



Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings

Monday, March 18, 2002

Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall
6911 No. 3 Road

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Councillor Lyn Greenhill
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves

David Weber, Acting City Clerk

Absent: Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt

Call to Order: Mayor Malcolm Brodie opened the proceedings at 7:07 p.m.

1. **ZONING AMENDMENT BYLAW 7325 (RZ 01-198983)**
(10091 Williams Road; Applicant: Chane Singh)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was present to answer any questions that may have come forth.

Written Submissions:

None.



Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings

Monday, March 18, 2002

Submissions from the floor:

Prior to submissions being heard from the floor staff were requested to provide clarification on how the two applications before Council would proceed due to the status of the four applications heard at the Public Hearing held on February 18, 2002.

Mr. George Smith, 10451 Ainsworth Crescent, referred to the minutes of the February 18, 2002 Public Hearing and said that item (iii) of the comments under his name should have said "two feet below development grade after new infrastructure goes in" and not two feet below lane grade. Mr. Smith also referred to the last paragraph on page two of the staff report and said that he thought that the applicable Lot Size Policy should be Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5433. A cap to a sanitary sewer outlet in the lane was reported to be missing.

Mr. Smith also expressed the following concerns, i) the site remediation and/or mitigation referred to in the report would only affect the immediate site and would not deal with the infrastructure deficiencies; ii) due to the problems identified within the infrastructure it would not be unfeasible for development to wait for the completion of the sanitary and storm water reports. Mr. Smith believed that developers would benefit from waiting for improvements and would not incur future problems as a result of the current deficiencies in the system; iii) that any Development Cost Charges collected would go to General Revenue and not specifically benefit the infrastructure deficiencies; and, iv) whether a risk would be incurred by the City if development was to proceed under the present circumstances.

Mr. Smith concluded his comments by requesting that Council reject the application. Mr. Smith said that he was not opposed to the subdivision philosophy but was concerned about the possible effects the proposed development would have on the existing infrastructure and ultimately on the residents of the area.



Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings

Monday, March 18, 2002

In response to a question from the Mayor, the Acting City Clerk, David Weber, provided information on the options open to Council for dealing with this matter. In response to a question from Cllr. Howard, the Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, said that it was the Engineering Department's opinion that the existing infrastructure could accommodate the seven applications currently in process.

Ms. Sandy Hanawalt, 10651 Dennis Crescent, said she has owned her home for twenty four years. Ms. Hanawalt was in favour of new development as she felt that new development, i.e. affordable new housing, would revitalize an area currently going downhill due to the number of rental houses. Ms. Hanawalt requested that the new development occur on Williams Road and No. 4 Road before Shell Road. The drainage problems of the home next door to Ms. Hanawalt, subsequent to the development of the lot adjacent to her neighbour, were mentioned. Ms. Hanawalt also expressed concern about the erosion that occurs in the unpaved alleyways and the effect that the increased number of accesses would have on this. A copy of a letter sent by Mr. and Mrs. Hanawalt to Jenny Beran, Planner, was provided and is attached as Schedule 1.

Ms. Jennifer Rule, 10080 Albion Road, said she was concerned about the drainage issues and traffic safety, ie. the lack of posted speed limits or other signage in the alley ways.

Mr. Archie Roberts, 10695 Aintree Place, said that he was not against the rezoning but that, in addition to his previous experiences with the present infrastructure not being capable of handling peak storm water volumes, he had now had his first encounter with the sanitary sewer system overflowing (into the lane).

Mr. Albert Drinovz, 11340 Seaton Road, said that he was not opposed to the rezoning requests but rather was reiterating the problems with the storm and sanitary sewer infrastructure with the note that nine days out of ten the catch basins are full. Mr. Drinovz said that it was possible that thirty-two new homes could result from the current rezoning applications on Williams Road alone. He also said that some existing homes are 2.5 to 3 feet below street



Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings

Monday, March 18, 2002

grade and would have to be raised for new development. A pump station located behind Mr. Drinovz's property was reported to be working overtime and that a bad smell was noticeable. In addition to the current burden on traffic and sewer systems, Mr. Drinovz questioned whether the schools in the area could accommodate the proposed new development.

Mr. Archie Roberts, speaking for the second time, said that he preferred the low maintenance lanes as the potholes slowed down the traffic in the lanes.

PH03-01

It was moved and seconded

That Zoning Amendment Bylaw 7325 be tabled and brought back to a future public hearing pending the results of the Planning Committee deliberation of all seven applications.

CARRIED

2. ZONING AMENDMENT BYLAW 7326 (RZ 02-199174)
(11271 Williams Road; Applicant: Joe Uppal)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was present to answer any questions that may have come forth.

A discussion then ensued on the appropriateness of proceeding with the public hearing on Zoning Amendment Bylaw 7326 in light of the action undertaken on Zoning Amendment Bylaw 7325. As a result of the discussion:

PH03-02

It was moved and seconded

That Zoning Amendment Bylaw 7326 be tabled and brought back to a future public hearing pending the results of the Planning Committee deliberation of all seven applications.

CARRIED



Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings

Monday, March 18, 2002

3. **ZONING AMENDMENT BYLAW 7327 (RZ 01-198010)**
(10631 Bridgeport Road; Applicant: AFCO Construction Ltd.)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was present to answer any questions that may have come forth.

Written Submissions:

Mr. Brian Cray, 10651 Bridgeport Road – Schedule 2.

Submissions from the floor:

None.

PH03-03

It was moved and seconded

That Zoning Amendment Bylaw 7327 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (7:50 p.m.).

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the
Minutes of the Regular Meeting for Public
Hearings of the City of Richmond held on
Monday, March 18, 2002.

Mayor (Malcolm D. Brodie)

Acting City Clerk (David Weber)

February 23, 2002

Jenny Beran, MCIP
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC
V6Y 2C1

SCHEDULE 1 TO THE MINUTES OF
THE REGULAR MEETING FOR PUBLIC
HEARINGS HELD ON MONDAY,
MARCH 18, 2002.

Ms. Beran:

As residents near the proposed change to the size policy 5443 on Williams Road and Shell Road, we have some concerns about this proposal.

Since the addition of Ironwood and Coppersmith Plaza, the traffic problems around our area have increased dramatically. The area of particular concern is Shell Road as it has already become a thoroughfare from Williams to Steveston Highway. The increased traffic and unsafe speeds have caused concerns to parents who have children attending Thomas Kidd Elementary School. Shell Road is not a main road as it is only 2 lanes and narrow and cannot handle increased traffic. We would prefer you try this new plan on more major roads like Williams first, and then evaluate how it is progressing before expanding to a secondary road like Shell Road.

Also, it is my understanding that houses on Williams Road will be encouraged to use the alleyways to enter their homes. If this were true, I would hope there would be plans to improve the alleyways. The stone/oil/improvements the city does currently once a year does little to help keep the alleyways functioning well. They get deep ruts from rain and are often in poor condition. They need to be paved to support the increased use and traffic and have proper drainage installed. I think there needs to be a fee attached to the granting of the rezoning so that the developer who is subdividing those lots contributes to the cost of improving the alleyways so that it is not passed on to the taxpayers.

We are also concerned about the drainage problems we have experienced due to the influx of building in our area over the last 5 years. It appears to be a problem caused by the new homes being built higher and not being required to install proper drainage at the property lines where the water accumulation goes to the neighboring lots. It would help a great deal if with the new zoning you could require better drainage systems as part of the re-zoning process.

We realize the council and mayor want to encourage building in Richmond, but it looks like from the number of lots that want to be re-zoned, that someone is certain they can make a good deal of money from this rezoning and subdividing. It is only fair that the city and local homeowners gain some benefit from their profits.

Kirby and Sandy Hanawalt
10651 Dennis Crescent
Richmond, BC V7A 3R6
604-271-5476

SCHEDULE 2 TO THE MINUTES OF
THE REGULAR MEETING FOR PUBLIC
HEARINGS HELD ON MONDAY,
MARCH 18, 2002.

To Public Hearing	
Date:	March 18, 2002
Item #	3
Re:	Bylaw 7327
	RZ 01-198010

10651 Bridgeport Rd.
Richmond, B.C.
V6X 1T1

March 10, 2002

		INT
	JRM	
✓	DW	DW
	KY	
	AS	
	DB	
	WB	

Mr. J. Richard Mckenna
City Clerk
City of Richmond

8060-20-7327

Dear Mr. Mckenna:

I am writing to you in regards to Zoning Amendment Bylaw 7327(RZ 01-198010).

I talked to Mr. Rob Innes in January of this year when the zoning sign was posted on the said property and he was very helpful in giving me some background and sending to me the appropriate bylaw in the mail. He also assured me there would be a public hearing in the future.

Imagine my surprise with your notice that gave me approx. 10 days notice of a public hearing during spring break when many people vacation with their families. As it happens I have had a vacation booked for this time period since Dec 01 and will be out of town during this short notice public hearing.

I was of an open mind concerning this rezoning and more interested in how it will affect my property but with the moves by the City of Richmond in regards to the process, I want to be on record as to opposing this application and will certainly appear before council during the final bylaw reading to tell them so. I feel this is my only option.

I am deeply disappointed in how my local government runs its affairs.

Sincerely yours,

Brian Cray
Brian Cray

