

Planning Committee

Date: April 18th, 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.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday, April 4^h, 2000, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on Tuesday, **May 2nd, 2000** at 4:00 p.m. in the W. H. Anderson Room.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **APPLICATION BY CAPE DEVELOPMENT CORP. TO REZONE PROPERTIES AT 9611, 9631, 9711, 9751, 9771 BRIDGEPORT ROAD, 9540, 9560 BECKWITH ROAD AND 2691, 2711, 2731, 2751, 2771 NO. 4 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1/F AND R1/D) AND ROADSIDE STAND (CLASS C) DISTRICT (RSC) TO AUTOMOBILE-ORIENTED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C6).**

(RZ 99-171337 - Report: Mar. 6/00; File: 8060-20-7116/7117; REDMS 140238)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reviewed the report with Committee members, during which he advised that as a result of the Public Information Meeting, a number of changes were made to the proposed project, and to the configuration of Beckwith Road.

These changes, which are as follows, were then explained to Committee members by Development Coordinator, Holger Burke.

- the proposal to extend Beckwith Road through to No. 4 Road has been eliminated from the proposed plans
- the drive area around the perimeter of the building at the northern and eastern property lines has been replaced with a wider landscaping strip, the northern loading bay (which has been moved slightly west) will remain
- the municipal road within the project will be developed in 2 phases: the access road would be constructed to the middle of the development, and would not continue north until the property to the north is developed at which time the road would continue north to Beckwith Road.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the matter of providing driveway access to Beckwith Road, during which the suggestion was made that rather than allowing through access, that only emergency vehicle access be permitted, until such time as property to the north was developed in the future. Also addressed was the feasibility of extending Beckwith Road to No. 4 Road now or in the future, and information was provided by Mr. Burke that in order to extend Beckwith Road approval would be required from BC Hydro for a Public Right Of Passage through their easement. He also noted that the property owners to the north have indicated that they were concerned about the extension of Beckwith Road through or adjacent to their properties. The General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan, expressed concern about the mixing of traffic by extending Beckwith Road to No. 4 Road, and he suggested that an alternate of providing a truck route for traffic from River Drive would be a north/south route rather than an east/west route. In response to further questions, advice was given that staff were of the view that Beckwith Road would only be considered for extension when and if the property to the north was developed. As a result, the request was made that the staff report be amended to delete any reference to the fact that Beckwith Road would not be developed, now or in the future.

Mr. Patrick Cotter, of Dikeakos & Cotter Architects, representing the applicant, spoke about the proposed project, noting that it complied with the requirements of the City's Official Community Plan and Development Permit Guidelines. He then reviewed in detail, the changes made to the proposal as a result of the Public Information Meeting, which included (i) the provision of north/south and east/west access to adjacent properties in the form of a right of access, and (ii) an increase in property screening and the loading bays relocated to be sensitive to the concerns of the adjacent neighbours. Mr. Cotter urged the Committee, because of the changes which had been made, to forward the application to a Public Hearing.

In response to questions about the elimination of vehicle access to Beckwith Road, he indicated that he would be prepared to undertake such action, even though he felt that this access was required to provide adequate traffic circulation throughout the development.

Ms. Vera Savkovic-Smart, of 2351 No. 4 Road, thanked the developer for the changes, however, she questioned the Committee on its views with regard to the decision not to extend Beckwith Road. In response, advice was given that extension of that part of the road would not occur until the future redevelopment of the area, if and when that was to

occur. She also asked if an arborist had examined all the trees on the property, or only the oak tree. Advice was given that an arborist's report would be reviewed at the Development Permit stage. The developer also confirmed that an arborist had been engaged to examine all the trees on the subject property and that the recommendations of the arborist would be followed, which was to retain all trees of value. Ms. Savkovic-Smart urged the Committee to delay a decision on the proposal to allow the opportunity to inform the School Board about the proposed development. A brief discussion ensued on this suggestion, during which it was advised that City staff did not normally advise the School Board of development applications which were received, however, it was noted that the School Board was consulted during the preparation of Official Community Area Plans.

Brian Lasko, of Oxford Properties, reported on the leasing arrangements which had been made to date for the site.

Barry Walsh, of 9520 Beckwith Road, expressed his total opposition to the proposed development, and indicated that he would like to see a larger project constructed which would encompass the entire area. He also voiced his opposition to the proposal to provide an access from the site to Beckwith Road because of the amount of traffic which would use this access to enter the development. Mr. Walsh noted that the proposed loading bay would be located directly adjacent to his home, and could be a detriment to the properties located on the north side of the development. He expressed concern that as a result, property values would decrease even more.

Mr. Walsh also expressed concern that the owner of the properties being leased to the developer had never been required to connect the dwellings to the sanitary sewer system, even though area residents had been given a maximum of 2 years to connect.

Ms. Popazivanov, of 9531 Beckwith Road, advised that the proposed access and loading bays would be located directly in front of her home and she expressed concern about the impact which the noise generated by truck traffic using the loading bays, would have on her life and that of her husband. In response to questions, she indicated that the elimination of Beckwith Road as an access to the development would help, but she was still concerned about the noise from the loading bays.

Mr. Harold Bath, of 9571 Beckwith Road, supported the elimination of Beckwith Road as an access to the proposed development, as he felt that any increase in traffic would be a disruption to the neighbourhood. He also requested the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Gage Road and Bridgeport Road, however, he was advised that the Ministry of Transportation & Highways (responsible for Bridgeport Road) did not agree that such an installation was warranted. Mr. Bath questioned whether an environmental impact study had been completed on the wildlife in the area, and advice was given that the subject property had not been identified as being in an Environmentally Sensitive Area. In conclusion, Mr. Bath indicated that he would be looking at the wall of the rear of the warehouse and the loading bays for that building.

Mr. Simon Langley, of 9391 Beckwith Road, voiced support for the proposal and the retention of the access road to Beckwith Road. He stated that the project would be an improvement to an area which has been deteriorating for a number of years. In response to questions, he stated that elimination of the access to Beckwith Road would make it difficult for residents to walk to the complex, and suggested that truck traffic would not be an issue.

Mr. Lorne Chernochan, a real estate agent representing the owners of 9460 and 9480 Beckwith Road, and 9491 Bridgeport Road, questioned whether the Committee was considering the long term development potential of the area. He spoke about possible development options for the area and the conditions of approving the proposed development. Mr. Chernochan noted that Mr. Walsh had indicated that if he received sufficient value for his property, he would be prepared to move, as his was the only property between the subject property and the next 4 properties which could be viable for development.

Mr. Chernochan also spoke about the impact which the closure of Beckwith Road could have on future development of the area, and about the wishes of area residents on the future of their respective properties. In response to questions, Mr. Chernochan advised that his clients would support anything which would help to move development down the road. He referred to the provision of access to Beckwith Road and suggested that a good alternative would be to allow emergency vehicle access only.

Mr. Bill Wright, proponent of Cape Development Corporation, provided background information on his company, reviewed the history of the development application, and spoke about the potential for future development of the northerly properties, if this application was approved.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That Bylaw No. 7116, to redesignate that area shown on Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw 7116, from "Neighbourhood Residential" to "Mixed Use" (in Attachment 1 to Schedule 1 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100), be introduced and given first reading.***
- (2) ***That Bylaw No. 7116, having been examined in conjunction with the Capital Expenditure Program, the Waste Management Plan, and the Economic Strategy Plan, is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3) of the Municipal Act.***
- (3) ***That Bylaw No. 7116, having been examined in accordance with the City Policy No. 5002 on referral of Official Community Plan Amendments, is hereby deemed to have no effect upon an adjoining Municipality nor function or area of the Greater Vancouver Regional District, in accordance with Section 883(3)(d) and (e) of the Municipal Act.***
- (4) ***That Bylaw No. 7117, for the rezoning of that area shown cross-hatched on Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw No.7117, from Single-Family Housing District (R1/D), Single-Family Housing District (R1/F) and Roadside Stand (Class C) District (RSC) to Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6), be introduced and given first reading.***

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on the proposal of the applicant to provide access from Beckwith Road to the development, preferably as an emergency access only until such time as there was a need for a proper road at some time in the future. In response to questions about how this provision could be accommodated, staff advised that the requirement for such an access to Beckwith Road could be addressed through the provision of modified plans at the Public Hearing, which would then be reflected in the Development Permit application. As a result of the discussion, the following **amendment** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the access to Beckwith Road from the proposed development, be in the form of an emergency access only for the near future.

The question on the motion was not called, as it was noted that only 4 of the residents in the area had expressed both opposition and approval of the proposed access, and therefore, any action on this issue should be delayed until the Public Hearing.

As a result, the above resolution was **WITHDRAWN**.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the order of the agenda be varied to deal with Item No. 9 at this time.

CARRIED

9. **SEWAGE HOLDING TANKS**

(Report: Mar. 30/00; File: 6400-06-01; REDMS 136288, 114336)

Mr. Erceg reviewed his report with Committee members. In response to questions, he provided the following information:

- a new policy would provide guidance about where sewage holding tanks could be located, while the bylaw would deal with the details of construction standards to be maintained, requirements for monitoring and cleaning of the tanks
- once the bylaw was adopted, approval and monitoring of the holding tanks would remain with the Vancouver-Richmond Health Board
- the request was being made because Health Board staff were concerned about the issue of liability if they approved a holding tank without the appropriate bylaw being in place
- there were currently 9 holding tanks in existence, however, there were a number of developments currently proceeding through the development process which would also require the installation of sewage holding tanks.

It was moved and seconded

That staff bring forward a new bylaw and revised policy to provide for the regulation of sewage holding tanks to Council as soon as possible.

CARRIED

4. **APPLICATION BY CANADA SHIN YAT TONG MORAL SOCIETY FOR REZONING AT 10300 NO.5 ROAD FROM AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT (AG1) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/110)**

(RZ 99-170129 - Report: Mar. 30/00; File: 8060-20-7078; REDMS 145422, 129572)

Mr. Erceg reviewed the staff report with the Committee.

During the discussion which ensued among Committee members and staff, concerns were expressed about the variances which the applicant was seeking with respect to parking and setback requirements. Concern was expressed about the increasing number of development applications being considered by Council which sought variances to provide less than the required number of parking spaces, and the suggestion was made that staff should be reviewing parking ratios for the entire City.

In response to questions about whether the number of parking spaces to be provided were sufficient, advice was given that the traffic consultants for the project had reviewed 3 similar meeting halls and had found that the amount of parking provided at each of these three halls was less than was being proposed for the subject property. Further advice was given that the use of the proposed meeting hall would be by invitation only to the members of the Society. As well, Committee members were advised that the applicant was aware that 'spill over' parking would not be permitted on No. 5 Road, and in the event of a special event being held, the applicant intended to co-operate with the City's Transportation section to ensure that a plan was in place prior to an event taking place to deal with the overflow of vehicles.

Reference was made to a similar application which had been approved a number of years ago, and which had resulted in farmland being used to provide overflow parking for the facility in question. The comment was made that the present applicant may not require many parking spaces, however, this could change in the future.

Reference was made by staff to the suggestion that a review be initiated of parking requirements, and advice was given that staff had already commenced a review of the City's "Assembly District" parking requirements because another application for a church which required variances to these requirements was presently being reviewed by staff. The comment was made however that parking requirements for every zoning district in the City should be reviewed.

Mr. Michael Apostolides of Tielker Sim & Associates, reviewed the history of the application. With reference to the concerns expressed about whether there would be sufficient on-site parking available, he advised that the Society had a limited membership of 100 people, and did not intend to hold large-scale events which would attract more than 100 people. Mr. Apostolides further indicated that if the membership increased beyond 100 persons, the Society would establish a new meeting hall at another location. He advised in response to further questions, that the issue of the lack of bus transportation to the subject property had been addressed not only by the City's Transportation section during its review of the project, but also by the traffic consultant engaged by the applicant. Reference was made to the traffic consultant's report, and the request was made that Council be provided with a copy of this report prior to the Public Hearing.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7078, for the rezoning of 10300 No. 5 Road from "Agricultural District (AG1)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/110)", be introduced and given first reading.

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion continued among Committee members about the variances being requested by the applicant, and to the lack of sufficient on-site parking for the project, both now and in the future.

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

OPPOSED: Cllr. Brodie
McNulty
Greenhill
Steves
Barnes

It was moved and seconded

That the application by Canada Shin Yat Tong Moral Society for the rezoning of 10300 No. 5 Road from "Agricultural District (AG1)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/110)" (Bylaw No. 7078), BE DENIED.

CARRIED

5. **COUNCIL REFERRAL – VEHICLE ACCESS OPTIONS FOR LONDON PRINCESS**

(Report: Apr. 5/00; File: 4045-20-04-WA; REDMS 145073, 145442)

Mr. Erceg briefly reviewed the history of the report with Committee members. Planner 2 David Brownlee then used site plans to explain the proposed traffic configuration to the Committee. Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on (i) the elimination of the internal private road from the original proposal, (ii) how much land would have been required to provide this road as compared to the perimeter road now being recommended, (iii) whether any part of the road construction costs could be attributed to the properties to the east, and (iv) residential encroachment adjacent to the Agricultural Land Reserve.

Amber Williamson, 6461 Dyke Road, expressed the wish that the emergency access road be provided at the foot of Princess Street rather than Princess Lane because of the problems which she experiences with youth congregating behind her property and motorists which use the lane to access the dyke. She provided information on a land exchange which the owners of London Lane were proposing which would result in (i) a pedestrian trail commencing at the foot of Princess Lane, and (ii) 'squaring' of Ms. Williamson's property. Ms. Williamson advised that if the land exchange was approved, then she would like to have the right-of-way redesignated to its original form as a utility right-of-way.

Considerable discussion then ensued among Committee members, staff and Ms. Williamson on her request, during which the ramifications of providing the emergency vehicle access at the foot of Princess Street were addressed. Advice was given that there would be an additional cost to provide an emergency access at the foot of Princess Street and that there was already a right-of-way at the east end of Princess Lane.

Mr. Leo Nicolaas, representing Ted and Maureen Hilton, noted that there was currently an industrial use on the property, and he provided information on the history of the business. Mr. Nicolaas referred to the proposed perimeter road and indicated that approval of this recommendation would mean that the property would not be redeveloped. He expressed concern that the proposed road would take at least 25% of the land and that the developer would be responsible for the entire cost of constructing this road. Mr. Nicolaas suggested that the cost of paying for the road reduced the selling price of the property, which made it uneconomical to relocate the existing business to another location.

Mr. Nicolaas also voiced concern that the mix of residential and industry which would result if the proposed perimeter road was approved, would be incompatible because of the noise generated by the heavy equipment of the existing industrial businesses in the area. He advised that approval of the perimeter road would simply mean that the owners of the existing business would make a long term commitment to remain on the property and improve their business. In closing, Mr. Nicolaas urged the Committee to approve the original design concept and to proceed in that manner, which was consistent with the Area Plan.

Mr. Dana Westermarck, of 13400 Princess Street, commented on the land exchange proposed by Ms. Williamson, the proposed construction of a fence along the boundary of Ms. Williamson's property, and the proposal that the foot of Princess Street be used to provide emergency vehicle access only. He referred to the proposed perimeter road and asked the Committee to reconsider the original proposal with the construction of a private internal road. Mr. Westermarck suggested that the financial burden of constructing the perimeter road was such that it would preclude redevelopment of the property, whereas a private road could be imposed on the developer and still meet the needs of the public.

In response to questions, he advised that a private road would enable the developer to make choices about the location of this road, the amount of setbacks which would be required to the edge of the road, etc., and in summary, allowed the developer to optimize the development of the property.

Mr. Andrew Rosen, of Polygon Properties, circulated material to Committee members of the layout of the proposed residential development for the subject property. A copy of this material is on file in the City Clerk's Office. He then provided information on the proposal, which was for 2 and 3 storey townhomes with a floor area ratio of 0.55. He expressed agreement with the previous speaker that the original proposal was acceptable.

A brief discussion ensued, during which concern was expressed about the fact that, based on the proposal put forward, a member of the public would not feel comfortable using the 'public' road through the development to access the dyke. The comment was made that the proposed plan had not been reviewed by staff and was not consistent with the discussions which had taken place about access for the area.

John White, 6341 Dyke Road, noted that the rationale for the provision of a public road was set out in the Official Community Area Plan, and stressed that this requirement should be met. He then commented on a number of statements made in the staff report, with respect to encouraging single-family and townhouse developments in the area, the possible incompatibility of some industrial businesses with the residential development; and staff responded to these issues. Advice was given that staff still felt that recommended Option 5 was workable as it would provide a smoother conversion of the area from industrial to residential use. Council's referral option is also workable but not likely in the near term.

Mr. White then spoke about the need to adhere to the heritage theme in the area, and expressed concern that no consideration had been given to the existing water courses on London Road and Princess Street. He also stated that structures should also reflect this theme. Mr. White stated that there was no indication given on the development plans with respect to future ground elevations, and he expressed concern that raised elevations could have a negative impact on the many trees which were located on his property.

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated April 5th, 2000, from the Manager, Development Applications), regarding Vehicle Access Options for London Princess, be received for information.

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

That the vehicle access option shown in Attachment 2 (to the report dated April 5th, 2000, from the Manager, Land Use), be selected for the London-Princess area.

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That the request made by Mrs. Amber Williamson regarding the exchange of land be referred to staff to enter into negotiations to consider the proposal to the City; and*

(2) *That staff investigate the issue of land and road elevations within the London/Princess area.*

Prior to the question being called, with respect to Part 1 of the recommendation, staff were directed to:

- (a) review the issue of ownership of the property in question,
- (b) endeavour to remove the house from the right-of-way.

The comment was also made that it was important to have the emergency access located as proposed in the option shown on Attachment 2.

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

6. **APPLICATION BY MR. BRUNO DEANGELIS FOR REZONING AT 7451 NO. 4 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)**

(RZ 99-161573 – Report: Mar. 27/00; File: 8060-20-7124; REDMS 141682, 143680)

Mr. Erceg reviewed the staff report with the Committee. In response to a question about designating a zone for the subject property (rear of 7451 No. 4 Road, he advised that following the completion of the road dedication, there would be insufficient property to comply with the requirements of “R1/F” zoning district. He added that staff were recommending that a restrictive covenant be placed on the property to ensure that the developer would be responsible for the construction of General Currie Road as well as the construction of the ‘ring road’ and lane.

The applicant, Bruno DeAngelis, questioned the necessity of requiring the dedication of a 20 foot lane allowance at the rear of the property, at this time. He suggested that it would be more convenient to subdivide the property without this requirement. In response to this concern, staff advised that the proposed dedication of the right-of-way for the ring road would provide flexibility in the future to assemble the lands located to the south of the subject property. Further advice was given that the construction of the lane would not have to proceed until such time as development of the backlands occurred - only the right-of-way would be dedicated at this time.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7124, for the rezoning of 7451 No. 4 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

7. **APPLICATION BY SUNCOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION FOR REZONING AT 4771 AND 4791 WILLIAMS ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) AND A PORTION OF 9711 GEAL ROAD FROM ASSEMBLY DISTRICT (ASY) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/114)**

(RZ 99-172844 – Report: Apr. 3/00; File: 8060-20-7127; REDMS 131453, 140153, 132097, 145528)

Mr. Erceg reviewed the staff report with the Committee. In response to a question about the provision of access from the Beth Tikvah Synagogue property to the townhouse complex to be located west of the St. Joseph the Worker Church, advice was given that this access had been deleted from the proposal as a result of concerns voiced at the Public Information Meeting held on this proposal.

Ms. Olga Ilich, of 6240 Danube Road, representing Suncor Development Corporation, introduced Mr. Morris Harowitz, Past President of the Beth Tikvah Synagogue. Mr. Harowitz then provided detailed information on the history of the Beth Tikvah Synagogue and the application now being considered by the Committee. He indicated that he was speaking in support of the proposed application.

Ms. Ilich, in response to questions about the concerns expressed at the Public Information Meeting, indicated that she would be happy to have the application proceed to a Public Hearing to determine the views of the entire neighbourhood.

Ms. Ilich referred to the proposed 3 storey height of the complex and noted that the development would only be slightly higher than the adjacent existing two-storey structures, the size of which was less noticeable because the properties were larger in size than the subject property. She further advised that the applicant had no objections to reducing the density of the proposal, however, the Synagogue would like to full value for their land because it had always intended to use the proceeds from the sale of the property to fund their programs.

Mr. Perry Staniscia, representing the Greater Vancouver Housing Corporation, spoke about the need for non-market housing, and of the concerns of the public that social housing meant 'low income households'. He then provided information on the changes which made been made in recent years with respect to the criteria for social housing from 'low-income' households to social housing with 'blended' incomes.

Mr. Staniscia spoke in support of the proposed development, noting that Richmond at 31% for rental households, was well below the Greater Vancouver Regional District average of 41%, and that of the 31% rental units, 41% of these renters contributed more than 30% of their income to rent and 20% paid more than 50% of their income to rent.

In concluding the presentation, Ms. Ilich advised that because of the current construction costs, the increase in the cost of acquiring property, and a decrease in the maximum unit numbers allowed by the GVHC, it would be uneconomical to construct a 2 storey development in today's market.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7127, for the rezoning of 4771 and 4791 Williams Road from Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) and a portion of 9711 Geal Road from Assembly District (ASY) to Comprehensive Development District (CD/114)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

9. **SEWAGE HOLDING TANKS**

(Report: Mar. 30/00; File: 6400-06-01; REDMS 136288, 114336)

See Page 5 of these minutes for action taken on this matter.

10. **FRASER RIVER PORT AUTHORITY – LAND USE PLAN (DRAFT)**

(Report: Apr. 7/00; File: 0140-20-FRHA1; REDMS 144922, 146372, 143534, 146212, 143520)

The Manager, Land Use, Terry Crowe, circulated to Committee members, a memorandum which provided the comments of the City's Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE). A copy of this material is on file in the City Clerk's Office. Mr. Crowe then reviewed the comments of ACE with the Committee and provided an explanation indicating that these comments were consistent with the concerns expressed by staff.

Mr. Brownlee briefly reviewed the proposed land use plan, during which he expressed disappointment that the plan did not provide a framework on how the Fraser River Port Authority intended to work with municipalities and other jurisdictions, or the public. He stated that this area should be strengthened in the land use plan. However, he stated that the FRPA should be commended for their first attempt.

A brief discussion ensued, during which concern was voiced that the proposed plan did not address the status of Steveston Island, and the comment was made that the FRAP Plan should be amended to designate Steveston Island as park. It was noted that Council had adopted a resolution several years ago requesting that the appropriate action be taken to designate Steveston Island as a park, however, no further action had been taken on this matter.

It was moved and seconded

That a letter be sent to the Fraser River Port Authority (FRPA) indicating the following:

That:

- (1) *The Fraser River Port Authority be congratulated on preparing their first Land Use Plan;*
- (2) *Council looks forward to strengthening partnership with the FRPA through the finalization of the draft plan and its subsequent implementation; and*
- (3) *Council's concerns, and those of the Advisory Committee on the Environment regarding the draft plan, (as identified in the report dated April 7th, 2000 Manager, Land Use, and in the memorandum dated April 17th, 2000, from the Advisory Committee on the Environment), be forwarded to the FRPA for their consideration and integration into the plan prior to its finalization.*

Prior to the question being called, staff were instructed in the correspondence to the Fraser River Port Authority, to emphasize the need for public input and working with municipalities and other jurisdictions on the development of their lands.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the Fraser River Port Authority be reminded of Council's interests and outstanding issues relating to the designation of Steveston Island as a park.

CARRIED

11. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

The General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan, reported that with respect to MacNeil School, there had been no substantial progress made to date on the receipt of comments for the revised scheme for the school.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

It was MOVED and SECONDED

That the meeting adjourn (7:35 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 18th, 2000

Councillor Malcolm Brodie
(Chair)

Fran J. Ashton
(Executive Assistant)