



City of Surrey

Social Planning Advisory Committee

Minutes

Executive Boardroom
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 2008
Time: 7:00 p.m.
File: 0540-20

Present:

Chairperson, Councillor J. Villeneuve
Councillor Tom Gill
Lara Alexander
Kuldip Ardawa
Robin Campbell
Gurtej Gill
Harbhajan Parhar
Dr. Zankka Malik
Stephen Dooley
Raj Mehta

Absent:

Karen Kreis

Guests:

Lesley Tannen, Downtown Surrey Business
Association
Anne Peterson, Peterson Community
Consulting
Laurie Birdsall, Pacific Community
Resources Society
James Bennett, South Fraser Community
Services
Michelle Van Keith, Pacific Community
Resources Society
Michel Pouliot, Pacific Community
Resources Society

Staff Present:

Aileen Murphy, Senior Social Planner
Kelly Rayter, Legal Services
H. Dmytriw, Legislative Services

A. ELECTION

The Committee is requested to pass a motion electing the Deputy Chair for the 2008 calendar year.

It was

Moved by Lara Alexander

Seconded by Harbhajan Parhar

That the Social Planning Advisory Committee

elect Robin Campbell as the Deputy Chair for the 2008 calendar year.

Carried

B. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of November 29, 2007

The request was made to amend the following:

Item D.1: Under discussion:

Bullet 3 (pg.3) -

- change wording in two places to read: *Community Councils*;
- remove the words "to make" and replace with "to *influence* funding decisions."

Bullet 7 (pg.3) -

- remove “Ministry of Children and Family Development (MCFD)” and replace with “*Ministry of Employment and Income Assistance (MEIA)*”.

Bullet 11 (pg.4) -

- remove first sentence: “Wages need to be met in order to retain the service workers/providers.”

It was

Moved by Gurtej Gill

Seconded by Councillor Judy Villeneuve

That the minutes of the Social Planning

Advisory Committee meeting held on November 29, 2007, be adopted as amended.

Carried

C. DELEGATION

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Community Services in Surrey City Centre

- (a) Aileen Murphy, Senior Social Planner provided an overview of the Community Impact Statement (CIS) process as outlined in Corporate Report C008. The following comments were provided:
- Coloured maps of community agencies were provided on table to the members. Although there appears to be many facilities, Surrey’s social infrastructure has not kept pace with our rapid population growth.
 - City Centre area is in the middle of Whalley between 92 and 112 Avenues and between 132 and 140 Streets.
 - Area is designated as the centre for both the South Fraser Region and the municipality of Surrey. It has the SFU campus, hospital, mall and there are a significant number of new multi-family residential developments being planned in the area.
 - Slides:
 - i. June 2005 – business license bylaw amended
 - ii. Every applicant for a new business license to operate a community service use in the City Centre requires the completion of a Community Impact Statement and related study as part of their business license application and requires Council approval for the issuance of such a business license.
 - iii. Came about due to concerns about the concentration of community services in the City Centre.
 - iv. “Community Service” means a use by a non-profit society:
 - Providing information, referral counseling, advocacy or physical or mental health services on an out-patient basis
 - Dispensing aid in the nature of food or clothing
 - Providing drop in or activity space

- But does not include churches, residential uses and independent group homes
- Objective of the CIS and related Study is to evaluate and document the anticipated positive and negative impacts of a proposed business, in terms of the impacts and benefits on the immediate neighbourhood and broader community.
- Terms of Reference in preparing a Community Impact Study.
- Must be prepared by an external consultant and include:
 - i. Description of business
 - ii. Comparative analysis with 2-3 similar businesses
 - iii. Public and stakeholders consultation
 - iv. Identification and discussion of issues identified through public consultation process
 - v. Analysis and recommendations
- Implementation June 2005 – January 2008:
 - i. One Community Impact Study completed by Surrey House of Grace
 - ii. Other non-profits have been issued licenses for other uses – medical office, recreation use, and office use.

(b) Presentations on the **Implementation of the CIS** were provided by:

(i) Lesley Tannen, Downtown Surrey Business Improvement Association (BIA):

- The BIA was formed in 2003 based on the concern of its 1,000 business and commercial property members about drug related crime and antisocial behaviour. There was also concern about how these issues may be aggravated by a concentration of social and community services in the area.
- The Downtown Surrey BIA made a presentation to Council-in-Committee on January 15, 2005 in favour of by-law amendments requiring community service organizations to submit CIS reports prior to obtaining a business license if they intended to operate within the City Centre area.
- Since the adoption of the CIS requirement in June 2005 the BIA has been involved with the process by 1) being a stakeholder/interviewee for two proponents; 2) attending the public meeting held by one proponent; 3) interacting with one successful licensee since July 2005; and 4) interacting with pre-existing CIS providers in City Centre who are not subject to this licensing requirement. Based on this experience the DS BIA provides the following observations and recommendations:

Current provisions of the CIS	Recommended Improvements/changes
The CIS provides the proponent with valuable information and insight into the needs of the community	The CIS should be viewed as a positive tool. The content should already be found in a proponent’s business plan. This process respects the needs of clients, residents and businesses. It is a rational and

	objective process. It is a vehicle to prevent duplication or concentration of services and could point to other areas in the City that lack needed services.
The license requirement promotes communication and community involvement at the front end of the process.	Include explicit requirement in the by-law for ongoing communications between the operator and the community.
The current “minimum area for the public notification” of public meetings is a radius of 100 meters from the proposed location of the business.	Because potential negative effects from anti-social behaviour by some people can extend as far as the nearest Skytrain Station or government and other community services the “minimum” notification area should be increased to 500 meters.
The CIS process has been used in its entirety only once since the licensing bylaw was amended. In spite of never complying with all the terms of its business license, and in spite of support from the BIA to do so, the organization has been granted two license renewals.	Re-licensing should not be automatic unless compliance licensing requirements are verified. The license database should have the capacity to tag or red-flag licensees with conditions attached to the terms of re-licensing.
Under the current provision corrective action, including revoking a business license is only possible at the time a license is renewed. Theoretically, bad operator could remain in business for 12 months with few consequences.	See comments below regarding Good Neighbour Agreements.
The current requirement to use an external third party to produce a CIS document is very costly and has had unintended consequences. At least one agency changed the classification of their business license application to avoid having to go through the CIS process.	See Comments below regarding Good Neighbour Agreements.
The current provisions do not apply to pre-existing operators. Anti-social behaviour in, or around such operations, is not subject to review.	See Comments below regarding Good Neighbour Agreements.

- In addition to the suggestions noted above “Good Neighbour” agreements could be employed:
 - Surrey already makes use of this tool for Liquor Licensees.
 - The City of Nanaimo uses these agreements in their downtown core for both liquor establishments and community service providers (e.g. Salvation Army men’s shelter).

- This would encourage on-going communication between community service providers and the community.
- This allows the City and the community to deal with poor operators or service concerns when issues occur and not just at the time of license renewal.
- Good operators could demonstrate that they are pro-actively responding to community concerns through the use of a neighbourhood advisory committee.
- The community would have an ongoing and formal mechanism to have its issues addressed.
- The community contains members with a wide range of experiences and skills, therefore it may be a source of creative solutions.
- The City would be able to demonstrate the efficiency of such agreements and, potentially, broaden their use to other service sectors and throughout the community.
- “Good neighbour” agreements could be applied retroactively to problematic operators, regardless of tenure, with prior notice, as a condition of re-licensing.

CONCLUSION:

- The Downtown Surrey BIA does not favour either a prohibition, or a concentration of community services in any one area of Surrey. Rather the BIA would like to see a rational process that considers the needs of the community prior to issuing a business license to community social service providers.
- By continuing the use of Community Impact Studies and incorporating the use of Good Neighbour Agreements businesses and residents will have clear evidence that their interests and concerns matter to the City of Surrey and community service providers.
- Groups that provide social services and are exempt from paying property taxes are being subsidized by other property owners. It seems reasonable to expect such organizations to monitor the impact of clients, services and property condition on the community.

Discussion ensued and the following comments were made:

- Community members can be a resource when issues arise.
- Should be accountability – most non-profits are more accountable than businesses – standards required by non-profits are higher.
- Good Neighbour Agreements can be applied retroactively without notice when the business license is being renewed.
- Downtown Surrey BIA would like to see a rational process prior to issuing licenses.
- Only non-profits are exempt from property tax and do not pay into business levy.
- The cost of a CIS is high but large non-profit organizations have the internal resources that small organizations do not have.
- Should be expanded to other areas of Surrey. This would be advantageous to the City of Surrey as a whole.

Chairperson Councillor Judy Villeneuve thanked the delegation for their presentation.

(ii) Anne Peterson, Peterson Community Consulting:

- Anne Peterson has her Masters in Anthropology. The focus of her studies was multi-disciplinary.
- She was hired as a consultant to prepare the CIS for the Surrey House of Grace. It is a religious organization serving the homeless in the area. Their objective is to provide a light lunch following a prayer meeting. Food is mostly donated and brought in (soup, cookies, and juice).
- As per the CIS Terms of Reference, 200 letters were sent out to neighbours explaining the process and providing a photo of where the House of Grace is located. 8 responses to the letter were received. Conducted a public meeting to which 30-plus people attended. Interviewed a number of businesses, and conducted street interviews at soccer pitches and at a number of other organizations.
- Came to the conclusion that the impact of the Surrey House of Grace on the community was minimal. Nothing would change and it would make no difference to the community, the homeless, or other services, whether or not the Surrey House of Grace was there.
- Recommends that the City take a step back to look at the bigger picture.
- The results from other studies have made some fabulous recommendations. The Surrey Homelessness Plan recommended the need for services to be coordinated.
- The City of Surrey should take a proactive role in coordinating social services to ensure overlaps in services do not occur. A paid coordinator could provide ongoing support to coordinate efforts between non-profit organizations and business, and to educate the faith community and the public about homelessness.

Discussion ensued and the following comments were made:

- The biggest stress related to the preparation of the Surrey House of Grace's CIS was the language barrier, as the Surrey House of Grace is operated by a Korean church. If no translator was available at the meeting, the time was a total loss for the consultant. Also, the Surrey House of Grace did not understand the CIS process.
- The House of Grace had a grant of about \$2,500 - \$4,000 from their mother church in Korea. The usual rate for consulting fees to conduct a CIS is estimated to be \$5,000. This can be prohibitive for small organizations. Large organizations would have in-house resources with their own workers with Masters degrees, and materials, etc.
- The Surrey House of Grace CIS took about one year to conduct. The research was easy. The coordination was hard due to the need for a translator. This could delay things by weeks at a time.
- The Surrey House of Grace's CIS report is an Appendix of Corporate Report R084 that went to Council on May 4, 2006.
- The Surrey House of Grace serves a light lunch three days a week. This level of service is insufficient to address homeless peoples' total

nutritional needs. There is not a coordinated effort to provide consistent caloric intakes for those that use the Surrey House of Grace and other food services in the area. A coordinator could do this.

Chairperson Councillor Judy Villeneuve thanked Anne Peterson for her presentation and feedback.

(iii) Laurie Birdsall and Michel Pouliot – Pacific Community Resources Society

Mr. Laurie Birdsall provided a history of Pacific Community Resources Society's (PCRS) experience with the Community Impact Statement (CIS) and how the CIS has impacted the Whalley situation for youth at risk.

Following are the comments provided:

- PCRS has been a non-profit society and registered charity since 1984. It has an annual budget of \$12M and over 200 staff in Vancouver, Surrey and Chilliwack. Over half of PCRS's staff are located in Surrey. Funding comes from a variety of sources including contracts from the Ministry of Children and Family Development (MCFD), Fraser Health Authority (FHA) Service Canada, and Ministry of Employment and Income Assistance (MEIA). Reporting back to these funders is done on a regular basis.
- PCRS is an accredited organization (through CARF Canada).
- PCRS's employment programs are run out of offices on East Whalley Road.
- PCRS was awarded the contract by MCFD to operate 2 new integrated youth service hubs - one in Whalley and one in Newton - at the same time as the City put a moratorium on community services in the City Centre. These hubs reflect MCFD's new service delivery model in which the full range of youth services are offered at one location. PCRS could not delay the establishment of the Whalley hub by conducting a CIS as MCFD expected the hubs to be set up as soon as possible, and a delay would have meant that families and youth would have to go without services. As a result, PCRS decided to set up the hub in Guildford instead of Whalley. Youth services in Whalley are therefore only provided on an outreach basis - there are no MCFD-funded youth services located in Whalley.
- Costs are an ongoing issue with all BC agencies as they have received no operating fund increases in the past 8 years.
- The Community Impact Statement process was initially not in place so PCRS undertook its own process to get things moving in Whalley. The agency went door-to-door and got very good support from all but one. Then PCRS went to BIA to present on what we proposed to do. BIA were not able to support the proposal so PCRS looked at alternate sites. Funders were getting impatient and the public missing was out on services. Cost of CIS would have had to come out of services budgets. Public would miss out on that money. Very difficult to measure impact. Healthiness of people relates to level of crime. Have not seen any data or research that shows that social services are directly related to an increase

in crime. CIS process would be a good thing for bars, pawnshops or other businesses that have a negative impact on the community. It is easier to get a business license for a liquor establishment than a community service use. Timelines are tight in terms of turn around from the time of being awarded a contract by the provincial or federal governments to being up and running and providing the service. The CIS process to get a business license prohibits this ability to deliver services in the timely manner expected by senior government funders.

- Laurie Birdsall noted that they provide services in Chilliwack and Vancouver and there is no such process:
 - PCRS recently opened an office in Vancouver for a MEIA-funded program for highly disadvantaged adults (life skills program for adults for whom employment is not a viable option). The process in Vancouver is to post a notice and get a response from the community, and then address any issues or concerns that are raised. There is a need to have good relationships with community and PCRS has a proven track record to rely on.
 - Respect the need for a community process but this CIS process needs to be revamped.
 - There are no services in Whalley for at risk youth -13-19 year olds. Kla-how-eya no longer delivers their youth program.
 - Youth Outreach happens through Pacific Community Resources Society.

Chairperson Councillor Judy Villeneuve thanked the delegates and complimented them on their very good presentation.

(iv) James Bennett – South Fraser Community Services

James Bennett provided the following comments:

- Funding tends to come from the federal and provincial government in large clumps and the expectation is that once funds are received by an agency there is a quick turn around time for starting to deliver the services.
- Surrey has missed out on a lot of funding for the homeless due to the moratorium.
- Surrey will be impacted as long as the moratorium is in place and there is a delay in the process of setting up services. You run into difficulty lining up a building and hoping that the landlord will hold the space while the CIS process takes place. The City's 6-12 month CIS process is too long. An agency identifies a need in the community – we need to take the money and run with it, but now we have to go back to Ottawa, then back to Council to convince them of what Ottawa wants to do.
- South Fraser Community Services challenged the CIS in court and won as the judge found that the HIV clinic is a health service and not a social service. The City can't regulate health services in the city – it's the responsibility of the Canadian Health Act, Mental Health services, Drug Act. In this day and age and the shortage of funding for health and

social services, the money is targeted and if we aren't ready then we don't get the funding.

- The coloured maps provided by Social Planning are really great--note the housing map regarding social and family housing. Historically, the housing was built 20 years ago but there are still social issues with the families that still live in the area. There was fall out. The services needed to follow up and infrastructures weren't in place in other areas of Surrey.
- South Fraser Community Services has the Front Room, the 40-bed Gateway Shelter, HIV/Aids needle exchange, and free medical clinic.
- Surrey has missed out on money since we could not keep the time line required to get it up and running in time.

Chairperson Councillor Judy Villeneuve thanked the delegation for all their time and presentation and noted that the Social Planning Advisory Committee is a relatively new committee and is attempting to deal with issues that have immediate impact.

Discussion ensued and the following comments were made:

- Night Shift is an organization that drives around providing food from a van. Night Shift has deliberately set up their service this way. The BIA would not support their operations so they operate with no facility and no license. Night Shift is having a huge negative impact on the community. By-laws officers and police have encouraged them to set up across the street from the Surrey Food Bank so as to not impact the businesses on King George Highway. The public do not feel safe when the Night Shift van is there and the garbage left behind is disgusting.

- (c) **Committee discussion on the CIS and recommended approaches for amending the process.** Information on the Community Impact Statement (CIS) is provided in the agenda package (Corporate Report C008, May 11, 2005, Corporate Report R266, Oct. 13, 2004, and an Update on the Implementation of the Community Impact Statement, July 2006).

Discussion ensued and the following comments were provided:

- There is confusion about the definition of "health" and "social services" and a need to get a legal opinion.
- CIS elements need to be redefined and could include:
 - i. Accreditation by CARF or COA indicates that the agency has policies and procedures in place. These agencies offer better value to the community.
 - ii. Board of Directors – who are they, their background, contributions, track record?
 - iii. Insurance coverage of groups?
 - iv. What is the population being served - who and why?
 - v. What are the outcomes of the service?
 - vi. What value is it bringing to the community?
 - vii. Cost of services vs. administration costs of the organization?
 - viii. The value of programs and services being provided?

- Potentially the City could use a two-stage process. We should have an early exit for organizations and quick assessment before going to the second stage of implementation of a CIS.
- Agency speakers were very compelling in terms of the barriers that the CIS creates for accessing funds.
- From a research perspective, the CIS process cannot answer the question of the actual impact that a service will have on the community.
- All non-profits that have charitable status must have a Board of Directors made up of community members and are restricted in the proportion of their budget that can be spent on administration. Accreditation is a red herring.
- Suggest a simple process for all non-profits to obtain a business license - not a CIS.
- Suggest a 1 or 2 page document for agencies to complete. If there are any red flags, then they could be required to hire a consultant and do a study.
- The City needs a Social Service Coordinator to facilitate the coordination of social services and liaise with the community.
- Committee members were directed to review the CIS information and provide written comments to Aileen Murphy, Senior Social Planner.
- The issue was referred back to staff for further study and reporting with recommendation to simplify the process and recommendation for a full time social services coordinator.

Round table introductions were provided by all committee members.

E. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

1. **Corporate Report on the Measuring Up Initiative** – Corporate Report R252 was received as information.

F. CORRESPONDENCE

G. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Social Planning Advisory Committee is scheduled for Thursday, February 28, 2008 at 7:00 pm in the Executive Boardroom.

H. ADJOURNMENT

It was

meeting do now adjourn.

Moved by Robin Campbell
Seconded by Zambka Malik
That the Social Planning Advisory Committee

Carried

The Social Planning Advisory Committee adjourned at 9:20 pm.

Margaret Jones, City Clerk

Chairperson, Councillor J. Villeneuve
Social Planning Advisory Committee