

## Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, February 8, 2000

Place: W.H. Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Malcolm Brodie, Chair  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Lyn Greenhill  
Councillor Harold Steves

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. **MINUTES**

It was moved and seconded

***That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday, January 18, 2000 be adopted as circulated.***

**CARRIED**

2. **NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE**

The next committee meeting will take place on **Tuesday, February 22nd, 2000** at 4:00 p.m. in the W. H. Anderson Room.

<b>URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION</b>
-----------------------------------

3. **AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE APPLICATION BY BENJAMIN DE PUTTER FOR NON-FARM USE (SECOND ONE-FAMILY DWELLING) AT 12951 RICE MILL ROAD**

(Report : Jan. 5/00; File: AG 99-170664; REDMS 127122, 106425)

***Designated Speaker: Joe Erceg***

Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reviewed the staff report. He advised that ownership of the property predates designation by the Agricultural Land Commission. Staff has recommended approval of the application subject to conditions. Upon query, Mr. Erceg provided an explanation of a temporary lease, noting that each lease would require approval. Councillor Greenhill expressed concern that approving this temporary lease would set a precedent.

Owner, Mr. De Putter, questioned the possible cost of upgrading the second dwelling to City standards, stating that if this was prohibitive, he would not proceed with the application. Mr. Erceg replied that the cost factor was unknown at present and explained that if the application were not to proceed, the dwelling would then become an illegal second dwelling and would have to be removed.

The owner advised that he had had no problems with the structure in question and was willing to make minor changes to conform to City bylaws.

It was moved and seconded

***That authorization for Benjamin de Putter to apply to the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission for non-farm use (second one-family dwelling) be approved, subject to the following conditions:***

- (1) The second one-family dwelling at 12951 Rice Mill Road be restricted by means of a covenant to the use of the immediate family only during the lifetime and residency of Benjamin and/or Marina de Putter on the subject property;***
- (2) Mr. and Mrs. de Putter forego the option of a Homesite Severance subdivision and register a short-term lease for the second one-family dwelling in order to avoid having to rezone or permanently subdivide 12951 Rice Mill Road; and***
- (3) The de Putters obtain all of the necessary Building/Plumbing Permits and Business Licenses for the subject property when and if the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission grants approval to the second one-family dwelling.***

**CARRIED**

OPPOSED: Councillor Lyn Greenhill

**4 AMENDMENT TO LIQUOR LICENSE APPLICATION – SHADY ISLAND PUB, 3800 BAYVIEW STREET**

(NP 98-138064 - Report: Jan. 25/00; File: 98-138064; REDMS 130913, 114344, 65081)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reviewed the staff report. He advised that the original request of extended hours did not conform to Council policy, but that the applicant was now agreeable to meet Council's policy restrictions for the amended hours.

Applicant, Jerry Biggar, of 3800 Bayview Street, provided further clarification for Committee members. He advised that the proposed off-premises sales area would consist of a liquor boutique with a kiosk type of shelving arrangement featuring products from B.C. He noted that the design for this would be well scrutinized by the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch (LCLB).

It was moved and seconded

***That the request by Shady Island Enterprises at 3800 Bayview Street:***

- a) for off-premises sales, be supported; and***
- b) for extended hours to 1:00 am, seven days a week, be supported on Friday and Saturday evenings only; and***

***that the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch be advised of the recommendation and that the RCMP does not object to this request.***

**CARRIED**

5. **APPLICATION BY PAULA LITT, ON BEHALF OF ALL LINE CONSTRUCTION LTD., FOR REZONING AT 9611 GEAL ROAD FROM "SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E)" TO "SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)"**

Report: Jan. 21/00; File: 8060-20-7077; REDMS 129534, 131341, 131364)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg reviewed the staff report. He advised that proposed rezoning was to allow subdivision in three lots. He noted that staff were not requesting a policy study be undertaken as this was the last property with subdivision potential in this area. He added that the rezoning was consistent with the existing lots in the locality.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) That, (in accordance with Section 702.01 of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300), no further action be taken on the establishment of a larger area for which to set a Lot Size Policy in connection with the application by Paula Litt on behalf of All Line Construction Ltd.***

- (2) That Bylaw No. 7077, for the rezoning of 9611 Geal 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**

6. **APPLICATION BY EXCEL HOMES LTD. FOR A REZONING AT 11511, 11531 AND 11535 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B) TO TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT (R2)**

(RZ 98-140477 – Jan. 24/00; File: 8060-20-7113/7114; REDMS 117683, 113893, 97366, 97372, 119272, 121151)

Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reviewed the staff report. He advised that staff were recommending an amendment to the OCP to provide further design guidelines for the area. He summarized that the proposed rezoning to accommodate nine townhouse units had been considered at Public Hearing in October of last year and referred back to staff to deal with a number of issues. He noted that the project had been amended to incorporate a temporary driveway to provide access and that when the entire lane is upgraded, the

driveway would be closed and vehicle access would be by the lane. Mr. Erceg stated that the rezoning allows for a sidewalk in the lane which is accommodated within a public-rights-of-passage.

It was moved and seconded

**(1) That Bylaw No. 7113, which would:**

- (a) include Development Permit Guidelines for the north side of the 11000 block of Steveston;**
- (b) include the future Canadian Tire site as part of the commercial Development Permit area; and**
- (c) reformat the Shellmont – Ironwood Development Permit Guidelines to be consistent with the Official Community Plan format, as Schedule 2.8A to Bylaw No. 7100,**

**BE RESUBMITTED TO A PUBLIC HEARING.**

**(2) That Bylaw No. 7114 , for the rezoning of 11511, 11531 and 11535 Steveston Highway from “Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B) “ to “Townhouse District (R2)”, BE RESUBMITTED TO A PUBLIC HEARING.**

**CARRIED**

**7. APPLICATION BY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 38 (RICHMOND) FOR REZONING AT 6551, 6591 AND 6611 NO. 4 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F) TO SCHOOL & PUBLIC USE DISTRICT (SPU)**

(Report: Jan. 10/00; File 8060-20-7050, REDMS 128060, 120521, 117178)

Senior Planner, Suzanne Carter-Huffman, reviewed the staff report. She advised that at the last meeting, staff recommended that the “Park Drive” concept be abandoned due to a lack of agreement with the School District. Staff had reviewed the amount of traffic in this area and recommended that the main vehicle entrance to the school site be via a signalized driveway onto No. 4 Road midway between Alberta Road and Granville Avenue, with a secondary driveway coming out on Granville Avenue. She further advised that following the January 18, 2000 meeting of the Planning Committee, in response to the Committee’s direction that further efforts be made to establish the “Park Drive” within a rights-of-way, discussions took place between City and School District staff and at a meeting of the Council/School Board Liaison Committee. These discussions resulted in no change. It was noted that Mayor Halsey-Brandt had sent a letter to the Minister of Education seeking guidance, but had not yet received a reply. Reference was made to copies of correspondence received just prior to the meeting from Sandra Bourque, Chairperson, Board of School Trustees, to Mr. Gordon Wilson, Minister of Education.

The three traffic signals at Alberta Road, Granville Avenue and the school would be synchronized to avoid unnecessary traffic delays along No. 4 Road.

Mr. Erceg advised, in discussion with School District staff, that City staff had suggested to the School District that a "latecomer-type" of agreement could be put in place to reimburse the School District for part of the "Park Drive" (land and construction), but that this would require the establishment of a rights-of-way (either dedicated or public-right-of-passage).

The Chair referred to the memo dated January 31, 2000, from the Manager, Development Applications, and clarified that the proposal currently before the Planning Committee was based on the original report submitted to the Committee's January 18, 2000 meeting, without any changes.

Mr. Ken Morris, Secretary-Treasurer, School District No. 38, advised of a February 2002 construction date with a September 2002 completion date.

He stated that the School District was proposing establishment of a driveway following the original "Park Drive" alignment. It would allow traffic to turn right in and right out onto No. 4 Road, and would be built to City standards at the expense of the School District. He further stated that, in the future, this driveway could be extended to Ash Street to provide a second access to Granville Avenue as set out in the McLennan North Sub-Area Plan. Mr. Morris noted that a right in/right out vehicle access onto No. 4 Road would be consistent with the Sub-Area Plan and that a driveway, versus a road, would be the safest approach.

Councillor Greenhill expressed concern regarding the traffic flow at the site; and stated that she liked the proposal to signalize school access on No. 4 Road; and, did not think the east-west leg of the "Park Drive" was critical.

Mr. Morris explained that 200-300 vehicles would be stopping at MacNeill before and after school and that the east-west leg of the school's driveway was necessary if drop-off/pick-up was to be accommodated with minimal impact on adjacent street. He referenced Cambie School as a comparison. Mr. Morris advised, however, that the Board had agreed to abide by staff's recommendation for a traffic signal although they believed it to be an inferior approach.

Councillor McNulty expressed concern regarding placement of a traffic signal mid-block on No. 4 Road which would disrupt traffic flow.

Mr. Morris reiterated that there seemed to be an impasse regarding "disposal of land" (e.g. establishment of a rights-of-way) for the "Park Drive" in favour of the City.

Councillor Steves referred to the Planning Committee Minutes of January 18, 2000, page 5, paragraph 3 where he requested that the School District provide written correspondence from the Ministry stating their opposition to the requested "Park Drive" road dedication. He further referred to the letter from the School Board to the Minister of Education, submitted to the Committee just prior to the meeting.

Mr. Morris referenced the fact that the Ministry stated that "disposal of land" for road purposes was unprecedented, and further noted that the new School Board would not support it.

Councillor McNulty suggested that the City needed to own access into the site if the property to the south of the driveway was to be zoned for townhouses to

provide safety services. Mr. Morris replied that, at present, the Fire Department was allowed to come onto school property to access adjacent private property.

Councillor Steves noted that, under law, each owner would provide half of the road allowance and that the road was vested into the Crown. He further noted that, if abandoned, it reverts to the original owners. He queried that if the road was owned by the Provincial Government, then why was the Ministry of Education not in agreement.

Mr. Morris expressed concern if a City road was established, it could become a thoroughfare and the School District would not be able to place speed bumps. He referred to McMath School and suggested that at MacNeill, as at McMath, it may be necessary for the School District to install gates to prevent vandalism. This too, would not be possible if a road, rather than a driveway, was established.

Councillor Steves referred to school sites in Richmond with gang problems and suggested that a significant source of those problems was the location of schools behind residential properties. He suggested that the School District's proposal would not alleviate, but increase the difficulties with vandalism.

Mr. Morris suggested that the RCMP could monitor the school site until such time as it proved necessary to place gates.

The Chair further clarified the options for the benefit of the Committee.

At the request of the Chair, the Manager, Development Applications, advised that a private developer applying for rezoning would be required to commit to dedicating and constructing all roads set out in the Sub-Area Plan (e.g. the "Park Drive") before being brought to the Planning Committee. The "Park Drive" would be named, possibly with one name for its north-south leg and a second, for its east-west leg.

Mr. Erceg explained if "Park Drive" was dedicated, that the School District could recover some cost through a "latecomer-type" of agreement. As sites adjacent to MacNeill come in for rezoning, fees would be collected and used to reimburse the School District for the cost of the road. Mr. Erceg confirmed that there were no "public" roads owned by private developers in the City.

Mr. Morris stated that the Board fails to understand why it must "dispose of land" in favour of the City for what would not be a major thoroughfare and further stated that the Ministry of Education staff was in agreement.

The Chair clarified that point of impasse between the City and the School Board was the issue of ownership of the road (e.g. "Park Drive") and read a portion of the letter to the Ministry from the School Board requesting that the Ministry support the Board's decision not to "dispose of land" for road purposes, nor to install a traffic signal along No. 4 Road.

Mr. Morris acknowledged that the Board felt that "disposal of land" was not in their best financial interests. Staff confirmed that dedication would be required for the north-south leg of the "Park Drive" as well as the east-west leg.

Mr. Erceg explained when the City undertakes development, that it pays Development Cost Charges (DCCs) just as would be required of a private developer. Mr. Morris indicated that he anticipated that the School District would pay approximately 1 million in DCCs.

The Chair called for comments from the public.

Julie Frate, of 8451 Seafair Drive, advised that she owned property at 6571 and 6573 No. 4 Road and indicated the location. She expressed concern that her property would be situated in front of the proposed main school entrance as a landlocked island. She briefly outlined the history of her involvement with the School District with respect to this project and expressed further concern regarding the potential for damage to her property. She noted that she had owned the property for 20 years and agreed with the need for signalization at the proposed school entrance on No. 4 Road. She stated if a right in/right out access goes in immediately north of her lot, her tenants would be unable to safely make a left turn onto No. 4 Road.

Victor Wei, Transportation Engineer, advised that motorists are legally able to make a left turn, and cross a solid yellow line or painted "island", provided they are not impeding other properties.

Lori Szabo, of 9760 Alberta Road, referred to the amount of traffic when the nearby H. Anderson school exits and suggested that another traffic light would create a backlog onto No. 4 Road. She recommended an island be installed in the centre of No. 4 Road to allow right in and right out traffic at the school site entrance but prohibit left turns. The Transportation Engineer advised that a triangular island at the school site entrance had been proposed rather than a raised median (e.g. island) in the middle of No. 4 Road, so as not to impact access to adjacent residential properties. Ms. Szabo requested that permits for daytime parking be considered along Alberta Road.

Frederick J. Carron, of 9820 Alberta Road, provided a brief history of the area and read from the Official Community Plan. He expressed concern regarding the size of the school on the site, necessitating variances for parking. He noted the differences between a contract and an agreement, and referencing other school sites, expressed concern regarding the future of the area. Further, he drew attention to the frequency of radar at Alberta Road and No. 4 Road, which indicates a traffic hazard at this location.

Roland Hogler, of 6560 No. 4 Road, expressed concern regarding the general design of the school and the layout of the parking lot on the north side. The Transportation Engineer confirmed that the cost of \$400,000 attributed by staff to the signalization of the No. 4 Road entrance to the school site included both traffic lights and road widening but not the cost of property acquisition nor construction of a driveway on the school site. Mr. Hogler commented that traffic numbers were likely to be 600, rather than 300 vehicles per day as quoted by School District and staff. He referred to Hugh Boyd School and expressed concern regarding traffic flow patterns for the proposed project.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That Bylaw No. 7115 to amend Schedule 2.10C (McLennan North Sub-Area Plan) of Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 and***
- (2) ***That Bylaw No. 7050, for the rezoning of 6551, 6591, and 6611 No. 4 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)" to "School & Public Use (SPU)",***

***be referred back to staff to:***

- (a) ***Pursue the alignment of "Park Drive" as shown in the McLennan North Sub-Area Plan,***
- (b) ***Pursue the provision of "Park Drive" by means of road dedication or public rights of passage,***
- (c) ***Re-examine the use of a latecomer agreement, and***
- (d) ***Review traffic/pedestrian movement and safety on No. 4 Road, Granville Avenue, and Alberta Road.***

**CARRIED**

## **9. MANAGER'S REPORT**

### **1. Unsightly Premises – 7040 No. 5 Road**

Sandra Tokarczyk, Manager, Property Use and Administration distributed photographs and reviewed correspondence on the above. She advised that the owner was an elderly women in a nursing home and that the tenant, Mr. Roy Uzelac, will address the Planning Committee of February 22, 2000. She provided a brief outline of the events surrounding the case.

### **2. Heritage Barn – No. 6 Road**

Terry Crowe, Manager, Land Use, advised that the above barn on the Heritage Inventory List has fallen down due to its dilapidated condition and become damaged. He noted that this has been authorized to be formally demolished.

Councillor Steves suggested that staff at London Farm be contacted regarding the possibility of using the wood from the barn.

### **3. London/Princess Open House**

The Manager, Land Use, provided an update on the public meeting regarding the London/Princess development options.



**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

***That the meeting adjourn (6:13 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 8, 2000.

---

Councillor Malcolm Brodie  
(Chair)

---

Susan Kopeschny  
(Administrative Assistant)