



Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, September 4th, 2002
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair
Councillor Lyn Greenhill, Vice-Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt
Absent: Councillor Harold Steves
Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m., and added to the agenda as an additional item, "Notice of Exclusion from the Agricultural Land Commission – 11120 No. 2 Road".

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Thursday, August 15th, 2002, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, **September 17th, 2002**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **APPLICATION BY AMAR SANDHU FOR REZONING AT 8411 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA K (R1/K)**
(RZ 02-203809 - Report: August 16/02, File No.: RZ 02-203809) (REDMS No. 833331, 833760)

Planner Jenny Beran was in attendance to respond to questions from Committee members on the proposed rezoning application.

Planning Committee

Wednesday, September 4th, 2002

Discussion ensued then among Committee members and staff, during which the following information was provided:

- the proposed construction would have to be shifted towards the front property line to accommodate the required 6 metre rear yard setback and the proposed 6 metre lane dedication across the north property line; the relocation of the construction southward towards Steveston Highway would still provide the required 6 metre front yard setback
- any funds deposited into a Neighbourhood Improvement Charge (NIC) account could not be set aside specifically for the development of the required lane in the future.

Mr. Patrick Cotter, architect for the project, circulated photographs of single lot subdivisions for which lane access had been required, and noted differences between these developments and the one proposed by his client. He stated that construction of the residences at the rear of the property was being proposed to provide better circulation of the shared driveway. Mr. Cotter further explained that his client was concerned that construction of the lane at this time could affect the marketability of the homes because of the resulting increase in cost. He stated that a right-of-way for the lane had been accommodated within the development plans and could be constructed in the future, however, construction of the lane at this time would prove to be a major hardship.

Mr. Cotter also spoke about a letter from the Urban Development Institute on file with the City about the City's Lane Policy, which indicated that UDI would only support the policy if exceptions to the policy could be made on a case-by-case basis. He stated that the new development in the surrounding area made it unlikely that there would be further redevelopment in the near future which would require immediate lane access, and therefore felt that an exception should be made to the Lane Policy requirements.

Mr. Cotter further stated that if the application for rezoning was denied, his client would construct a single family residence with access from Steveston Highway and there would be no dedication of property for the lane in the future. Mr. Cotter reiterated that his client was meeting the requirements of the City's lane policy but in a manner which would allow redevelopment to take place in a logical and realistic way.

In response to questions from the Chair, Mr. Cotter confirmed that his client was not prepared to build a lane at the present time, but instead was (i) providing a right-of-way over the property for a future lane, (ii) contributing funds to a NIC account; and (iii) placing a covenant on the property title to ensure that only one access was constructed from Steveston Highway.

Planning Committee

Wednesday, September 4th, 2002

During the discussion which ensued, questions were raised about whether approval could result in other similar applications coming forward. In response, Development Coordinator Holger Burke provided information on a rezoning application for which the owner was waiting for the outcome of this application as he would also be requesting permission to pay a Neighbourhood Improvement Charge. He also advised that:

- the City's Lane Policy did give Council the option of authorizing an exemption during the rezoning process; and
- the funds contributed as a Neighbourhood Improvement Charge would be based on current construction costs.

Mr. Amar Sandhu, the applicant for the project, confirmed in response to questions, that his original proposal had sought more density on the property, however, he was advised that the density proposed would be more suitable in the City's core area. He also advised that the adjacent property owner had not been interested in selling his property at the present time. Mr. Sandhu further advised that he did not want to contribute funds as part of a Neighbourhood Improvement Charge because he was already providing property for the lane right-of-way.

It was moved and seconded

That the rezoning of 8411 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K)" BE DENIED.

Prior to the question on the motion being called, Committee members commented on the City's Lane Policy and the fact that the criteria now made it easier to undertake smaller lot developments. Comments were also made about the proposed development and the reluctance of the applicant to comply with the requirements of the Lane Policy, during which it was noted that other developers had complied with these requirements. The Chair stated that he would support the rezoning application if the applicant constructed the lane now rather than in the future.

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

4. **APPLICATION BY G5 MANAGEMENT INC. FOR REZONING AT 8220 AND 8240 GARDEN CITY ROAD AND 9020 DIXON AVENUE FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA C (R1/C) AND 9040 DIXON AVENUE FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/43)**
(RZ 02-202113 - Report: July 16/02, File No.: 8060-20-7411) (REDMS No. 814042, 820342)

Mr. Burke briefly reviewed the report with the Committee.

Planning Committee

Wednesday, September 4th, 2002

A brief discussion ensued between Cllr. Greenhill and staff on whether the location of a future pedestrian crossing light proposed for Dixon Avenue through to the school/park site would be too close to the existing crossing at Dayton Avenue. Advice was given that the proximity of the two crossings to each other would not be an issue. The suggestion was also made that the contribution for park improvements could be better used to fund the proposed Dixon Avenue pedestrian crossing.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7411, for the rezoning of 8220 and 8240 Garden City and 9020 Dixon Avenue from Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area C (R1/C) and 9040 Dixon Avenue from Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B) to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/43)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

5. **APPLICATION BY PARM DHINJAL & MICHAEL TILBE, REMAX SELECT PROPERTIES FOR REZONING AT 4640, 4700, 4720, 4740 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA K (R1/K)**

(RZ 02-208491 - Report: August 1/02, File No.: 8060-20-7412) (REDMS No. 812799)

Mr. Burke briefly reviewed the report with the Committee. Further information was provided by Planner David Brownlee that a telephone call had been received from the owner of 4780 Steveston Highway who was concerned about the position of the laneway accessing Steveston Highway. As a result, the applicant had agreed to relocate the access to between Lots 10 and 11.

A brief discussion ensued, during which concern was expressed that the proposed location of the laneway access could be too close to Bonavista Gate, and the suggestion was made that location of this access between Lots 11 and 12 would be a good compromise. Staff agreed to review the proposal further.

Mr. Parm Dhinjal, one of the applicants for the project, advised that the anticipated sale value of the homes would be approximately \$300,000, however, this would be dependent on the market.

It was moved and seconded

That the following recommendation be forwarded to Public Hearing:

- (1) *That Single Family Lot Size Policy 5438, adopted by Council on April 17, 1990, be repealed; and*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7412, for the rezoning of 4640, 4700, 4720, 4740 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K)", be introduced and given first reading.*

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Wednesday, September 4th, 2002

6. **UPDATE TO AREA PLANS & ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS**
(Report: July 26/02, File No.: 8060-20-7406) (REDMS No. 803499, 809213)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, reviewed the report with the Committee.

A brief discussion ensued, during which Mr. Crowe explained how changes to the Official Community Plan document were handled to ensure that minor OCP changes were periodically undertaken. He also provided information on how staff dealt with noise issues as they related to the Official Community Plan.

Reference was made to the elimination of the names of those individuals who had prepared the individual area plans and information was provided on the rationale for no longer including these names. It was noted during the discussion that the names of these people were still contained on the original OCP documents on file at the City Archives.

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That Bylaw No. 7406, which amends Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100, by:*

(a) *substituting the following Area Plans for the existing Area Plans:*

i) *Steveston as Schedule 2.4;*

ii) *West Cambie as Schedule 2.11A;*

iii) *East Cambie as Schedule 2.11B; and*

iv) *Bridgeport as Schedule 2.12;*

(b) *replacing the Planning Areas Map on two pages of the OCP and for the Key Maps in eight Sub-Area Plans;*

(c) *removing specific wording and instead directing readers to the OCP with regard to the requirement for lands adjacent to the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) in the Terra Nova Sub-Area Plan and the Ash Street Sub-Area Plan;*

(d) *removing a redundant Issue statement in the Thompson (Terra Nova Sub-Area) Plan;*

(e) *changing the wording of the policy relating to aircraft noise requirements in the Dover Crossing Area Plan to be consistent with the other Area Plans; and*

(f) *replacing Attachment 1 & 2 to Schedule 1 (Generalized Land Use Map) to update the ALR boundaries and correct the reference numbers for the Area and Sub-Area Plans;*

be introduced and given first reading.

Planning Committee

Wednesday, September 4th, 2002

- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7406, having been considered in conjunction with:*
- (a) *the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;*
 - (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. 7406, having been considered in conjunction with Section 882(3)(c) of the Local Government Act, be referred to the Land Reserve Commission for comment and response by October 16, 2002.*
- (4) *That Bylaw No. 7406 having been considered in accordance with the City Policy on Consultation During OCP Development, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation.*

CARRIED

7. NOTICE OF EXCLUSION APPLICATION FOR PROPERTY IN THE AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE – 11120 NO. 2 ROAD

Councillor McNulty expressed concern about the Notice of Exclusion Application for property in the Agricultural Land Reserve located on the east side of No. 2 Road, and he questioned whether staff had sent a letter to the applicant advising of the City's policy about development east of No. 2 Road.

A brief discussion ensued, as a result of which, staff were requested to prepare a response which outlined the process which would be required if the owners were considering development of that site; and advising that the City would not allow any development to take place on the east of No. 2 Road.

8. MANAGER'S REPORT

- (a) The General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan, advised that he would be submitting a report to the closed Council Meeting on September 9th, 2002, on the issue of staff overtime.
- (b) Mr. Burke provided information on a rezoning application for property on No. 5 Road, which would could result in the construction of a new 108,000 sq. ft. temple. He displayed site plans of the proposal to explain staff's concerns about (i) the proposed height of the building (160 feet), and (ii) the replacement of the originally proposed vegetable garden with ornamental ponds.

Planning Committee

Wednesday, September 4th, 2002

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (4:58 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 Wednesday, September 4th, 2002.

Councillor Bill McNulty
Chair

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