

Wednesday, August 1, 2007

Turning Point Recovery Society (1984)

**Re: Minutes of Neighbourhood Consultation Meeting
South Arm Community Centre, August 1, 2007**

Present:

Neighbourhood: Kathy, Ildiko, Mark, Sharon, Neil, Barbara K., Walter,
Barbara R. Eric, Shawn Odlin Road neighbour: Satta'

TPRS: Brenda Plant;

Consultants: Doug Purdy, Michael Goehring

1. Introductions: Doug Purdy – Consultant, Chair of Committee.
Neighbours' introductions with names and concerns:

Satta' is a former neighbour of current Odlin Road location who has experienced no problems ever with the house and clients.

Satta' reported that there have been times when there has been more traffic than usual and an increase in the number of cars on the street.

She also expressed that she was grateful for the activity around the house after her husband passed away because she felt safer knowing there were people next door.

Satta' also mentioned that there were times when it was noisy and she could hear the residents talking or playing in the back yard.
2. Traffic and Parking: Ten spaces proposed. A traffic and parking analysis has been done by ND Lee Consultants which will be posted on Turning Point's website. Neighbours expressed concern about the amount of parking proposed and the potential of on-street parking. It was noted that City staff would review the parking to determine the appropriateness of the parking proposed.
3. City Review of Rezoning Proposal - There has been no feedback yet from the City. MPT Civil Engineering is conducting a site services analysis that is critical to the review process. Neighbours brought up concerns about noise impact on adjacent property owners and Turning Point will return with information.

Type & Size of Facility and Who Will Be There – A concern was raised by an immediate neighbour about the proposed number of clients and the potential impact on privacy of adjacent homeowners and their abutting rear yards. There was a discussion on size. What size will work best? Two schools of thought were presented by the neighbours, some don't want the project at all while some are prepared to accept a ten bed house. A request for a size comparison between Odlin Road and Ash Street was put forward. Doug Purdy stated that city council will make the final decision. It is a desire for people to be informed prior to public hearings. A comparison with other similar agencies will be done to compare sizes, square footage, number of clients etc. The sites for comparison include Phoenix Society, Triage, Turning Point's Vancouver site, and Pacifica.

4. Resentment - Some Neighbours concerns are financial – concerned about property values. Comment – people have paid a lot of money and thought they were in an exclusive residential neighbourhood. Homes are a major investment. There are currently five homes on the street for sale. Current site zoning was raised. It was noted by a neighbour that the site has been zoned for institutional use since the 1980's and neighbours should have known that an institutional use of some kind would be built on the site. Turning Point was asked prepare a model of the proposed development including showing adjacent homes. This will be ready sometime in September.
5. Risk Residents Pose to Community - A neighbour expressed concern about the proposed development's proximity to Liquor stores and other temptations. Comment - It was noted that existing residences are similarly located and that because residents are concerned about their recovery, proximity has not been and is not an issue, whether it is proximity to liquor stores, parks, schools or other perceived temptations.

A neighbour also expressed concern about the new family centre being opened this fall on the DeBeck Elementary School site and was concerned about the proximity of two social service facilities being so close together.

6. Shawn presented his summation of the discussion to date as representing five key themes:
 - 1) Value of Facility to Community (Social) – Shawn commented that decision makers make their decisions based on public policy and influences their decision
 - 2) Location in relation to schools/location in general
 - 3) Number of clients – noise, what kinds of people

4) Risk clients may post to community

5) Potential impact on housing prices

Neighbours are looking to Doug and Brenda for answers to the above, and Turning Point is asking if the neighbours are prepared to weigh the pros and cons of the proposal. Information will be provided to a neighbour on relapse as he has a concern regarding the 25% relapse rate and its implication for neighbours.

A request was made for Turning Point to provide more educational information on problematic substance use.

Shawn suggested that there were three possible outcomes for the proposal:

- 1) Approved
- 2) Not Approved
- 3) Approved with conditions

He posed the question to his neighbours, "Which of these do we want to do?" Shawn then asked if those attending were prepared to begin discussions on the pros and cons of each of the 5 themes one at a time beginning at the next NLC meeting. A majority preferred to discuss all 5 items together.

It was also noted that many people were not informed about either the proposal or Turning Point. Comment - Turning Point needs to find ways to better communicate and educate the community.

7. Proposed dates for public meetings hosted by Turning Point are September 11 and 27

These meetings are hosted by Turning Point not the City. The City will hold a separate public hearing and could also hold its own public information meeting if it was deemed necessary. The proposal is still in the preliminary review stage of rezoning with the city.

8. Demolition – The existing house on the property needs to be demolished. Recent break in and further damage underline need to remove home from the lot. Also, there are some trees that need to be removed as they are a problem to Eric's property. Two approvals are required for both tree removal and demolition - BC Housing and City of Richmond. Turning Point to follow up with BC Housing regarding this request.

Eric expressed concern about how the demolition of the house would proceed given that there is asbestos in the house. Doug advised that asbestos removal is regulated by WCB and that all necessary precautions

are taken by certified companies whose staff is qualified to remove asbestos materials. The materials are inert and there is no risk to the public. As a note, asbestos is found in materials used in many homes built prior to 1970 or earlier.

Eric also advised that another neighbourhood group has been formed and that on July 17th, Jack Clerkson and Michael Goehring were invited to speak.

8. Next Steps –

To provide firm dates for upcoming meeting – Public Information

Get back to members of NLC with follow up information

Let members know what the feedback is from the city. There was a time-frame of four to six weeks for feedback and it has now been four weeks.

Sean suggested spending at least thirty minutes on the five key points above and that neighbours need to make an informed decision rather than a consensus.

Mark requested a two hour meeting so that twenty minutes can be spent on each of the five key points.

The next meeting date was set at Wednesday September 5 from 6-8 PM at South Arm CC

Invitations were extended to come by the Turning Point houses and a request was made for the addresses of the other facilities mentioned in this report.

Meeting concluded at 8:22pm