allow all to understand what is expected and be making resources available to allow City staff to find the locations of currently unregulated care facilities. She felt that the proposed bylaw is not ready to be given third reading.

**Mark Steele**

Mr. Steele felt that concerns being expressed are with transitional type of persons and lack of regulations, not with challenged persons. He also felt that it is the responsibility of the Provincial Government, not municipalities, to provide regulation for supportive recovery homes and other such facilities to ensure all get appropriate treatment. He expressed concern with staffing at such facilities in terms of qualifications and the distance between facilities in the proposed bylaw. Mr. Steele encouraged Council to push back at the Provincial Government to do their jobs and regulate these types of properties. He stated that more dialogue is needed.

**Sandy McDougall**

Mr. McDougall advised on a meeting of the Housing Committee with both new MLA's. HE spoke about alcoholism and how communities have to find a way of dealing with addictions. He cited the success of the Maple Ridge Treatment Centre and the importance of a sense of family and involvement in the community. Mr. McDougall requested that it be ensured that licences are not transferable and that street parking be taken into account.

**Adele Carado**

Ms. Carado wished to advocate for her children. She asked whether the proposed bylaw was at Public Hearing to allow for the opening of more facilities or to allow the City to regulate the existing facilities.

The Director of Planning provided clarification on the intent of the proposed bylaw. She advised that certain facilities will be allowed to open however the City will have the ability to control operator and resident expectations. She also advised that the proposed bylaw will also assist the Bylaws Department.



Ms. Carado expressed concern that she can no longer go to certain areas in the Maple Ridge due to behaviours which she feels may negatively impact her children.

**Marvin Cavanagh**

Mr. Cavanagh advised on his experience in the recovery field and stated that he has six recovery houses in Vancouver. He advocated for regulation and staff who are professionals who will be in the facilities 24/7. He provided information on how the houses he operates are run, stipulating that residents are screened, there are rules and regulations and if they are not adhered to, residents are told to move on and that the police are involved if need be.

**Melissa TeBoekhorst – Alouette Addictions Services**

Ms. TeBoekhorst provided information on the housing program operated by Alouette Addictions. She advised on the number and types of persons supported by the program and how they have progressed since being housed and going through the transitional program. Ms. TeBoekhorst feels that regulations are necessary however she expressed concern over the cost of 24 hour staffing and two meals per day. She advised that Alouette Addictions Services would like to be part of the process to discover what may work for the whole community. She also advised that many different types of persons are housed by the organization, not just those with addictions.

The Mayor called for speakers at second call.

The Mayor called for speakers at third call.

**Anna Mieszkowski**

Ms. Mieszkowski asked how a cap on the number of houses such as the one in Surrey works and what the advantage of having such a cap in Maple Ridge would be. She also asked if the number of recovery homes in Maple Ridge is not currently known and new ones are brought in, how will the City know how many there are and how many persons are coming in from outside the community to take advantage of the facilities. She questioned how it can be ensured that residents of Maple Ridge have access to such services rather than people coming to the City from other communities.

The Director of Planning provided clarification on the process in Surrey. She advised that the number of supportive recovery or transition homes in Maple Ridge is currently not known and to ascertain the number and locations will be a lengthy process.

Ms. Mieszkowski asked how the City can determine the number of homes.

The Director of Planning provided information on the process followed to date and indicated that a staff report will be provided to Council with further details on capping the number of homes in the community.

Ms. Mieszkowski asked whether a cap for Maple Ridge will be proportional.

Mayor Read advised that staff will provide further information on the subject in a future report to Council.

**Judy Dueck**

Ms. Dueck expressed concern with the proposed housing agreements and asked whether consideration will be given within the housing agreements to allow for differences between residential and industrial zones. She explained that she sees facilities such as the Salvation Army and Alouette Addictions as different providers in the community compared to a residential staffed facility.

The Manager of Community Planning Brent clarified that future housing agreements will be tailored on a site by site and case by case basis.

Ms. Dueck felt that many residents are in favour of some form of regulation. She asked whether a discussion on capping the number of recovery facilities in Maple Ridge can be held as information comes in and when the proposed bylaw is reviewed. As Maple Ridge is much smaller than the City of Surrey, Ms. Dueck indicated the community did not need 55 recovery homes and that the City of Maple Ridge should take care of its own. She suggested that the Salvation Army and Alouette Addictions may be able to assist in identifying those homes in the community not currently known. She stated that support for persons should be provided however rules and regulations are necessary.

**Marvin Cavanagh**

Mr. Cavanagh addressed the topic of a cap on the number of recovery homes in the community. He explained how his recovery homes in Vancouver are operated, offered to provide assistance with the issue of such facilities in Maple Ridge and invited Council to visit one of the facilities he owns.

**Elizabeth Taylor**

Ms. Taylor commented on the regulation of recovery type housing and stated that many such homes are not funded. She expressed concern over the future of recovery type houses should they be required to pay for licencing and standards. She asked that care be taken not to regulate and licence these facilities out of the community.

**Stacy Choeack**

Ms. Chomeak encouraged regulation of recovery homes. She expressed concern with the opening of a supportive recovery house next to her home, advising that there are 10 men living in the facility and it is not been clear as to the number and qualifications of staff support. She advised on the negative impact this has had to peace of mind, stated she wished to be a good neighbourhood but more communication and respect is required on both sides.

**Heide Smith**

Ms. Smith identified herself as an outreach worker with Fraser River All Nations Aboriginal Society ("FRANAS"). She advised that she has worked at the local shelter and spoke to the difficulty in finding people with addictions housing. She provided positive examples of clients with addictions who did receive housing from local recovery houses. She supported recovery homes within the City.

**Jim Reilly**

Mr. Reilly referred to the conversation around capping and the number of recovery homes around the community. He felt that recovery homes, treatment facilities, transition programs should come before Council on an individual merit basis through a rezoning process to an individual property. He expressed concern that the current structure regarding the bylaw amendment is a Pandora's Box as homes cannot be regulated currently through the Bylaws Department. He put forward that such facilities are the responsibility of the Provincial Government.

**Name of Speaker not provided**

The speaker felt that the majority of citizens are caring people however many such as herself are frustrated by the constant break-ins and the costs associated with those break-ins. She asked that the police deal more harshly with drug dealers. She recounted that she was told by police when filing a victim impact statement that charges would be pointless. The speaker asked if persons who are homeless receive a portion of income.

Mayor Read advised on funds received.

The speaker expressed her feeling that persons in recovery and shelters should receive vouchers rather than cash to prevent funds from going to drugs. She reiterated that many residents are frustrated with the negative impact of shelters and recovery housing.

There being no further comment, the Mayor declared this item dealt with.

Having given all those persons whose interests were deemed affected by the matters contained herein a chance to be heard, the Mayor adjourned the Public Hearing at 9:00 p.m.

---

N. Read, Mayor

Certified Correct

---

L. Darcus, Corporate Officer