



Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, November 20, 2001
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair
Councillor Lyn Greenhill, Vice-Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Harold Steves
Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, November 6, 2001, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be on Tuesday, December 4, 2001, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **APPLICATION BY THE CITY OF RICHMOND TO REZONE 780 LANCASTER CRESCENT AND THE ADJACENT UNCONSTRUCTED ROAD ALLOWANCE TO THE NORTHEAST FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD125) IN ORDER TO PERMIT THE EXISTING FIREHALL AND A TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL BUILDING**
(RZ 01-196147 - Report: Oct. 30/01, File No.: 8060-20-7297) (REDMS No. 545959, 551269, 551283)

Planning Committee

Tuesday, November 20, 2001

The Development Co-ordinator, Holger Burke, reviewed the report.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7297 for the rezoning of 780 Lancaster Crescent and adjacent unconstructed road allowance from Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) to Comprehensive Development District (CD/ 125), be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

4. **REZONING APPLICATION BY JOE UPPAL AT 7500 RAILWAY AVENUE**

(RZ 01-188957 - Report: Oct. 30/01, File No.: 8060-20-7280) (REDMS No. 539679)

The Development Co-ordinator, Holger Burke, reviewed the report. In response to a question Mr. Burke provided the information that no response from the neighbourhood had been received.

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated October 30th, 2001, from the Manager, Development Applications), regarding Rezoning Application RZ 01-188957 (Bylaw 7280) by Joe Uppal for property at 7500 Railway Avenue, be received for information.

CARRIED

5. **PLANNING COMMITTEE REFERRAL: PRINCESS LANE – DYKE ROAD ACCESS (ADJACENT TO 6461 DYKE ROAD)**

(Report: Nov. 1/01, File No.: 4045-20-04-WA) (REDMS No. 493700)

The Development Co-ordinator, Holger Burke, reviewed the report. In response to a question, Planner David Brownlee said that the Williamson's would not agree to the north end of the lane being closed to vehicle traffic if a vehicle access from their property at 6461 Dyke Road to Dyke Road was not permitted.

Ms. Amber Williamson distributed a written submission which is attached as Schedule 1 and forms a part of these minutes.

Mr. Curtis Eyestone, 6451 Dyke Road, said that he was in favour of the closure of both ends of the lane. It was Mr. Eyestone's suggestion that the Williamson's be given a right of passage agreement between the end of Dyke Road and 6461 Dyke Road upon removal of the existing covenant. Further to this, Mr. Eyestone said that he would eventually like to see Princess Lane extended to the Williamson property.

A discussion then ensued on the benefits of extending the road as opposed to a right of passage agreement.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, November 20, 2001

Mr. Dana Westermarck said that he would like to see a permanent fire lane access in place. It was Mr. Westermarck's opinion that if access to Dyke Road was approved for the Williamson's a number of other requests for access would follow (i.e. John White's former properties).

In response to a question from the Chair, Ms. Williamson said she would like temporary parking on Dyke Road, removal of the restrictive access covenant from 6461 Dyke Road, and closure of the north and south ends of the lane. Mr. Brownlee provided the information that the City could not frustrate the full legal access the Williamson's currently have to the lane without the Williamson's agreement.

The General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan advised the Committee that the parcel of land in question was originally part of the industrial parcel. Concession had been given that the McKinney house, a heritage home, be granted access to Dyke Road. It was Mr. McLellan's opinion that if access to Dyke Road were granted to the Williamsons a strong case for precedent would be set. Mr. McLellan said that while a right of passage might be appropriate for the Williamson and White properties vehicle traffic on the lane would still be of issue.

It was moved and seconded

That staff undertake actions necessary to close the laneway adjacent to 6461 Dyke Road to regular vehicular traffic which would include the placing of bollards on the north (between the Williamson driveway and the blind curve) and south ends of the laneway, that no new vehicle access be provided to 6461 Dyke Road, and that interim vehicle parking be permitted within the Dyke Road parcel in front of 6461 Dyke Road.

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllr. McNulty
Cllr. Greenhill

6. MANAGER'S REPORT

The General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan, reported that, as requested at the November 6 Planning Committee meeting, a representative from the Urban Development Institute would attend either the December 4th, or a January, Planning Committee meeting.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, November 20, 2001

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (5:07 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,
November 20, 2001.

Councillor Bill McNulty
Chair

Deborah MacLennan
Administrative Assistant

RE: Planning Committee meeting Nov20,01
Princess Lane-Dyke Road access

Firstly, I would like to address staffs comment that if they only bollard the lane at Dyke Road (option 1) signs would prevent traffic from driving on the pedestrian path. This will not work. There has been a No Exit sign at the entrance to this area on London Road for many years. We have also placed Private Driveway, For the Use of 6451 Dyke Road Only and No Truck signs at both ends of the lane. None of these signs have had any affect on the heavy flow of traffic on the lane. We have an average of 10 cars and trucks per hour driving up and down the lane. There has been an even greater number since the new townhouses were built down the street. This will only get worse as the whole area develops. You cannot see the Dyke from Princess Lane and therefore will not be able to see the bollards until you have driven around the corner and are half way down the lane. Vehicles will then have to back out down the pedestrian trail and return the way they came. Even if half of the vehicles respected the new signs that is still a huge number of vehicles driving forward and then backward on the the lane. The other safety concern is people parking on the lane and blocking emergency vehicles. If there is a fire we won't have time to arrange for a tow truck to remove the offending vehicle. There is never enough parking around here when events are on at London Farm or on a sunny summer day and I can guarantee you that people will park in the lane no matter what signs you post. It is a risk we don't need to take.

Secondly , staff feels that my husband and I driving on the pedestrian trail is safer than us driving on the Dyke. They are assuming that we will be the only vehicles that will drive there which as I explained above is unrealistic. I would prefer not to have to negotiate a blind corner where there are people dogs bikes ect. The Dyke is a road with regular vehicle traffic. Yes there are rollerbladers, horses, bikers ect on the road, I know as I am one of them most days, but they expect cars on the road. They won't be expecting to meet vehicles on the pedestrian pathway. I have to dodge cars and trucks daily with my dog and toddler in tow. Luckily I am well aware of the danger and have kept everyone safe so far. Staff mentions that the only other vehicles driving on the lane will be maintenance ones. How do they

intend to ensure this? On existing Dyke trails vehicles are disallowed access by using bollards or chains. The city workers have keys to gain access to garbage cans, waterworks ect. This is exactly what we are suggesting (option 2).

Thirdly, I want to correct an error on page 26 where staff mentions that allowing us to continue to drive on Dyke Road would require the addition of a new driveway. The driveway from the Dyke to our house is already present and wouldn't need any modifications at all. There is plenty of room for the pedestrian trail and a double wide driveway as it is now. All that is needed is to remove the access covenant on our title.

Lastly, Option 3 is exactly what staff is concerned about, which is setting a precedent for other property owners to ask for Dyke access. I'm not sure why they made this an option since it is what they have said they don't want. The only other property owner who could ask for Dyke access is the fellow who bought one of John's lots. The rest of the property has been purchased by developers who intend to put up townhouse complexes similar to what has been built by Dana. This fellow never had a driveway to the Dyke and has proper road access at the back. If we did not have the pedestrian trail being put on our access we would not be asking for the Dyke access either. Each request to the City is looked at on a case by case basis and the City has to decide what makes the most sense for the area. Please support Option 2.