



Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2003

Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt, Vice-Chair 4:03 p.m.
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Harold Steves

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

As a result of a request from the Chair that the order of the agenda be varied:

It was moved and seconded
That the order of the agenda be varied in order that Item 4 on the agenda be heard after Item 11.

CARRIED

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, February 4th, 2003, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, **March 4th, 2003**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 18, 2003

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **APPLICATION FOR A FOOD PRIMARY LIQUOR LICENCE WITH AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (KARAOKE) AT UNITS #1028 AND 1031 – 8300 CAPSTAN WAY**
(Report: Jan. 21/03, File No.:) (REDMS No. 946873)

The Manager, Zoning, Alan Clark, was present and, in response to questions, reviewed the general layout of the proposed facility, and indicated that the reason that this particular site had been chosen was not known.

It was moved and seconded

That the application by Rising Tide Consultants Ltd. to the Liquor Control and Licencing Branch for a Food Primary Liquor Licence with audience participation (Karaoke) be supported, and that the Liquor Control and Licencing Branch be advised:

- (1) The potential for noise if the application is approved has been reviewed and is not an issue.*
- (2) The impact on the community if the application is approved has been reviewed, and, as the premise is located in a commercial development with no immediate residential presence it is deemed an appropriate location that would create no impact.*
- (3) The establishment of a restaurant with a Food Primary Liquor Licence with audience participation (Karaoke) would not be contrary to its primary use.*
- (4) The views of residents is not an issue because the restaurant is located in a commercial development away from any residential development, and therefore not affected.*
- (5) That the RCMP does not object.*

CARRIED

Cllr. S. Halsey-Brandt joined the meeting – 4:03 p.m.

5. **APPLICATION BY S297 HOLDINGS LTD. FOR REZONING AT 9420, 9460, AND 9480 CAMBIE ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/137)**
(RZ 02-213334 - Report: Feb. 3/03, File No.: 8060-20-7486) (REDMS No. 943673, 955925, 955945)

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

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 18, 2003

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7486, for the rezoning of 9420, 9460, and 9480 Cambie Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/137)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

6. **APPLICATION BY AMAR SANDHU FOR REZONING AT 8671 CANTLEY ROAD FROM TWO-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R5) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)**

(RZ 02-221217 - Report: Jan. 30/03, File No.: 8060-20-7487) (REDMS No. 954322, 954376, 954378)

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

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7487, for the rezoning of 8671 Cantley Road from "Two-Family Housing District (R5)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

7. **APPLICATION BY JATINDER BHANGAV TO PERMIT A CHILD CARE PROGRAM AS A PERMITTED USE IN THE AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT (AG1) ZONE SPECIFICALLY AT 7471 NO. 6 ROAD**

(RZ 02-205483 - Report: Feb. 5/03, File No.: 8060-20-7488) (REDMS No. 928283, 930663, 930659)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, and Janet Lee, Planner, were present. A discussion then ensued that included:

- the role that provincial Community Care Facility officials provide in the regulating of child care facilities and programs;
- whether an option would exist for another similar use facility in the ALR;
- that the City liaises with the Health Board on a monthly basis to address any issues that may have arisen although it was noted that since the inception of the Child Care Policy no issues had come forth.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 18, 2003

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7488, for the rezoning of 7471 No. 6 Road to include "Child Care program as a Home Occupation, limited to a maximum of 30 children" among the permitted uses in the "Agricultural District (AG1)" zone specifically at the subject site only, be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

8. **RECOMMENDED COST SAVINGS FOR LANE IMPLEMENTATION**

(Report: Jan. 27/03, File No.: 6360-07) (REDMS No. 943226, 961545)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, and the Director, Engineering, Steve Ono, were present: Mr. Erceg briefly reviewed the report.

A discussion then ensued during which the following information was provided:

- that lane dedications at the rear of properties would continue;
- in some cases access to the rear lane would be by right-of-way;
- Neighbourhood Improvement Charges (NIC) in lieu of construction of the lane would be an option for developments yielding less than 4 lots;
- a covenant on title indicating the lane dedication, but not the interim use of that dedication, would be required which in some cases would also provide for a re-arrangement of access;
- the cost saving of reducing lane standards and eliminating curbs would be offset by an increase in City maintenance and operational costs;
- prior to the actual construction of the lane, no infrastructure would be installed which could be problematic in terms of drainage in the interim period between the lane dedication and its construction.
- Neighbourhood Improvement Charges are not specifically applied to the property for which they were collected but rather rotate as collections continue thereby offsetting any increase to the construction cost of the lane caused by inflation.

Mr. Ray Froh questioned the feasibility of allowing developments mid-block that would result in lane dedications and mentioned the liability and drainage issues that could arise from such dedications. It was suggested that it would be more feasible to develop the lane from the ends of the block in.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 18, 2003

In response to a question, Mr. Erceg said that developments that yielded less than 4 lots were being provided with the option of NIC charges in lieu of lane construction due to the onerous cost on small lot developments of building the access from the arterial to the future lane.

Mr. Martin Woolford, 5951 Egret Court, said that his property backed onto 2 properties on No. 2 Road, and he questioned what would result if one of those properties were to develop and not the other. Mr. Erceg responded that although there would be a change in circumstances at the rear of Mr. Woolford's property, i.e. garages and an increased activity level, the requirement that the property being subdivided be provided with perimeter drainage should negate any drainage problems for his property.

Ms. J. Fletcher, 11251 No. 2 Road, expressed her concern that in the event the older homes that surround her property were to be redeveloped she would lose a portion of her lot or be the cause of her neighbours's ire.

Ms. P. Anderson, 11991 No. 2 Road, expressed concern that in the cases of properties on No. 2 Road that subdivided, the possible change in grade for the new development could result in retaining walls of 8 – 10 feet for the adjacent properties to the rear.

Mr. Meyer, 5971 Kittiwake Drive, questioned how a lane would be provided on a cul-de-sac.

A brief discussion then ensued on the proposed changes to the Lane Establishment Policy.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the current components of lane construction, (as outlined in the report dated January 27th, 2003, from the Director of Engineering and Manager of Development Applications,, be endorsed;*
- (2) *That staff, in the implementation of the Lane Establishment Policy:*
 - (a) *accept the payment of a Neighbourhood Improvement Charge (NIC) as an alternative to the construction of a lane, in development situations where no public access is constructed or where there is no means to connect a lot to an existing lane or road; and*
 - (b) *require public lane access with subdivisions of four or more lots or townhouses.*

Prior to the question being called further discussion ensued on the proposed changes. The question on the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllr. Barnes **OPPOSED**.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 18, 2003

9. **APPLICATION BY JERRY AND KARIN GIESBRECHT FOR REZONING AT 10291 BRIDGEPORT ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA D (R1/D) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)**
(RZ 02-205510 - Report: Feb. 3/03; File No.: 8060-20-7489) (REDMS No. 957203, 280247, 961548, 957336)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, and Rob Innes, Planner, were present.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw 7489 for the rezoning of 10291 Bridgeport Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area D (R1/D)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllr. Barnes

10. **PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LANE ESTABLISHMENT POLICY NO. 5038**

AND

APPLICATION BY ROCKY SETHI FOR REZONING AT 11851 NO. 2 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA A (R1/A)

(RZ 02-219330 - Report: Jan. 29/03, File No.: 8060-20-7483) (REDMS No. 929343, 442122, 936817, 935184, 933073, 933103)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, and David Brownlee, Planner, were present. Mr. Crowe presented a map denoting the arterial roads which required lanes, as well as those arterials suggested for inclusion into the Lane Establishment Policy.

Mr. Martin Woolford, 5951 Egret Court, provided, and then summarized, a written submission which is attached as Schedule 1 and forms a part of these minutes. Also provided by Mr. Woolford was a neighbourhood petition containing 104 signature of opposition to the proposed rezoning. A copy of the petition is on file in the City Clerks Office.

Ms. Adele Peters, 11460 Pintail Drive, said that she agreed with the comments made by the previous speaker, and referred to the letter she had submitted to the Planning Department on January 15, 2003. Ms. Peters then cited her concerns of the affect of increased traffic accessing No. 2 Road; the potential grade differences and retaining walls; and, the possible flooding implications. Ms. Peters said that she loved the school in the area, and that she was concerned that the single family character of Westwind could be lost. In response to a question, Ms. Peters said that she would not support perimeter development in her subdivision as those properties also belonged to the single-family character of Westwind.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 18, 2003

A resident of Pelican Court indicated that should No. 2 Road be widened from Steveston Hwy. to Moncton St. the traffic issues would be alleviated.

Ms. L. Meyer, 5971 Kittiwake, expressed concern that the lane would run along the side of her house. She advised that she owned the corner lot on the north side of Kittiwake and No. 2 Road and that she had no intention of moving.

Ms. C. Dunham of 11511 Pintail Drive, cited traffic and the increased demand new development would have on Westwind School as her concerns. Ms. Dunham also said that the uniqueness of the Westwind subdivision should be retained.

Mr. P. Dhillon, representing 5940 Goldeneye Place, said that he was disturbed that a lane could be constructed in the rear of his mother's home. Mr. Dhillon also said that the Westwind subdivision and neighbourhood was something to be proud of due to its great characteristics. The petition submitted by Mr. Woolford was referred to in the hope that the concerns of the neighbours would be appreciated.

Mr. R. Higo, 5960 Kittiwake, questioned the intent of the Lane Establishment Policy stating that in the instance before Committee the issues of safety and traffic flow could not be met due to the volume of traffic on Kittiwake and No. 2 Road. Mr. Higo also expressed concern that the lane would pass beside his property and the traffic would be a disturbance; that he might not be able to exit his driveway; and, that increased parking on Kittiwake would occur.

Mr. Rocky Sethi, the agent for the owners of the subject property, said that he would attempt to address the good points raised by the previous speakers. He then offered the following:

- i) the grade level would be raised to accommodate the rear lane only and would not be significant;
- ii) all lanes include drainage down the centre;
- iii) the investors in the subject property had two options of development – subdivision or the construction of one large home. Mr. Sethi indicated that the view encroachment to the properties to the non arterial lots would be lessened by a two lot subdivision;
- iv) new developments pay Development Cost Charges and contribute to school levies and facilities/parks in the area;
- v) developments such as that proposed provide the funds for road improvements such as those required on No. 2 Road;

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 18, 2003

- vi) no land is taken from any property other than that being re-developed; and,
- vii) a 33 ft. lot could accommodate 3 car parking;

It was moved and seconded

That:

- (1) *the lane Establishment Policy No. 5038 and Bylaw 7483 be referred to staff for further consideration; and,*
- (2) *that a transportation study be completed for the No. 2 Road, Railway Avenue, Trites Road and Moncton Street area to address:*
 - a) *two road improvements scenarios for No. 2 Road:*
 - i) *without a lane including widened lanes, and bike lanes;*
 - ii) *widening No. 2 Road to four lanes; and,*
 - b) *overall traffic flow.*

CARRIED

11. AMENDMENTS TO THE ARTERIAL ROAD REDEVELOPMENT POLICY

(Report: Jan. 30/03, File No.: 8060-20-7240) (REDMS No. 927858, 439247)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, briefly reviewed the report and the staff recommendation.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy be amended, (as shown on Attachment 1 to the report dated January 30, 2003, from the Manager of Policy Planning), for areas outside of Neighbourhood Centres to:*
 - (a) *permit townhouses in the range of 0.6 FAR; and*
 - (b) *permit single family housing to be built at a density of 0.6 FAR for properties along arterial roads where lanes are required;*
- (2) *That work be initiated by staff to create a 0.6 FAR townhouse zone and amend the R1 zone to permit 0.6 FAR for areas outside of the neighbourhood centres; and*
- (3) *That in 2004, staff present Council with a process to explore a Neighbourhood Centre Redevelopment Model in order to provide better guidance to neighbourhoods and the development community as how best to manage change in the Neighbourhood Centres.*

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 18, 2003

4. **APPLICATION BY GREAT CANADIAN CASINOS INC. FOR REZONING OF A PORTION OF 8811/8831 RIVER ROAD FROM AUTOMOBILE-ORIENTED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C6) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/87)**

AND

APPLICATION BY CAROUSEL VENTURES LTD. TO AMEND LAND USE CONTRACT 126 OVER 8320, 8340, 8440 BRIDGEPORT ROAD AND 8311, 8351 SEA ISLAND WAY TO PROHIBIT A CASINO AS A PERMITTED USE

(RZ 02-211434 / LUC 03-223306 - Report: Jan. 30/03, File No.: 8060-20-7484/7485/6880/6927)
(REDMS No. 933998, 709597, 953446, 951327, 944496, 951325)

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

Mr. Randy Knill, Randy Knill Architects Ltd., with the aid of a site plan, reviewed the proposed development including the proposed extension of Garden City Road; the public amenity areas; the pedestrian links, and a possible transit alignment. Mr. Knill indicated that the proposal would include a 200 suite hotel, various food services, a 650 seat dinner theatre, a banquet facility/conference area, a spa/fitness centre and the Great Canadian Casino Head Office.

Mr. Knill then, in response to questions, provided the following information:

- i) that construction of the proposed development, including 2 lanes of the Garden City extension, would be complete in approximately one year;
- ii) that Great Canadian would operate the marina;
- iii) a circulation path along the marsh would be located well back from the bank;
- iv) only the existing market place would be retained in the new development; and,
- v) that early indications of economic development are evident.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Bylaw No. 7484, for the rezoning of a portion of 8811/8831 River Road from "Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/87)", be introduced and given first reading.*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7485, which amends "Land Use Contract 126" (Bylaw 3612) in order to exclude a casino use as a permitted use at 8320, 8340, 8440 Bridgeport Road and 8311, 8351 Sea Island Way, be introduced and given first reading.*

Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 18, 2003

- (3) *That Bylaw No. 6880, for the rezoning of 8811/8831, 8671, 8840 River Road, 2420 No. 3 Road, Lot 6880 and Lot "G" Duck Island from Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6) to Comprehensive Development District (CD/87), be abandoned.*
- (4) *That Bylaw No. 6927, for the rezoning of 8320, 8340, 8440 Bridgeport Road and 8311, 8351 Sea Island Way from Land Use Contract 126 to Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6) be abandoned.*

Prior to the question being called a request was made that the items be dealt with separately.

The question was called on Part 1 and was **CARRIED** with Cllr. S. Halsey-Brandt **OPPOSED**.

The question was called on Part 2 and was **CARRIED** with Cllr. S. Halsey-Brandt **OPPOSED**.

The question was called on Part 3 and was **CARRIED**.

The question was called on Part 4 and was **CARRIED**.

12. MANAGER'S REPORT

There were no reports.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (6:53 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 18th, 2003.

Councillor Bill McNulty
Chair

Deborah MacLennan
Administrative Assistant

February 17, 2003

Martin Woolford
5951 Egret Court
Richmond, B.C.
V7E 3W2

Planning Committee
City of Richmond
6911 No 3 Road
Richmond, B.C.
V6Y 2C1

Dear Sir/Madam:

RE: The Proposed Amendment to the Lane Establishment Policy #5038 and The Rezoning Application for 11851 No. 2 Road (RZ 02-219330).

I am writing to you to express my opposition to the above proposed amendment to the Lane Establishment Policy (particularly the section of lane (#3 on attachment 2 (No. 2 Road between Moncton and Steveston Hwy.) and the Rezoning Application for several reasons. Some are personal and some reflect upon the whole neighborhood.

1: Loss of privacy for my home and garden:

My home is a rancher style home, secluded at the end of a cul-de-sac, the only entry to the property is at the front via the street, it is very private and quiet. The proposed lane, when established, will expose the back of my property (a pie shape) to 123 feet of the lane way and at one point to within 20 feet of the rear bedroom area of the house. This laneway and the probable future re-development it would bring, (up to 4 -2.5 storey "heritage style" homes towering over the existing landscape,) would shatter any seclusion and privacy of which, we have been accustomed and valued, and that, that existed and was originally designed into the sub-division layout. The potential loss of already existing and matured landscaping and hedging.

2: Concern for Ground Water/ Flooding:

As the lane and any new properties would be developed it would necessitate elevating the grades 3 to 4 feet at the land at the back of my property (similar to sections of No 2 Road north of Steveston Highway). This elevation change and retaining wall would create a drainage problem along the abutting lower properties, already a problem in Richmond with these types of development.

3: Security and Vandalism:

At present and as mentioned earlier the only exposure my lot has is from the street. This new laneway would basically open up the rear and the two sides to access from intruders and vandalism, a known problem in laned areas. It also becomes a litter and debris haven.

4: Increased noise

The exposure to new vehicular traffic noise, not just 1 or 2 driveways but traffic from a potential 60 homes entering and exiting through the lane. Street racing in laneways (this straight) is becoming an up and coming problem in Richmond.

5: Property value:

The decrease in my property value due to the encroachment of density and decrease in ambience to not only my property but the neighborhood in general. Our present property tax assessment increased significantly this year, this reasoned by the assessor to be because of the desirability of our property.

6: Lane exiting and volume:

Exiting onto #2 Road, Kittiwake and Moncton at the ends of the lane will compound traffic problems that already exist at these locations, and intersections.

7: Lane Positives:

No positives will result, A garage (already provided at front of house) would have to be elevated and would take up desirable garden space. Landscaping, fences and established hedges would have to be relocated and re-grown from scratch.

8: Property rezoning at 11851:

I cannot see any positive points to re-zone an existing 70 foot wide corner lot or a 60 foot wide interior lot into 2-R1/A (29.5 foot wide lots) and increase the density of the already well established Westwind sub-division that already exists with R1/E wider lots. The whole sub-division of Westwind (including No.2 Road, Moncton, and Railway was established by E H Greczmiel into a desirable, well designed quality neighborhood, having a distinct character of its own, which it has maintained since its inception to this present day. Adding property sizes and houses that are out of character with the area will certainly not enhance, maintain or add to its quality and appearance. The proposed rezoning and possible future redevelopment of some houses along No 2 Road. will be piecemeal at best and would result in a mismatch of house styles, set backs lot sizes and grade elevations, etc. not "the more appealing streetscape concept" envisioned by the planners. The position of the lot to be rezoned could not be at a worse location for adding congestion and density to an already troublesome area, the lane exiting and view corridors that would be decreased by the new structures, would only add to the traffic safety and congestion issues at that corner. The developer concerned in the rezoning is establishing a "flex house" concept with the city, would this site warrant this type of house and its extra legal suite, which again would stress density and traffic loads.

9: Lack of Comprehensive Planning and Consultation:

Lack on consultation with the neighborhood and immediate areas effected should be completed prior to considering applications and amendments such as these. The 50m rule seems too restrictive in cases such as these. People across No 2 Road from the concerned property have never been notified. Shouldn't there be some traffic improvements to No 2 Road in place or at least planning prior to redeveloping this street. The farm land, power

poles relocation etc. will deter the city cost wise from improving the road in any foreseeable near future. In the planners reports the transportation review mentions concerns for R1/K and R1/A rezoning across from the ALR. There is also mention of providing a boulevard and sidewalk on the front property line, but wouldn't necessarily go ahead because of a possible power pole conflict, and the planner would have to make site visit to verify. I ask, does the city approve rezoning applications without actually visiting the property and area under review?

10: Lack of Adequate Notice:

I'm not sure what the correct procedures are on handling rezoning and amendments in notifying the affected neighboring properties, but I would wonder and like to ask why I and others received the notifying letter from the city which is dated February 4, 2003 and is after the recommendation for first reading and report to committee dated January 29, 2003 which includes the same letter dated January 8, 2003.

Based on my concerns and I know that of other area residents in this amendment action and the rezoning issue, I would like to see the planning committee defer its recommendations for The Lane Establishment Policy No 5038 or at least the No 2 Road Portion of the policy until its determined that this action is really required and that the recommendation that Bylaw No 5038 for rezoning of 11851 No. 2 Road from "Single Family Housing District , Subdivision Area E (R1/E) to "Single Family Housing District, Subdivision Area R1/A) be denied and the current zoning remains as is.

Yours truly



Martin Woolford

Inc. Dated copy of notification

February 17, 2003

Martin Woolford
5951 Egret Court
Richmond, B.C.
V7E 3W2

Planning Committee
City of Richmond
6911 No 3 Road
Richmond, B.C.
V6Y 2C1

Dear Sir/Madam:

RE: The Proposed Amendment to the Lane Establishment Policy #5038 and The Rezoning Application for 11851 No. 2 Road (RZ 02-219330).

Please except a petition from the affected residents and property owners notified by the city on the above item. Please note that the petition was signed by every affected owner within the interior of Westwind subdivision and by 20 of the 43 properties on the No. 2 Road side of Westwind subdivision. Of the houses canvassed only 4 owners expressed any interest and favorability to the Lane Amendment and rezoning Application, 6 people declined comments or sign the petition as they were renters and unfortunately in the short time period we failed to reach the remaining 13 properties. The question comes where does the city see the development pressure coming from? Or who is promoting this. The remainder of the community seems to like the status quo including the larger lots. Unfortunately the piecemeal development prospects and the residual lots and houses does not help acquire a laneway, but only makes more of a mess on exiting on No 2 Road.

Based on the petition results and I know the concerns of area residents in this amendment action and the rezoning issue, I would like to see the planning committee defer its recommendations for The Lane Establishment Policy No 5038 or at least the No 2 Road Portion of the policy until its determined that this action is really required and that the recommendation that Bylaw No 5038 for rezoning of 11851 No. 2 Road from "Single Family Housing District , Subdivision Area E (R1/E) to "Single Family Housing District, Subdivision Area R1/A) be denied and the current zoning remains as is.

Yours truly



Martin Woolford

Inc. Neighborhood petition

PETITION

TO THE CITY OF RICHMOND PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL
 WE THE UNDERSIGNED RESIDENTS ARE **OPPOSED** TO THE PROPOSED
REZONING APPLICATION FOR 11851 No. 2 ROAD (RZ 02-219330)
 AND/OR
THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LANE ESTABLISHMENT POLICY

<u>PRINT NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>SIGNATURE</u>	<u>DATE</u>
JACQUELINE GRESKO	5931 SANDPIPER	<i>Jacqueline Gresko</i>	Feb 15/03
ROB GRESKO	5931 SANDPIPER	<i>Robin Gresko</i>	Feb 15/03
ROBERT LEWIS Robert Lewis	5911 - SANDPIPER COURT	<i>Robert Lewis</i>	FEB. 15/03
JOHN WILLIAMS	5951 CORMORANT CRT	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 15/03
Louise Williams	5951 Cormorant Crt	<i>Louise Williams</i>	Feb 14/03
Shannon Campbell	5940 Egret Crt	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 15/03
Rose Kisker	5940 Puffin Court	<i>R. Kisker</i>	Feb. 15/03
Ellen Penney	5960 Goldeneye Place	<i>Penney</i>	Feb 15/03
Fintan Penney	5960 Goldeneye Place	<i>[Signature]</i>	FEB 15/03
DANLEY YIP	5951 GOLDENEYE PLACE	<i>[Signature]</i>	FEB 15/03
Chris Cougle	5931 Goldeneye Place	<i>[Signature]</i>	FEB 15/03
ALEX HERRING	11340 PELICAN COURT.	<i>Alex</i>	FEB 15/03
KATE HERRING	11340 PELICAN COURT.	<i>Kate</i>	Feb. 15/03
RUTH AICHINGER	11351 PELICAN CRT.	<i>R. Aichinger</i>	FEB 15/03
ERWIN AICHINGER	11351 PELICAN CRT.	<i>E. Aichinger</i>	FEB. 15/03
Debbie Wile	11420 Pintail Drive	<i>Debbie J Wile</i>	Feb. 15 2003
Adele Peters	11460 Pintail Drive	<i>Adele Peters</i>	Feb. 15/03
STEVE WARD	11460 PINTAIL DRIVE	<i>Steve Ward</i>	FEB 14/03
ROY HIGG	15960 KITTNAKE DR.	<i>R/H</i>	FEB 15/03
JEAN FLETCHER	11251 No. 2 Rd	<i>J Fletcher</i>	15 Feb 03
Mike Fletcher	11251 #2 Rd	<i>[Signature]</i>	15 Feb 03

PETITION

TO THE CITY OF RICHMOND PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL
 WE THE UNDERSIGNED RESIDENTS ARE *OPPOSED* TO THE PROPOSED
 REZONING APPLICATION FOR 11851 No. 2 ROAD (RZ 02-219330)
 AND /OR
 THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LANE ESTABLISHMENT POLICY

<u>PRINT NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>SIGNATURE</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Stan Reese	1151 #2 Rd. Richmond		Feb 15, 2003
Alison Hutchison	1151 #2 Rd Richmond	A. Hutchison	Feb 15/03
Chris Evans	11531 Trumpeter Dr	Chris Evans	Feb 16/03
Thomas Jones	5921 Puffin Ct.	Thomas Jones	Feb 16/03
Jackie Grant	5920 Puffin Ct.	J. Grant	Feb. 16/03
Janice NORMAN	12031 NO 2 ROAD.	J. Norman	FEB 16/03
JACKY LOUNG	12031 NO 2 ROAD	J. Loung	FEB 16/03
Tom Corkan	5831 Moncton St.	T. Corkan	Feb 16/03
RON MCBRYAN	11620 #2 ROAD	Ron Mc Bryan	FEB 16/03
SHERRY MCBRYAN	11620 #2 ROAD	Sherry Mc Bryan	Feb 16/03
FRLEDA SCALES	11620 #2 ROAD	Frieda Scales	Feb 16/03
RICHARD FOSTER	11731 No. 2 ROAD.	Richard Foster	Feb. 16/03.
NINA FOSTER	4731 No. 2 Rd	N. Foster	Feb. 16/03
AUDREY MCWHIRTER	11711 NO. 2 RD	A. McWhirter	Feb 16/03
BRIAN MCWHIRTER	11711 NO. 2 RD.	B. McWhirter	Feb 16/03
PAULIP ATOUI	11531 No. 2 Rd		FEB 16/03
Grace Nakhleh	11471 #2 Rd	Grace Nakhleh	Feb 16/03
Bill WIDDESS	5871 EGRET COURT	B. Widders	FEB. 16/03
Susan Robertson	5920 Egret CRT	Susan Robertson	Feb 16/03
LAUREL STEWART	11440 TRUMPETER DR	L. Stewart	Feb 16/03
Diana Schwab	11431 No. 2 Road	Diana Schwab	Feb. 16/03

PETITION

TO THE CITY OF RICHMOND PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL
 WE THE UNDERSIGNED RESIDENTS ARE *OPPOSED* TO THE PROPOSED
 REZONING APPLICATION FOR 11851 No. 2 ROAD (RZ 02-219330)
 AND /OR
 THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LANE ESTABLISHMENT POLICY

<u>PRINT NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>SIGNATURE</u>	<u>DATE</u>
RE. SCHWAB	11431 #2 Rd		Feb 16/03
Heather Aftergood	11411 #2 Rd		Feb 16/03
ELAINE BONIN	5911 EGRET COURT		Feb 16/03
HUBERT S. BONIN	5911 EGRET COURT		FEB 16/03
Seigo Sakamoto	5911 Puffin Court		Feb. 16/03
King Yee Chow	5911 Puffin Court		Feb 16/03
KAI HSU	11271 NO. 2 ROAD.		FEB. 16/03
Kirk Waechter	1111 No. 2 Road.		Feb 16/03
Mana Leung	11091 NO. 2 ROAD		16 Feb 03
BILL & GAYLE HORIE	5960 CORMORANT CRT		FEB. 16/03
H&L RAE	5940 CORMORANT CT.		"
LYN ter BORG	5860 Sandpiper Court		Feb 16/03
RICHARD ter BORG	5860 Sandpiper Court		Feb 16/03
AUSTIN COOPER	11051 N°2 ROAD		FEB 16/03
Martin Woolford	5951 Egret Court		FEB 16/03
Aileen Campbell	5940 Egret Ct		FEB 17/03
Dorothy Whitehead	5960 Egret Ct.		Feb 17/03
C. J. Dunlop	5940 Goldeneye Pl.		Feb 17/03
MARILYN KICCIWIN	11331 Pelican Ct.		Feb 17/03
B. DRISSI BOUZAIOL	11871 #2 Rd - Richmond		Feb 17/03
K. DAWYDIAK	11580 #2 RD RICHMOND		Feb. 17/03

PETITION

TO THE CITY OF RICHMOND PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE RICHMOND CITY
COUNCIL
WE THE UNDERSIGNED RESIDENTS ARE OPPOSED TO THE PROPOSED REZONING
APPLICATION FOR 11851 No. 2 ROAD (RZ02-219330)
AND/OR
THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LANE ESTABLISHMENT POLICY

Print Name	Address	Signature	Date
DARREN HOFF	11451 Pintail Dr.	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 16/03
LAURA HOFF	11451 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 16/03
ED GROCHOWSKI	11471 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 16/03
CHRISTA GROCHOWSKI	11471 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	FEB 15/03
B. J DEVITO	11441 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	FEB 15/03
Matt Dickinson	11540 Pintail Dr.	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 16/03
PAUL HANNA	11551 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	FEB 16/03
MONICA HANNA	11551 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 16/03
Linda Wong	11560 Pintail Dr.	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb. 15/03
Karen Tam	11440 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	FEB. 16. 2003
Raymond King	11991 No 2 Rd	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 16/03
Paul B. Meyer	5971 Kittiwake Dr. P. Meyer	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb. 16. 03
Lynda Meyer	5971 Kittiwake Dr. Meyer	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb. 16. 03
HIROSHI NOGAMI	5951 KITTIWAKE DR. H. N.	<i>[Signature]</i>	-- " --
HARVEY NOGAMI	5951 KITTIWAKE DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	FEB 16, 2003
Shelia Lyon	5931 KITTIWAKE	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 16/2003
Toshiaki Hanada	11431 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 16/2003
JANET WHITE	11480 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb. 16, 2003
PETER WHITE	11480 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	FEB 16, 2003
Kari Dickinson	11540 Pintail Dr	<i>[Signature]</i>	Feb 14, 2003
John Chy	11560 PINTAIL DR	<i>[Signature]</i>	FEB. 16, 2003

PETITION

TO THE CITY OF RICHMOND PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL
 WE THE UNDERSIGNED RESIDENTS ARE **OPPOSED** TO THE PROPOSED
REZONING APPLICATION FOR 11851 No. 2 ROAD (RZ 02-219330)
 AND/OR
THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LANE ESTABLISHMENT POLICY

<u>PRINT NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>SIGNATURE</u>	<u>DATE</u>
B. PHILLIPS	11580 PINTAIL DR.	B. Phillips	Feb 16/03
L. Nishi	11960 Pintail Dr.	L. Nishi	Feb 16/03
S. Takasaki	11580 Pintail Dr.	S. TAKASAKI	"
ALLEN HALL	11860 PINTAIL DR.	Allen Hall	"
BRUCE ROBINSON	11840 PINTAIL DRIVE, 2ND.	Bruce Robinson	"
Michelle Jackson	11720 Pintail Dr.	Michelle Jackson	"
Bob Jackson	11720 Pintail Dr.	Bob Jackson	"
TED DALEY	11680 PINTAIL DR.	Ted Daley	"
CHERYL DUNHAM	11511 Pintail Dr.	Cheryl Dunham	"
ANDREW DUNHAM	11511 PINTAIL DRIVE	Andrew Dunham	2/16/03
Kathi Colak	11600 Pintail Drive	Kathi Colak	Feb 17/03
Zena Liu	11440 Pintail Drive	Zena Liu	Feb. 17, 03
David Tam	11440 Pintail Drive	David Tam	Feb. 17, 03
DON ROY	12060 OSPREY DR.	Don Roy	Feb. 17/03
MARIE ROY	12060 OSPREY DR.	Marie Roy	17 Feb
Janis Woolford	5951 Egret Court	J. Woolford	Feb. 17/03

