



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: Tuesday, January 16, 2001
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Councillor Malcolm Brodie, Chair
Councillor Bill McNulty, Vice-Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes 4:07 pm
Councillor Lyn Greenhill
Councillor Harold Steves
Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, December 5, 2000, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. The next Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for February 6, 2001.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **APPLICATION FOR A CLASS "B" LIQUOR LICENCE WITH AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (KARAOKE AND DANCING) AT UNIT 200 - 8171 WESTMINSTER HIGHWAY.**
(Report: December 8/00, File No.: 8275-05) (REDMS No. 247174)

The Manager, Zoning, Alan Clark, reviewed the report.

It was moved and seconded

That the application by Xing-Xing Café and Karaoke Ltd. to the Liquor Control and Licencing Branch for a Class "B" Liquor Licence with audience participation (Karaoke and Dancing) be supported, and that the Liquor Control and Licencing Branch be advised:

- (i) *of this recommendation; and*
- (ii) *that the R.C.M.P. does not object.*

CARRIED

4. **SINGLE FAMILY LOT SIZE POLICY FOR THE PROPERTIES LOCATED ALONG RYAN ROAD, LEONARD ROAD, RUSKIN ROAD AND RUSKIN PLACE IN A PORTION OF SECTION 33-4-6**

APPLICATION BY SIAN ENTERPRISES FOR REZONING AT 10311 AND 10331 LEONARD ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)

(RZ 00-176792, Report: December 11/00, File No.: 8060-20-7199)
(REDMS No. 243975,201530,244644))

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reviewed the report. During the brief discussion that then ensued it was advised that the sign and public hearing notice will reflect a four lot subdivision.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That the following recommendations be forwarded to Public Hearing:***

That the following Single-Family Lot Size Policy be adopted:

That the properties located generally along Ryan Road, Leonard Road, Ruskin Road and Ruskin Place in Section 33-4-6 (shown on Attachment 1 to the report dated December 11, 2000, from the Manager of Development Applications), be permitted to subdivide in accordance with the provisions of Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B) in Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300; and

- (2) ***That Bylaw No. 7199, for the rezoning of 10311 and 10331 Leonard Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)", be introduced and given first reading.***

CARRIED

Councillor Barnes arrived at 4:07 pm.

5. **SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SIZE POLICY 5454 FOR THE AREA GENERALLY BOUNDED BY NO. 5 ROAD, THORPE ROAD, DANFORTH DRIVE AND HIGHWAY 99 IN SECTION 36-5-6**

APPLICATION BY DAVA DEVELOPMENT FOR REZONING AT 4591 NO. 5 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA C (R1/C) AND SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA A (R1/A)

(RZ 00-175758 - Report: Dec. 6/00, File No.: 8060-20-7200) (REDMS No. 244664, 221881,248552)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reviewed the report.

In response to a question regarding the nature of the phone calls received by staff Jenny Beran, Planner, stated the calls were related mainly to lot size.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That the following recommendation be forwarded to Public Hearing:***

That Single-Family Lot Size Policy No. 5454 adopted by Council in May 1994 be amended to exclude those properties fronting the west side of No. 5 Road from Thorpe Road to Highway 91; and

- (2) ***That Bylaw No. 7200, for the rezoning of 4591 No. 5 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area C (R1/C)" and "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area A (R1/A)", be introduced and given first reading.***

CARRIED

6. **AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE APPEAL APPLICATION BY KABEL ATWALL FOR NON-FARM USE AND SUBDIVISION AT 18691 AND 18791 WESTMINSTER HIGHWAY (NANAKSAR GURDWARA GURSIKH TEMPLE)**

(Report: January 2/01, File No.: AG 00-175102) (REDMS No. 228028, 233156)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reviewed the report.

Mr. Atwall then addressed the Committee. He displayed two plans which identified the current and proposed layout of the site. Mr. Atwall noted that if tie in to the Nelson Road sewer line proved possible, the proposed expansion, including parking, could be achieved within a 7.5 acre parcel. He also stated that if it were required, the building would be downsized to meet the requirements of the parking bylaw.

A discussion ensued over the possibility of the sewer tie in and the measures that would be required to allow for the proposed expansion in the interim period prior to the Nelson Road sewer installation. Mr. Atwall stated that of the 3 acres presently requested for the septic field one quarter currently contains blueberries.

Holger Burke, Development Coordinator pointed out that the gravel area behind the existing building had Land Reserve Commission approval but that a condition of their approval was a covenant restricting the area to parking or agricultural use only.

It was moved and seconded

That authorization for Kabel Atwall to apply to the Land Reserve Commission for non-farm use and subdivision at 18691 and 18791 Westminster Highway (Nanaksar Gurdwara Gursikh Temple) be approved.

Prior to the question being called discussion ensued.

Councillor Steves pointed out that when the temple was originally built the proponents were aware that there was no room for expansion. Also, as the flower garden was originally approved as agriculture, although in a different location, there would be no net benefit to agriculture by changing from flowers to blueberries. Similarly, if the two parcels were to be consolidated no benefit to agriculture would be realized. Councillor Steves was also concerned about the development of the back lands of the other large properties on No. 5 Road if this application was approved.

Due to the critical issue of the sewers and the amount of land required for the different uses the following **referral** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That authorization for Kabel Atwall to apply to the Land Reserve Commission for non-farm use and subdivision at 18691 and 18791 Westminster Highway (Nanaksar Gurdwara Gursikh Temple) be referred to staff for a report on:

- 1. the feasibility of a sewer connection which would include the timing, costing and likelihood of the sewer extension;***
- 2. the relocation of the ornamental garden;***
- 3. how the extension of the gravel areas were approved;***
- 4. the exact location of existing uses on the site, the number of parking spaces now available and proposed by the applicant; and***
- 5. the exact layout of the site following development (ie. the building footprint, parking layout and 3 acre septic field).***

CARRIED

Staff were requested to report back, at least verbally, by March 2001.

7. **AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE APPEAL APPLICATION BY BOB RANSFORD (ON BEHALF OF GURDIAL AND INDERJEET DHA) FOR SUBDIVISION AT 7931 MCLENNAN AVENUE**
(Report: December 4/00, File No.: AG 00-183664) (REDMS No. 240334)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg reviewed the report.

Ms. Jublee Dha read a submission which is attached as Schedule 1 and forms a part of these minutes. Also provided to the Committee was a series of photographs identifying the proximity of the neighboring houses and the type of land involved. These are attached as Schedule 2 and form a part of these minutes.

Mr. Bob Ransford addressed the Committee stating that when he had been contacted by the Land Reserve Commission he was advised that there may be a number of other cases in Richmond where the separate certificate of title condition had not been met.

During the discussion that ensued, it was determined that the Land Reserve Commission had not contacted staff in regard to properties which may have been improperly granted exemption from the ALR. It was further noted that current practice was to put the onus on the property owner to provide evidence of the separate certificate of title.

It was moved and seconded

That authorization for Bob Ransford to apply to the Land Reserve Commission for subdivision of Gurdial and Inderjeet Dha's property at 7931 McLennan Avenue be approved.

DEFEATED

Opposed: Councillor Barnes
Councillor Greenhill
Councillor Steves

It was moved and seconded

That authorization for Bob Ransford to apply to the Land Reserve Commission for subdivision of Gurdial and Inderjeet Dha's property at 7931 McLennan Avenue be denied.

CARRIED

Opposed: Councillor Brodie
Councillor Mc Nulty

8. **APPLICATION BY DMH EQUITIES LTD. FOR REZONING AT 4591 GARDEN CITY ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/117)**

(RZ 00-175928, Report: December 8/00, File No.: 8060-20-7191)
(REDMS No. 219583, 225526)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reviewed the report.

A brief discussion on the issue of restaurant use within the framework of the Zoning Bylaw took place. It was suggested by the Committee that a restrictive covenant to prohibit restaurants on the site would be appropriate in addition to the Zoning Bylaw, to which Mr. Greg Megrian, part owner of Fabricana Imports, and Mr. Dick Smith, consultant, had no objection.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7191, for the rezoning of 4591 Garden City Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/117)", be introduced and given first reading, and that a restrictive covenant preventing restaurant use be required from the applicant prior to the adoption of the Bylaw.

CARRIED

9. **STRATA TITLE CONVERSION SUBDIVISION APPLICATION SC 98-153681 AND LAND USE CONTRACT AMENDMENT APPLICATION LU 00-086975 CORONA HOLDINGS LTD. – 3740 CHATHAM STREET**

(Report: December 29/00, File No.: SC 98-153681 LU 00-086975) (REDMS No. 255746, 255909, 82582, 156637)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reviewed the report.

Mr. Gerry Hol and Mr. Bert Hol addressed the Committee. Mr. Gerry Hol read a submission which is attached as Schedule 3 and forms a part of these minutes.

During the discussion that ensued reference was made to illegal loading zones in the area and the number of land use contracts in the vicinity of Mr. Hol's property. Also discussed were the items listed in the previously negotiated Land Use Contract.

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That the application for a Strata Title Conversion by Corona Holdings Ltd. for the property located at 3740 Chatham Street be approved on fulfilment of the following conditions:*

- (a) *Payment of all 2001 utility charges and property taxes;***
- (b) *Submission of appropriate plans and documents for execution by the Mayor and City Clerk within 180 days of the date of this resolution by Council; and***
- (c) *Adoption of a bylaw to amend Land Use Contract 070 which would have the applicant:***
 - i) relinquish the right to the six (6) parking spaces on Second Avenue, provided that one (1) space is reserved as a loading zone;***
 - ii) install wheel stops for the parking spaces facing Chatham Street so that vehicles do not encroach over the sidewalk and bus stop area; and***
 - iii) install a handicapped parking space in front of the building where the elevator is located.***

(2) *That a bylaw to amend Land Use Contract 070 with Corona Holdings Ltd. for the property located at 3740 Chatham Street be introduced and given first, second and third readings.*

CARRIED

10. **APPLICATION BY L. AND P. POON AND WESTMARK DEVELOPMENTS LTD. FOR REZONING AT 7451 AND 7471 ST. ALBANS ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E), TO TOWNHOUSE AND APARTMENT DISTRICT (R3)**

(RZ 00-180731, Report: December 22/00, File No.: 8060-20-7201)
(REDMS No. 253699, 253712)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reviewed the report.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7201, for the rezoning of 7451 and 7471 St. Albans Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Townhouse and Apartment District (R3)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

11. **PROPOSED CONVERTIBLE HOUSE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT**
(Report: December 15/00, File No.: 4057-07) (REDMS No. 250454)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe reviewed the report and then Rob Innes, Planner, added more detail, noting that the City contribution would be the zoned service property.

During the discussion that ensued it was noted that control of the conversion project would be undertaken through the building and permit process, although it was further noted that the owner would have the option to change it without approval of Council.

The General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan noted the project variables would include design, cost, how long the demonstration process would involve, how profits from the sale would be shared with the City.

Mr. Bob Ransford questioned the City being the developer of the project and asked why the lot could not be sold with requirements including the developer allowing inspection for six months. Mr. Ransford proposed that it would be more beneficial to rezone areas where builders could develop this type of property and let the market decide the best design.

Dr. Knapp, 10420 Odlin Road, stated that he had contributed to the resurrection of this project and that he had asked staff to research the possibility for his and his son's lot to be rezoned to CD/44.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated December 15, 2000 from Terry Crowe) regarding the Proposed Convertible House Demonstration Project be referred to staff to clarify the role of the private sector in undertaking this project.

Prior to the question being called further discussion took place during which it was asked that various design options for the second suite be explored and that staff comment on the request by Mr. Knapp.

The question was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

12. **UPDATE TO AREA PLANS**

(Report: Dec. 19/00, File No.: 8060-20-7190) (REDMS No. 251772, 223687, 225322, 98758, 257547, 94262, 144251, 149862, 122374, 114341, 122071, 163328, 150896, 164474)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, explained the contents of the Schedule 2 to Bylaw 7100 binders as being reformatted area plans as outlined on page 138 of the Blue binder. The black binder (Attachment 1) identifies the changes which have been undertaken.

It was moved and seconded

(1) ***That Bylaw No. 7190, which amends Official Community Plan, by substituting the following Area Plans for the existing Area Plans:***

(a) ***Thompson (Dover Crossing Sub-Area) as Schedule 2.2A;***

(b) ***Thompson (Terra Nova Sub-Area) as Schedule 2.2B;***

(c) ***Blundell (Laurelwood Sub-Area) as Schedule 2.5A;***

(d) ***Blundell (East Livingstone Sub-Area) as Schedule 2.5B;***

(e) ***Broadmoor (Ash Street Sub-Area) as Schedule 2.6A;***

(f) ***Broadmoor (Central West Broadmoor Sub-Area) as Schedule 2.6B;***

(g) ***Broadmoor (Sunnymede North Sub-Area) as Schedule 2.6C;***
and

(h) ***Shellmont (Ironwood Sub-Area) as Schedule 2.8A,***

be introduced and given first reading.

(2) ***That Bylaw No. 7190, having been examined in conjunction with the Capital Expenditure Program, the Waste Management Plan, the Economic Strategy Plan, and the 5 Year Financial Plan, is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3) of the Local Government Act.***

(3) ***That Bylaw No. 7190, having been examined in accordance with the City Policy on referral of Official Community Plan Amendments, is hereby deemed to have no effect upon an adjoining Municipality nor function or area of the Greater Vancouver Regional District, in accordance with Section 882(3)(d) and (e) of the Local Government Act.***

- (4) *That Bylaw No. 7190 be referred to the Vancouver International Airport Authority in accordance with the Richmond YVR Accord.*
- (5) *That Bylaw No. 7190 be referred to the Agricultural Land Commission in accordance with Section 882(1)(c) of the Local Government Act.*
- (6) *That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 7113 which replaced Schedule 2.8A (Shellmont-Ironwood Sub-Area Plan), be abandoned.*

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

It was MOVED and SECONDED
That the meeting adjourn (6:25 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, January 16, 2001.

Councillor Malcolm Brodie
Chair

Deborah MacLennan
Administrative Assistant

I certainly didn't think we would be back here at Planning Committee after Council approved our rezoning application last August. We have followed a long process, only to end up back here because of a technicality.

This has been an extremely frustrating process for my family.

Our request is not unusual. It is straight forward.

We are simply asking Council to recognize that our property is not agricultural land. It is a large residential lot in a residential neighbourhood. Anywhere else in Richmond, there would be no problem creating the two lots we are proposing. Council did recognize this fact last August in approving our rezoning application.

Today, we're here because of an oversight in the processing of that rezoning. The oversight was only caught by the Land Reserve Commission staff when they were well into processing our application for a road extension, following Council's third reading approval of our rezoning.

We regret that both the City and the land Reserve Commission didn't point out much earlier the exact legal provisions of the Agricultural Land Reserve Act.

Our dealings with this property date back a decade and only now have we been informed that the City overlooked the technical requirements of the Act.

The determination of whether or not our property falls within the Agricultural Land Reserve, even though it is less than two acres in size, is now being made solely on the legal technicality that the land title was not registered on a separate certificate at the time the Land Reserve was put in place in 1972.

None of this changes Council's determination last August that this land could be sub-divided.

We were well on our way to meeting all of the conditions of that rezoning when this latest oversight was discovered.

I am asking Committee members to see that there has to be some justice in the way in which our application is handled.

A majority of Council saw fit to support our application last August and nothing has changed since then, except a technical oversight.

I ask for your support for the request to the Land Reserve Commission to permit us to sub-divide our property.



Subject property existing conditions. View looking northeast from southwest corner. Dwelling in foreground is on subject property. Dwelling in background is on neighbouring lot across McLennan Avenue. Dwelling at right is on neighbouring lot to the south.

SCHEDULE 2 TO THE MINUTES OF
THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY,
JANUARY 16TH, 2001.



View from the east side of McLennan Avenue looking west. Existing residential dwelling on subject property shown on right. Neighbouring existing residential dwelling shown on the left.



View from McLennan Avenue looking northwest toward road end (east property line of subject property fronting on McLennan Road - left).



View from east property line of subject property looking west.

Mr. Chairman and Committee Members

I like to take this opportunity to extend my thanks to the Planning Committee members that made time to meet with me for a first hand look at my property and the Steveston parking problems.

Late last Friday afternoon I was notified that my application would be presented to this Committee next Tuesday, and the REPORT TO COMMITTEE could be picked up after 4:00 PM. This REPORT TO COMMITTEE, dated December 29, 2000, took Development staff 7 months to prepare. Although I had less than 2 days to research and reply, I found several inaccuracies, all favoring staff's report. I will mention a couple of them.

1. Land Use staff commented that C5 is the zoning for ALL parcels in the immediate vicinity, without much research I found 4 Land Use Contracts in existence in the immediate vicinity.
2. In the conclusions of this report it says that Development staff compromised and agreed to support my application, which is untrue.

Mr. David McLennan general manager of Urban Development, very clearly indicates the opposite in his submission to this Committee on June 20, 2000 and in his Memorandum dated June 01, 2000.

After several discussions with City staff about 3 years ago, our first official meeting with Development Department officials was held on July 07, 1998.

The first obstacle, a 1-½ inch building encroachment, (very common in Steveston due to errors in ancient surveys) which had to be dealt with, accounts for some delay.

Their vision was to close off the Second Avenue entrance to my parking lot and take back City land on the north side to widen the sidewalk for the bus stop and to eliminate my Land Use Contract, and worse of all, reduce the size of my parking lot.

The gist of that meeting was, that if I would agree to the elimination of my Land Use Contract, I would then be allowed to Strata Title convert.

I explained, that the size and accessibility of my parking lot was the main factor for my tenants being able to stay in business and not have to declare bankruptcy like many other Steveston businesses. For that reason I could not agree to eliminate my Land Use Contract.

It was quite apparent to me then that my explanation fell on deaf ears and that they had absolutely no concern about ruining the only good parking lot in Steveston and thereby endangering the livelihood of my Tenants.

Staff suggests replacing my Land Use Contract with C5 zoning. They know full well that there is absolutely no benefit to me or my Tenants, all the uses permitted under that zoning are the same as permitted under my Land Use Contract. The major change would be, that the City will then be able to close off the Second Avenue entrance to my parking lot etc. etc.

Over the course of 2 ½ years I was persuaded to agree to amend my Land Use Contract. Finally in June of last year the Strata Title conversion application was put before this Committee, then referred back to staff.

I don't know what the norm is, to have a referral come back before this Committee, but it took a long time to have this one dealt with, the stalling seemed endless. This REPORT would still not be before you today, had I not made phone calls and sent faxes to Mr. Burke, finally sending a letter with copies to City Council and this Committee.

I realize that this Committee is not at all responsible for the stalling and delays.

The way that Development staff dealt with my application is a disgrace in my opinion. City business should be run like a private business as much as possible. Any private business operating this way would have been bankrupt long ago.

It's bad enough to have to deal with Urban Development's tunnel vision, dig in their heels, my way or none attitude, but to add all this stalling and waiting is beyond reason.

Most of you probably heard or read about the Drayer's and their foster children versus a government official. This case has very similar overtones, 1 citizen, against government officials digging in their heels and flexing their muscle.

You may remember that I also made an application for removing a small parcel of land from the ALR, which was referred back to staff as well. I understand that it will be before this Committee next month.

I realize that my frustration and disgust with Development staff will probably have a negative effect on that application, but such is life.

Compensating me for parking stalls in exchange for the elimination of my Land Use Contract was not my suggestion and is not what I'm looking for.

The best place to spend the small balance of funds now left in the Steveston Parking Reserve Fund would be to improve Public Parking in Steveston.

I really look forward to the day when the need to enforce parking regulations on my property can be eliminated. This will only happen if adequate Public Parking in Steveston is provided.

I agree with Mr. McLennan statement that this may very well be the first and only opportunity the City has to negotiate my Land Use Contract.

There are other Land Use Contract's in the Steveston business district. A very helpful young lady in your Zoning Department on the main floor could not find that any Land Use Contracts were eliminated in the Steveston Business area in the last 10 years, she suggested to check Richmond Archives, unfortunately I did not have adequate time for that.

It is mentioned in REPORT TO COMMITTEE that this proposed subdivision does nothing to improve the parking encroachment on Chatham Street.

Development staff only mentioned negative items. They failed to mention my 6 parking spaces on Second Avenue, the most important item, a positive one. Using Mr. McLennan's words and I quote "a rare opportunity to bring back into public control much needed parking for the greater public benefit". A \$63,000.00 financial benefit to the City, using the numbers in staff's report.

If indeed more room is required for the bus stop, it would be very simple to relocate the bus stop either 1 block to the East or 1 block to the West, where there is ample City owned land unencumbered by a Land Use Contract.

In a nutshell, my parking lot in its present form is required for my Tenants. Twenty-five years ago I could have purchased the adjacent lot to the south for less than half the cost I spent on improvements of City property.

In hindsight that should have been the way to go, my whole parking lot would now be on my property.

I was then persuaded by your Development staff to adopt their development proposal and Land Use Contract, on the premise that zoning would be changed to ensure all other new developments along Chatham would conform, this never happened.

Mr. Alex Jamieson, I believe still employed by your Development Department will be able to confirm planners vision for Chatham Street development back then.

Conclusion:

It is not this Committee that I'm frustrated with, it's Urban Development staff.

I've maintained from the onset that this Strata Title Conversion application should have nothing to do with my Land Use Contract, because I fear losing a good parking lot if my Land Use Contract is eliminated.

I think we all agree that public parking in Steveston needs to be improved. A lot of money will be required. Don't waste the few dollars left in the Steveston Parking Reserve Fund.

Seize the opportunity at hand, as your staff points out in their report, "*this may be the first and only opportunity the City has*", to gain control over the controversial parking spaces on Second Avenue.

My offer to return those parking stalls to the City if my Strata Title Conversion is approved still stands. The reason for my February 28, 2001 deadline to accept this offer was that I don't want to drag this application out for another indefinite time.

Nothing is carved in stone however, and I'm not trying to be unreasonable.

As noted by Development Department staff on page 5 of this report, The City has no control over the 6 parking spaces on Second Avenue, which form a part of my Land Use Contract. Over the last 2 or 3 years the City's Transportation Staff has, without my permission, taken control over those parking stalls.

They have taken down my parking regulation signs, posted City's parking signs, and ticketed my Tenants that have used those parking stalls for more than 15 years

Should you reject this application and my offer, I would appreciate a directive to your Transportation staff for removal of the City parking signs and I would like it to be made very clear in writing on what grounds this application is rejected.

I believe that all the requirements under the application for Strata Title Conversion have been met. The elimination of a Land Use Contract is not a part of those requirements.

How you vote on this issue is your business, but please let your conscience and common sense guide you.

Gerry Hol