



Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, February 21st, 2006
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Councillor Harold Steves, Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt
Absent: Councillor Bill McNulty, Vice-Chair
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, February 7th, 2006, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, **March 7th, 2006**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

It was moved and seconded
That the 'Twinning of the George Massey Tunnel' be added to the Planning Committee agenda as Item No. 11.

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **RICHMOND INTERCULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2005 ANNUAL REPORT AND 2006 WORK PROGRAM & BUDGET**
(Report: Feb. 2/06, File No.: 01-0100-20-RIADI-01) (REDMS No. 1755818, 1758009, 1740831)

Social Planner Lesley Sherlock introduced Mr. Rod Belleza, Chair, and Cpl. David Hansen, member, of the Intercultural Advisory Committee (IAC). Mr. Belleza then introduced the members of the Committee who were present at the meeting. Mr. Belleza referred to the annual report, and indicated that he was available to answer questions from the Committee.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members, the delegation and staff on:

- how the Committee would manage the two Council referrals dealing with (i) the inclusion of all religious groups in the City within the framework of the new City policy on the display of religious displays at City Hall; and (ii) the matter of the ethnic makeup of all committees
- the proposal to implement a sign audit to assess the significance of language barriers in the community; and the rationale for undertaking such an initiative
- the 'graffiti' presentation made to the IAC and whether graffiti was a problem in Richmond.

During the discussion, comments were made about the importance of the work being undertaken by the Intercultural Advisory Committee. As well, congratulations was offered to the Committee on the many activities in which the Committee was involved, and the networking undertaken with other committees not only within the City, but also outside of Richmond.

The Chair referred to the City's new policy which allowed the display of religious symbols at City Hall, and the IAC was requested to monitor the situation over the coming year and to present its views to Council once the policy had been in place for a year.

In concluding his presentation, Mr. Belleza thanked Council for establishing the IAC and providing the opportunity for the Committee to work to strengthen intercultural harmony and to enhance the intercultural cooperation between different groups.

It was moved and seconded

That the Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee 2006 Work Program be approved.

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

4. **RICHMOND HERITAGE COMMISSION 2005 ANNUAL REPORT AND 2006 WORK PLAN**

(Report: Jan. 31/06, File No.: 01-0100-20-HCOM1-01) (REDMS No. 1753346)

Mr. Graham Turnbull, Chair of the Heritage Commission, accompanied by Planner Terry Brunette, briefly reviewed the Commission's 2005 annual report. He then referred to their 2006 work plan, and spoke about the project currently being undertaken by the Heritage Commission, which was to determine a vision for a Steveston Village Conservation Plan, as had been directed by City Council.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members, Mr. Turnbull and staff on:

- the proposed design charette to be held as part of the process to develop the conservation plan; when the plan would be completed; the availability of funding; and who would be involved
- the feasibility of examining how Lunenburg, Nova Scotia had been developed to determine if the Nova Scotia heritage legislation provided legal approaches which Richmond could use in Steveston
- the feasibility of conducting a heritage home tour
- how Steveston evolved as a community.

During the discussion, reference was made to the Minoru Ice Centre. The request was made that a discussion be held with the Commission about this building, the significant contribution it had made to the community, and whether the structure could be placed on the heritage inventory.

Reference was made to two possible developments for the Steveston area which might be approved prior to the completion of the Steveston Conservation Plan, and a brief discussion ensued on whether the Heritage Commission had had the opportunity to review these proposals. Advice was given by staff that a report was being prepared for submission to the Planning Committee, which would be recommending that applications dealing with certain designated heritage issues be referred to the Heritage Commission for comment.

The Chair also questioned whether the Steveston Buddhist Church had been added to the heritage inventory. In response Mr. Turnbull advised that the current criteria had to be reviewed to determine whether these requirements could be expanded to include 'new' older buildings. The Chair concluded the discussion by asking the Heritage Commission to review this matter.

It was moved and seconded

That the Richmond Heritage Commission 2006 Work Plan (Attachment 2 to the report dated January 31st, 2006, from the Manager, Policy Planning), be approved.

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

5. **APPLICATION BY SILVERADO HOMES LTD. FOR REZONING AT 5411 AND 5431 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B) AND SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA C (R1/C)**

(RZ 04-268223 - Report: Feb. 2/06, File No.: 12-8060-20-7911; xr 4430-00) (REDMS No. 1718567, 280220, 1751204, 1689508, 1693108, 1693813, 1755456, 1755542, 1755527, 1718567, 1751304)

The Director of Development, Jean Lamontagne, briefly reviewed the report with the Committee.

In response to questions about the number of accesses which would result on Steveston Highway, information was provided that the number of accesses would remain the same – one for this particular development.

Discussion then ensued on the impact of the decision not to include a lane in this proposal on developments further west along Steveston Highway. Advice was given during the discussion that lanes would be constructed in this area of Steveston Highway. Also addressed was the need to reduce the amount of traffic on Steveston Highway.

During the discussion staff were commended for the preparation of a thorough report and the time taken to address the concerns of area residents about the type of development they wished to have in their neighbourhood. Appreciation was also expressed about the completeness of the tree consultant's report and the efforts taken to provide specific measures to be taken to protect the existing trees on the property.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That based on the public consultation and survey undertaken along this portion of Steveston Highway, the following recommendations be forwarded to Public Hearing:*

That Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5420 in section 36-4-7, adopted by Council on August 21, 1995 be amended to only permit the westerly 13.5 m of 5411 Steveston Highway to rezone to Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area C (R1/C).

- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7911, for the rezoning of 5411 and 5431 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)" and "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area C (R1/C)", be introduced and given first reading.*

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

6. **APPLICATION BY SANDHILL DEVELOPMENT LTD. FOR AN OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONING AT 22351 WESTMINSTER HIGHWAY FROM "AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT (AG1)" TO "COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/156)"**

(RZ 05-310045 - Report: Feb. 7/06, File No.: 12-8060-20-8025/8026) (REDMS No. 1732993, 946502, 1732917, 1740348, 1749312, 1732924)

Mr. Lamontagne briefly reviewed the report with the Committee. In response to a request from the Chair, he commented on the overall development proposed for the neighbourhood, during which he advised that an application had been received to develop the property to the east of the subject property.

Discussion ensued, with information being provided by Planner Sara Badyal on (i) the criteria used to determine the size of the outdoor amenity area; and (ii) the difference in height of the proposed development in comparison to the existing ground surface.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Bylaw No. 8025, to redesign the eastern end of Sharpe Avenue as a cul-de-sac, remove the roadway through the subject lot, and reconfirm the land use designation of the portion of 22351 Westminster Highway south of Sharpe Avenue as "Small and Large Lot Single-Family Residential; Two-Family Residential; Townhouse Residential; & Institutional" in the Lower Westminster Sub-Area Land Use Map to Schedule 2.14 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 (Hamilton Area Plan), be introduced and given first reading;*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 8025, having been considered in conjunction with:*
 - (a) *the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program; and*
 - (b) *the Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;**is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act;*
- (3) *That Bylaw No. 8025, having been considered in accordance with the City Policy on Consultation During OCP Development, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation; and*
- (4) *That Bylaw No. 8026:*
 - (a) *to amend "Comprehensive Development District (CD/156)" to permit one-family dwellings north of Sharpe Avenue and tandem parking; and*

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

(b) for the rezoning of 22351 Westminster Highway from "Agricultural District (AG1)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/156)",

be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

7. **APPLICATION BY DHINJAL CONSTRUCTION LTD. FOR REZONING AT 9651 NO. 3 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1/0.6)**

(RZ 05-315345 - Report: Jan. 31/06, File No.: 12-8060-20-8007) (REDMS No. 1704508, 1752557, 1710074, 1710082)

Mr. Lamontagne reviewed the report with the Committee, during which he noted that at the request of staff, the applicant had approached the owners of the neighbouring properties about the feasibility of expanding the application site, however, he had been unsuccessful in his efforts.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 8007, for the rezoning of 9651 No. 3 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1/0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

8. **APPLICATION BY SANDHILL DEVELOPMENTS LTD. FOR REZONING AT 10480, 10500/10506 FINLAYSON DRIVE AND AN UNCONSTRUCTED WALKWAY ADJACENT TO 2291 DAVIES PLACE FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA D (R1/D) AND TWO-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R5) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)**

(RZ 05-318997 - ; Report: Feb. 6/06, File No.: 12-8060-20-8023) (REDMS No. 1751213, 280247, 1755770, 1755773)

Mr. Lamontagne reviewed the report with the Committee, during which he commented on the unopened walkway adjacent to 2291 Davies Place.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 8023, for the rezoning of 10480, 10500/10506 Finlayson Drive and an unconstructed walkway adjacent to 2291 Davies Place from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area D (R1/D)" and "Two-Family Housing District (R5)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

9. **APPLICATION BY PATRICK COTTER ARCHITECT INC. FOR REZONING AT 7191, 7211, 7231 AND 7251 NO. 2 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT (R2 – 0.6)**

(RZ 05-298878 - Report: Jan. 30/06, File No.: 12-8060-20-8033) (REDMS No. 1698323, 1698296, 1698312)

Mr. Lamontagne reviewed the report with the Committee.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 8033 for the rezoning of 7191, 7211, 7231 and 7251 No. 2 Road from “Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)” to “Townhouse District (R2 – 0.6)”, be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

10. **WEST CAMBIE AREA PLAN UPDATE**

(Report: Feb. 9/06, File No.: 12-8060-20-8029/8031/8037; xr 4045-20-11WE) (REDMS No. 1756836, 1746295, 1746886, 1755921, 1737653, 1759547)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, provided an overview of the preparation of the proposed West Cambie Area Plan update, and used display boards to explain the evolution of the plan. He also reviewed the proposed implementation and financing strategies, during which he advised that the redevelopment of the area would be developer driven, and that the City would not be financing the installation of any services within the area. Mr. Crowe also talked about:

- the rationale for the creation of the proposed Local Area Development Cost Charges bylaws instead of using only a City-wide Development Cost Charges bylaw
- density bonusing and how the revenue derived from this approach would be allocated
- interim amenity guidelines
- potential developments for the West Cambie area
- the public process which would be held once Council had given first reading to the plan.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on:

- the intention of the ‘front end’ financing and the proposed Development Cost Charges bylaws
- the proposed Ismaili temple development
- the feasibility of locating a community centre or fire hall within the area
- the provision of a child care centre in the area
- the inclusion of affordable housing within the redevelopment proposal

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

- whether the proposed park met the City's standards for high density population in relation to the amount of parkland being provided, and whether the Garden City lands should be included in that calculation
- the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) and whether the amount of area being proposed was a compromise
- whether (i) parking for the multi-family developments would be underground; and (ii) on-street parking would be permitted
- the type of parking to be provided at the site of the future Wal-Mart store
- the point at which TransLink would become involved with the timing of potential transit improvements for the West Cambie area
- the potential costs faced by developers in the area
- the proposed interim amenity charge
- who would be responsible for the management of the affordable housing developments.
- whether the City would achieve its objective of providing a minimum of 20% of affordable housing within the area
- what action would taken, if any, if developers did not agree to provide affordable housing within their projects
- the feasibility of developing a 'green roof' on the proposed Wal-Mart store as a means of increasing the amount of parkland in the area
- whether the ESA would be left completely natural.

Mr. Ray Stolberg, 9540 Odlin Road, questioned the cost to provide high density development over and above development cost charges, and discussion ensued between Mr. Stolberg and staff on the payment of the Development Cost Charges and how these charges would be calculated.

During the discussion, advice was given that a required minimum size for development proposals would have to be assembled before a development application could be submitted, and that orphaned lots would not be permitted.

Mr. Larry Cray, 9411 Alexandra Road, questioned the impact of the increased elevation resulting from the initial developments in the area on those properties which would be redeveloped in the future.

Information was provided that staff were aware of this issue and would take steps to ensure that the new developments were elevated in a manner which would not unduly impact adjacent properties and that these properties would not flood as a result of the increased elevation.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

Further information was provided that the West Cambie Area plan proposed the construction of a new drainage system, and that staff were aware that steps would have to be taken to provide interim drainage measures.

Mr. Cray then spoke about the 2 ½ acre minimum land assembly requirement for redevelopment, and with reference to his property, questioned what would happen if one of the property owners in his 'section' chose not to participate in a redevelopment project. A brief discussion ensued with staff, during which the comment was made that orphaned lots would not be acceptable and that in all likelihood, a proposal would not proceed if there was one property owner who did not wish to sell.

Ms. Ann Gosen, 9391 Odlin Road, voiced her strong objections to the location of an eastern north-south greenway on her property and questioned why the greenway had not been split equally between her property and the adjacent property. In response, staff talked about the limited flexibility to shift the proposed road location in relation to future developments and stated that this location was not permanent at this time. Discussion ensued between Ms. Gosen and staff on this issue.

Ms. Gosen then referred to her property at 9500 Cambie Road, and voiced concern about the status of the 100 year old trees located on the perimeter of her property because the West Cambie Area Plan showed a road where the trees currently existed. She also voiced her concern about the location of the proposed Ismaili temple on one side of her property and a car lot already located on the opposite side, and questioned whether (i) the car lot shared a portion of the proposed roadway, and (ii) her property would be attractive to potential developers.

Ms. Gosen also expressed concern that because of the proposed temple and the existing car lot, her property would be effectively landlocked, and she questioned how she would be able to develop her property which was only 1 ½ acres in size when staff had indicated that 2 ½ acres would be required for a land assembly. Discussion ensued between staff and Ms. Gosen on this matter, with comments being made about the feasibility of possibly allowing smaller properties to develop. The Chair also indicated that staff would review Ms. Gosen's situation to ensure that the trees on her property were not destroyed. A further comment was made that if the temple proceeded to construction, a provision could be made that the temple construct only half of the road with construction of the other half of the road being delayed until development proceeded on her property.

Mr. Farid Damrji, a volunteer member of the Ismaili Council, and Ms. Farzana Mohamed, 4751 Duncliff Road, stated that they were pleased to have been involved in the planning process of the West Cambie Area Plan. He stated that the Ismaili Council had not had the opportunity to fully assess the impact of the proposed plan on their project, but looked forward to working with other developers, the residents and the City.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

Ms. Mohamed referred to the proposed temple, and extended an invitation to the Planning Committee and other members of Council to tour their existing facilities to give members an idea of the type of facility to be constructed in Richmond. She questioned when the area plan would be submitted to a public hearing, and advice was given that the matter would go to Public Hearing on March 20th, 2006 and presented to a public information meeting either March 8, 9 or 10th, 2006

Mr. Michael Wolfe, 9731 Odlin Road, stated that adding seven intersections to the area would have a major impact on the movement of traffic in the area and on the ability of emergency response teams to respond quickly in the event of an emergency. He referred to the proposed guidelines and suggested that the best long term benefit for the area would be to keep as much existing landscape as possible. Mr. Wolfe also referred to the holding of open houses and suggested that they were ineffective because the people (tenants) who lived in the homes were not consulted, only the owners.

Mr. Wolfe suggested that all future developments in the area should have geothermal heat or another 'green' heat source, such as solar panels or other renewable energy sources, instead of using City resources. He added that home air conditioning equipment should not be permitted.

Mr. Wolfe also commented that locating a trail through the ESA was wrong, and expressed concern about the amount of garbage being deposited in this area. He stated that the ESA and the habitat which lived in the ESA should be protected. He added that this area should not be included in the ratio of parkland proposed for the West Cambie area. Mr. Wolfe then offered the following comments:

- a community farm development should be included in the plan
- the City should be acquiring land in this area to include in the Agricultural Land Reserve
- pesticide use should be completely banned in this quarter section
- the perimeter trees should be retained and the City's Tree Bylaw strengthened to increase tree protection
- the Vancouver Airport Authority (VIAA) did not support any development in the West Cambie area, and he questioned how a child care facility could be proposed for the area when airplane noise in this area had a NEF rating of 30
- the VIAA was planning on increasing the number of landings and takeoffs from the airport, which would result in more and more complaints from impacted residents
- the ESA should be expanded within the West Cambie Area Plan to include those smaller areas on private properties which had been overlooked

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

- the Heritage Commission and the Advisory Committee on the Environment should be included in discussions on the development of the area plan.

Mr. Gary Dian, 9151 Alexandra Road, voiced the opinion that the minimum size for property development would be problematic, and that while the proposal was excellent news for the owners of large properties, he suggested that the 2 ½ acre land assembly requirement should be revisited. He voiced the opinion that there would be increased support for the proposed area plan if smaller sizes were considered. In response, comments were offered by staff that while lot-by-lot development was not an option, the plan offered flexibility and an opportunity to review individual properties to determine if a proposal could be considered. As well, reference was made to the many long, narrow lots in the area, and the comment was made that staff were concerned that if individual lots were permitted to be developed, long narrow ‘tunnel’ driveways could result and staff wanted to avoid that scenario.

Mr. Dian stated that not all of the lots in the area were long and narrow, as his property was ‘squarish’, and he voiced the opinion that the City should be accommodating more of these property owners.

Mr. Lawrence Lim advised that many of the properties in the area were one acre in size, and that he understood the City’s rationale for not wanting to have one acre developments, however he questioned whether the City would consider a minimum 2 acre development. In reply, the comment was made that the larger the land assembly, the better the design of the project, and that because of the new infrastructure which would be required, the initial cost would make it more difficult for smaller developments.

Discussion then ensued on the provision of affordable housing, with information being provided that the plan had been developed to achieve a minimum 5% affordable rental housing. In addition, staff would be working with developers to provide affordable purchase housing. A question was raised about whether ‘flex’ housing would be a viable option for the area, however advice was given that ‘flex’ housing was not permitted as it was considered to be single-family housing due to the City’s policy regarding aircraft noise.

It was moved and seconded

That, (as per the report dated February 9, 2006, from the Manager, Policy Planning, entitled, “West Cambie Area Plan Update”):

- (1) Bylaw No. 8029, which amends Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100, by substituting an updated West Cambie Area Plan for the existing West Cambie Area Plan as Schedule 2.11A thereof, be introduced and given first reading.***
- (2) Bylaw No. 8029, having been considered in conjunction with the:***
 - (a) City’s Financial Plan and Capital Program; and***

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

- (b) *Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;*
- is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act.*
- (3) *Bylaw No. 8029, having been considered in accordance with the City Policy on Consultation During OCP Development, be referred to the:*
- (a) *Richmond School Board;*
- (b) *Ministry of Transportation; and*
- (c) *Vancouver International Airport Authority for comment, prior to the public hearing.*
- (4) *Local Area Development Cost Charges Amendment Bylaw No. 8031, to amend Development Cost Charges Bylaw No. 8024, be introduced and given first reading.*
- (5) *City Wide Development Cost Charges Amendment Bylaw No. 8037, to amend Development Cost Charges Bylaw No. 8024, be introduced and given first reading.*
- (6) *That, subject to the adoption of the Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 8029, Local Area Development Cost Charges Amendment Bylaw No. 8031, and City Wide Development Cost Charges Amendment Bylaw No. 8037, the following be approved:*
- (a) *A policy amendment to the City's Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy Policy 7000 (Attachment 4 to the report dated February 9, 2006, from the Manager, Policy Planning);*
- (b) *The West Cambie - Alexandra Interim Amenity Guidelines (Attachment 5 to the report dated February 9, 2006, from the Manager, Policy Planning).*
- (7) *The Approval Process be approved (Attachment 6 to the report dated February 9, 2006, from the Manager, Policy Planning).*

The question on the motion was not called, as Committee members expressed their support to forward the West Cambie Area Plan to public hearing. During the discussion, questions were raised about the appropriate time to address specific issues, such as tree retention, the use of solar panels, etc. to ensure that the proper consideration was given to some of the suggestions made by the speakers. In response, reference was made to the proposed development guidelines, and advice given that sustainability issues could be addressed when specific development applications were submitted.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

Discussion continued, with comments being made that the proposed plan was very innovative in making the development community assume responsibility for the installation of services, etc. Concern was expressed about the small amount of affordable rental housing which had been included in the proposed area plan. Staff were also cautioned about the potential costs being proposed as a means to provide affordable housing in the City.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

In concluding the discussion on this matter, staff were thanked for their time and effort in developing the proposed area plan.

11. **TWINNING OF THE GEORGE MASSEY TUNNEL** (Oral Report)

It was moved and seconded

That the Planning and Public Works Departments review the "Freedom to Move" report and the recent Gateway program, and report to Committee on Richmond's needs and timeline.

The question on the motion was not called, as Councillor Steves talked about the need for the twinning of the tunnel. He provided information that the twinning of the tunnel was at least 15 years away, and he stated that the City should be planning for this improvement now, especially if the proposed Blundell Road/Highway 99 interchange was to occur and congestion at the tunnel was to be reduced.

Discussion continued briefly, with staff indicating that they were endeavouring to obtain a copy of the Gateway program report, and that a report would be submitted to the March 2006 meeting of the Public Works & Transportation Committee on the proposed Blundell Road/Highway 99 interchange.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (7:05 p.m.).

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 21st, 2006

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 21st, 2006.

Councillor Harold Steves
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant – City Clerk's Office