

## Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, April 4, 2000

Place: W.H. Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Malcolm Brodie, Chair  
Councillor Bill McNulty, Vice-Chair  
Councillor Lyn Greenhill  
Councillor Harold Steves

Absent: Councillor Linda Barnes

Also Present: Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt (4:45 p.m.)

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

It was moved and seconded

***That the agenda be varied to deal with Delegation – Mr. John White as Item No. 6.***

**CARRIED**

1. **MINUTES**

It was moved and seconded

***That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday, March 21st, 2000 be adopted as circulated.***

**CARRIED**

2. **NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE**

The next committee meeting will take place on **Tuesday, April 18th, 2000** at 4:00 p.m. in the W. H. Anderson Room.

**URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**

3. **APPLICATION BY DARSHAN RANGI FOR NON-FARM USE AT 6120 NO. 5 ROAD.**

(Report: Mar. 6/00; File: AG 00-084495; REDMS: 138367)

This item has been postponed until the meeting of April 18, 2000.

4. **BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION FEES – REQUEST FOR DEFERMENT  
AH-TEN HOLDINGS LTD. – 6300 AND 6388 ALDER STREET**

(Report: Mar. 24/00; File: 8360-01; REDMS: 141827, 135104, 102665)

A. L. Bortolussi, Manager, Building Approvals Department, reviewed the staff report. He briefly highlighted the events leading up to the above request for deferment. He then explained the intent of the permit and the bylaw. He clarified that the applicant was seeking deferment of building permit fees and that City staff had notified the applicant of the process. Mr. Bortolussi stated that due to the current economy, the applicant was reluctant to proceed with building the final three phases of the proposed project. He further stated that, should the application be cancelled, the applicant would have to comply with the new Provincial Homeowner Protection Act regulations as well as changes in the School Board regulations. Referencing the financial perspectives (see Appendix D in the staff report), Mr. Bortolussi noted that, if forfeited, the financial impact for the applicant would be the plans processing fees. If the applicant pays the full fees and the construction of the project does not commence, then the applicant may be eligible for refunds or credits for the building permits, DCCs, as well as fees for site servicing, and engineering services. Mr. Bortolussi stated that the bylaw was specific in that once the applicant is notified that the permits are ready for issuance, the fees must be paid within 30 days. It was noted that the ability to make a change to the bylaw to make this request applicable for the applicant was not an option in this case as the benefit would only apply to applications received after amendment occurs.

In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Bortolussi explained the composition of the plan processing fee and advised that the applicant had chosen this method of making his application to utilize the regulations at that time. He clarified what had been charged by the City to date. Mr. Bortolussi drew attention to the fact that if this project is permitted deferment, it would set a precedent for future requests from other applicants.

David McLellan, General Manager, Urban Development, advised that revenue generated by the Building Department offsets expenditures, and expressed concern regarding the possibility of setting a precedent.

Thomas Meyer, Project Manager, of Cressey Development Corporation, 1200 – 1066 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, was present to address the Committee. He advised that they were aware of the bylaw and confirmed that they had chosen to apply for all the building permits to lessen impact of the new Provincial Homeowner Protection Act. He stated that they fully intended to continue with the project at a slower pace, to prevent stockpiling of unsold inventory. Hence the idea to request for a deferment to get an economic break during this time of a slow growth economy.

The Chair expressed concern regarding the possible legal implications of the proposed deferment. He questioned the advisability of taking out permits in phases and suggested that the issue of the bylaw be reviewed. Discussion ensued on the issue of setting a precedent by allowing deferment of building permit application fees and the possible cost to the City.

It was moved and seconded

***That the request by Ah-Ten Holdings Limited to defer the forfeiting of the plans processing fees and cancellation of building permit application for phases 2, 3 and 4 of the townhouse project proposed for 6300 and 6388 Alder Street be denied.***

**CARRIED**

5. **SOIL CONSERVATION ACT  
HOUSEKEEPING REGARDING ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS APPOINTED  
DUTIES AND OTHER ACT REQUIREMENTS**

(Report: Mar. 9/00; File: 0172-03; REDMS: 141201)

Sandra Tokarczyk, Manager, Property Use & Administration, briefly reviewed the staff report. She advised that the proposed appointments would expedite the permit response time by one month and recounted this process for the Committee. She noted that the requested recommendations address issues of length of time for processing and deleterious materials noted in the Agricultural Viability Report recently reviewed by the Committee.

It was moved and seconded

1. ***That Resolution No. R95/3-7 adopted on February 13, 1995 be amended to read as follows:***

***“That Bob Lang, Supervisor – Property Use Inspections, be appointed as the local enforcement officer to administer and enforce soil regulations, subject to the directions of the local authority (i.e. Council), pursuant to Section 8(1) of the Soil Conservation Act.”***

2. ***That Mrs. Sandra Tokarczyk, Manager – Property Use and Administration Department, be appointed as the alternative local enforcement officer to administer and enforce soil regulations subject to the directions of the local authority (i.e. Council) pursuant to Section 8(1) of the Soil Conservation Act.***
3. ***That the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission be advised of these appointment changes.***

**CARRIED**

**DELEGATION**

6. **LONDON PRINCESS AREA/COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT  
(CD/50)**

(Correspondence: Apr. 3/00; File: 4040-01; REDMS: 145686)

Mr. John White was in attendance to make a presentation to the Committee. He distributed copies of a map of his property as well as the neighbouring properties along Dyke Road and adjacent to London Farm, as well as a rendering of a residential dwelling proposed for lot 4 (a copy of which is on file in the City Clerk's Office). Mr. White referred to his previously submitted correspondence which referenced the previous initiative to develop the C/D50 bylaw which regulates zoning at the above property. He reviewed the conditions and the

intent of the bylaw and expressed concern that this bylaw had not been mentioned in the Official Community Plan (OCP). He then queried why single family residences had not been promoted in the "Heritage Residential" designated area along Dyke Road. He stated that much work had been done by individuals restoring heritage single family homes which was not being recognized or supported by the OCP.

David McLellan, General Manager, Urban Development, advised that staff had worked with residents in formulating the CD/50 bylaw to accommodate several heritage style homes. He referred to the City's inability to control design of single family homes and referenced the use of Development Permits and design guidelines for multiple family developments. Mr. McLellan noted the possibility of use of a "Heritage District" under the Municipal Act to regulate activity within the area designated "Heritage Residential" and also noted that more research was required.

Terry Crowe, Manager, Land Use, recalled preparation of the London/Princess Area Plan and noted that the intent was to permit townhouses and single family homes in the area designated Heritage Residential.

It was moved and seconded

***That staff review criteria applicable to a "Heritage District" and its appropriateness for the London/Princess area.***

**CARRIED**

7. **A. R. MACNEILL SECONDARY SCHOOL REZONING**

(Memo: Mar. 29/00; File: RZ 98-147632; 8060-20-7050; REDMS: 145014, 128060, 117,178, 128044)

The following representatives of School District No. 38 were in attendance:

Sandra Bourque, Ken Morris, Garry McLean, Chris Evans, Chris Kelly, Gerry Retalick, et al.

Suzanne Carter-Huffman, Senior Planner/Urban Design reviewed the background history of this project with the use of various site plans and explained the intent of the Official Community Plan for the McLennan North Sub-Area. She then referred to the Options, indicating the positive and negative elements for each. She further referred to the location of properties, proposed roadways, and access points for each Option.

In response to a query from the Chair, Ms. Carter-Huffman explained that the City favoured establishment of the "park drive" as a public road (e.g. dedicated and constructed to City standards) to ensure 24-hour public access and good access to the school, "openness" along 50% of the perimeter of the school site (thus, providing the visibility necessary to deter vandalism which typically occurs in areas out of view of a public road), and the ability of the City to determine the appropriate form of adjacent development and method of access (e.g. to further reinforce the publicness of the road and "eyes on the street/school"). She then clarified the process of roadway development and noted that due to the grade difference between the School District property and the adjacent residential properties, the "park drive" road right of way would not be as efficient as it could be (e.g. it would be somewhat wider). Staff have not, however, made a final decision with regard to minimum right of way width. An explanation of the use of

a latecomer type of agreement, both with and without a termination date was presented and discussion followed.

There was a general consensus that discussion on the school should continue.

#### **MANAGER'S REPORT**

David McLellan, General Manager, Urban Development, drew attention to the question of scheduling the Planning Committee meeting of May 15, 2000. After some discussion, it was felt that this issue should be re-addressed at the Planning Committee meeting of April 18, 2000.

Joe Erceg, Manager, Development Applications, advised that a public information meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 11<sup>th</sup> to review the Cape Development Corporation rezoning located at the intersection of Bridgeport Road and No. 4 Road.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

***That the meeting adjourn (4:56 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, April 4, 2000.

---

Councillor Malcolm Brodie  
(Chair)

---

Susan Kopeschny  
(Administrative Assistant)