Monday, January 17, 2011

Place:

Council Chambers

Richmond City Hall

6911 No. 3 Road

Present:

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie

Councillor Linda Barnes Councillor Derek Dang

Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt

Councillor Ken Johnston Councillor Bill McNulty

Councillor Harold Steves

Gail Johnson, Acting Corporate Officer

Absent:

Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt

Councillor Greg Halsey-Brandt

Call to Order:

Mayor Brodie opened the proceedings at 7:00 p.m.

1. Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8681 (RZ 10-517689)

(10191 Williams Road; Applicant: Zeeshan Hasan)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was available to answer questions.

Written Submissions:

None.

Submissions from the floor:

None.

PH11/1-1

It was moved and seconded

That Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8681 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED

Monday, January 17, 2011

2. Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8672

(Entire City of Richmond; Applicant: City of Richmond)

Applicant's Comments:

Brian J. Jackson, Director of Development, and Glenn McLaughlin, Chief Licence Inspector & Risk Manager, were available to answer questions.

Written Submissions:

None.

Submissions from the floor:

Ron Bain, 8811 Lansdowne Road, sought and received clarification regarding the Bylaw amendments related to licensing fees and the enforcement process for violations, as follows:

- licensing fees are applied according to the number of guest rooms in a bed and breakfast establishment;
- if a bed and breakfast establishment has not abided by the regulations set out in the Bylaw, staff would undertake an enforcement program; and
- staff also enforce the regulations that govern businesses that have rooms for guests, without a breakfast component.

Mr. Bain was advised that he could contact staff directly with any other queries he may have.

PH11/1-2

It was moved and seconded

That Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8672 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED

PH11/1-3

It was moved and seconded

That Business License Amendment Bylaw 8666 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED

PH11/1-4

It was moved and seconded

That Business Regulation Amendment Bylaw 8667 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED

Monday, January 17, 2011

PH11/1-5

It was moved and seconded

That Municipal Ticket Information Authorization Amendment Bylaw 8668 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED

3. Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8684

(Entire City of Richmond; Applicant: City of Richmond)

Applicant's Comments:

Brian J. Jackson, Director of Development made the following comments:

- (i) after Council approved Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, staff became aware that amendments were required to provide clarifications and address omissions, including the definition of "structure, accessory" as it applies to tennis courts in the City's Agriculture (AG) Zone;
- (ii) staff met with the Agricultural Advisory Committee and with persons interested in the AG zone, to discuss the need to regulate tennis courts in the AG zone; and
- (iii) of the 24 tennis courts located in the AG zone, only three are not located within the first 100 metres of their lots.

In response to a query regarding accessory residential building heights in the AG zone, Mr. Jackson advised this issue was not addressed as part of the housekeeping amendments before Council.

Written Submissions:

Memorandum dated January 14, 2011 from the Director of Development providing additional information (Schedule 1).

Submissions from the floor:

Roland Hoegler, 6560 No. 4 Road thanked staff for meeting with him. He was concerned with the definition of "structure" and queried whether a tennis court would be included in the floor area ratio (FAR) of the property. Mr. Hoegler noted that setback requirements for tennis courts should be as generous as possible due to noise generated by tennis playing. Ideally, tennis courts should be placed in the back of the lots.

Monday, January 17, 2011

Dale Badh, 7251 Ash Street, thanked staff for consulting with him. He stated that the matter of tennis courts in the AG zone is not an issue, and spoke in support of maintaining the tennis court conditions as outlined in the Zoning Bylaw amendment.

He stated that the issue is the existing height limit on accessory residential buildings in the AG zone, and said that instead of a prolonged process to address that issue, he supported the idea of returning to the previous height limit outlined in the earlier Zoning Bylaw 5300.

PH11/1-6

It was moved and seconded

That Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8684 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED

PH11/1-7

It was moved and seconded

That Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8684 be adopted.

CARRIED

PH11/1-8

It was moved and seconded

That staff consult with stakeholders to discuss the existing height limit for accessory residential buildings on farmland of any size in Richmond and report back through Planning Committee.

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Cllrs. L. Barnes and

H. Steves

ADJOURNMENT

PH11/1-9

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (7:33 p.m.).

CARRIED

Monday, January 17, 2011

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting for Public Hearings of the City of Richmond held on Monday, January 17, 2011.

Mayor (Malcolm D. Brodie)

Acting Corporate Officer City Clerk's Office (Gail Johnson) Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of Council held for Public Hearings on Monday, January 17, 2011.



To Public Hearing
Date: Jan 17, 2011
Item # 3
Re: Bylaw 8684

Memorandum

Planning and Development Department Development Applications

To:

Mayor and Councillors

From:

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP

Director of Development

Date:

January 14, 2011

File:

12-8060-20-8684/Vol 01

Re:

Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8684

At the December 13, 2010 Council meeting, when *Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500*, *Amendment Bylaw 8684* was introduced and given First Reading, it was requested that staff discuss the proposed housekeeping amendment to include tennis courts in the definition of "structure, accessory" with the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) and persons previously interested in the Agriculture (AG) zone setback amendments. The purpose of this memo is to report the result of these discussions as part of the consideration of *Bylaw 8684* at the January 17, 2011 Public Hearing.

Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC)

Staff met with the AAC to discuss the proposed amendment. No objections or concerns were identified by Committee members. Members did comment that the option of having a tennis court included in the accessory structure definition was preferred.

Persons Interested In The Agriculture (AG) Zone

Staff met with Dale Badh, Roland Hoegler and Jan Knap (who have been interested in the Agriculture (AG) zone). They questioned the need to regulate tennis courts in the Agriculture (AG) zone and indicated that this housekeeping amendment would jeopardize the goodwill the City had developed with agricultural property owners when reverting back to the previous Zoning Bylaw's Agriculture (AG) zone road setbacks.

They also brought up other issues related to the Agriculture (AG) zone related to the existing height limit on accessory residential buildings; the need for a larger side yard on peat soils; requirements for perimeter and storm drainage. These issues are not part of the housekeeping amendments before Council at the January 17, 2011 Public Hearing. The accessory residential building height issue was discussed with the AAC as the Bylaw was being drafted in 2008/2009. Further, this issue was highlighted as a key issue in the 2009 Staff Report on the Zoning Bylaw changes. Council may consider directing staff to further review these issues and report back in the future.

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP
Director of Development

OUAN

HB.blg

cc: Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning & Development