Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, January 7th , 2003

Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt ,Vice-Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Harold Steves
Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie

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, December 3rd, 2002, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, **January 21st, 2003**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **APPLICATION BY D & T DETTLING FOR REZONING AT 8340 HEATHER STREET FROM SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B) TO SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA K (R1/K)**

APPLICATION BY GURBACHAN SIDHU FOR REZONING AT 8320 HEATHER STREET FROM SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B) TO SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA K (R1/K)

(RZ 02-219164; RZ 02-220252 - Report: Nov. 26/02, File No.: 8060-20-7459/7460) (REDMS No. 913947, 914391, 914389, 914382)

The Development Co-ordinator, Holger Burke, and Jenny Beran Planner, were present.

Mayor Malcolm Brodie joined the meeting – 4:01 p.m.

It was moved and seconded

That the following bylaws each be introduced and given first reading:

(1) Bylaw No. 7459, for the rezoning of 8340 Heather Street from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K)"; and

(2) Bylaw No. 7460, for the rezoning of 8320 Heather Street from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K)".

CARRIED

4. **APPLICATION BY POLYGON DEVELOPMENT 140 LTD. FOR REZONING AT 7131, 7151,7171, 7191, 7195, 7211, 7231, 7271, AND 7291 HEATHER STREET FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/126), AND TO AMEND THE MAXIMUM PERMITTED BUILDING HEIGHT AND CORRESPONDING LOT COVERAGE REQUIREMENT UNDER COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/126)**

(RZ 02-216183 - Report: Dec. 6/02; File No.: 8060-20-7465/7466) (REDMS No. 921220, 921997, 922000, 921838, 921733)

The Development Co-ordinator, Holger Burke, and Suzanne Carter-Huffman, Planner, were present. Ms. Carter-Huffman responded to questions relating to the public art contribution of the applicant. Information was provided that at present no specific policy was available to developers that provided guidance as to whether the child care program or affordable housing program was deemed by the City to be more appropriate than the public art program.

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, said that he would report back on the timeframe of the previously requested report on these development contributions.

Ms. Carter-Huffman also provided the information that the amount of road works required of the applicant was not far in excess of the eligible Development Cost Charge credits at the Leighton Gate project being completed by Polygon.

Cllr. Barnes joined the meeting – 4:05 p.m.

Ms. Carter-Huffman reiterated that Polygon has a corporate policy of contributing to public art and that as a result of lengthy discussions between staff and Polygon the decision was made by Polygon that there were insufficient funds to support affordable housing and there were no specific childcare projects available.

Mr. Crowe gave advice that a report, identifying the importance, ranking and formula for each program and the resulting creation of a framework for Council consideration, was anticipated to be complete in March 2003.

It was moved and seconded

That the following bylaws each be introduced and given first reading:

(1) ***Bylaw No. 7465, to increase the maximum permitted building height under "Comprehensive Development District (CD/126)" from 2 ½ storeys to 3 storeys, together with a corresponding decrease in lot coverage; and***

(2) ***Bylaw No. 7466, for rezoning at 7131, 7151,7171, 7191, 7195, 7211, 7231, 7271, and 7291 Heather Street from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/126)".***

CARRIED

5. **APPLICATION BY JERRY AND KARIN GIESBRECHT FOR REZONING AT 10291 BRIDGEPORT ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA D (R1/D) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)**

(RZ 02-205510 - Report: Nov. 12/02, File No.: RZ 02-205510) (REDMS No. 733599, 280247)

The Development Co-ordinator, Holger Burke, said that the recommendation for denial of the application was based on the following concerns, that i) the lane should be built now and not later to be consistent with the Lot Size Policy for the area; ii) approval of the rezoning without the lane construction would be inconsistent with other rezonings/subdivisions approved in the area; and iii) a precedent to accept Neighbourhood Improvement Charges in lieu of lane construction would be set. In response to recent concerns expressed by Council regarding the lane policy, Mr. Burke said that a report addressing those concerns would be provided in the near future.

A discussion then ensued on the feasibility of requiring a lane that would not be extended for the foreseeable future.

The applicant read a written submission which is attached as Schedule 1 and forms a part of these minutes, and distributed a sheet of photographs of one of the neighbouring properties that had recently been renovated, which is attached as Schedule 2 and forms a part of these minutes,

It was moved and seconded
That the rezoning of 10291 Bridgeport Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area D (R1/D)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)", be referred to staff for further consideration upon Council's review of the lane policy.
Prior to the question being called further advice was given that, in addition to a review of the current construction standard of the lane policy, the clarification of the benefits of receiving NIC contributions in lieu of lane construction may not include any new information that has not previously been reported on.

In response to a question, the General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan confirmed that the Land Titles Act did include a provision for a land owner to reclaim unused road allowances where the dedicated land is not used within a certain timeframe and this has been the subject of court law.

The question on the **referral** motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Howard and McNulty opposed.

6. **APPLICATION BY ARMINDER JHUTTY FOR REZONING AT 10260 BIRD ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)**
(**RZ 02-219324** - Report: Nov. 27/02, File No.: 8060-20-7458) (REDMS No. 915043, 915095, 915096)

The Development Co-ordinator, Holger Burke, and Jenny Beran, Planner, were present.

It was moved and seconded
That Bylaw No. 7458, for the rezoning of 10260 Bird Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

7. **APPLICATION BY WANG LEUNG LEUNG & MING SHUEN LEUNG FOR REZONING AT 5211/5231 LAPWING CRESCENT FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO TWO-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R5)**
(**RZ 02-210430** - Report: Dec. 3/02, File No.: 8060-20-7461) (REDMS No. 918814, 919414, 919038)

The Development Co-ordinator, Holger Burke, and David Brownlee, Planner, were present.

It was moved and seconded
That Bylaw No. 7461 for the Rezoning of 5211/5231 Lapwing Crescent from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Two-Family Housing District (R5)", be introduced and given first reading.
CARRIED

8. **APPLICATION BY S.K.M.B. HARCHAND CONSTRUCTION FOR REZONING AT 5440 FRANCIS ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA C (R1/C)**
(RZ 02-207199 - Report: Dec. 12/02, File No.: 8060-20-7468) (REDMS No. 853420, 923768, 923811)

The Development Co-ordinator, Holger Burke, and Jenny Beran, Planner, were present.

It was moved and seconded
That Bylaw No. 7468, for the rezoning of 5440 Francis Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area C (R1/C)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

9. **AMENDMENTS TO R1/C LOT SIZE POLICIES**
(Report: Dec. 19/02, File No.: RZ 02-207199; 4430-01) (REDMS No. 927933)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, gave a brief summary of the report and noted that the staff recommendation allowed for flexibility by balancing developer and City interests.

As part of further discussion on the matter, information was provided that the current lane requirements were based on the adopted Lane Policy; that a process was being developed which would allow public comment on how growth was envisioned; and, the R1/C zone is based on an onsite turnaround being provided.

It was moved and seconded
That staff amend the R1/C Lot Size Policies on Arterial Roads, as outlined in Option 3 of the report dated December 19, 2002 from the Manager, Policy Planning, in batches over the next year and bring forward the revised policies by the end of 2003.

CARRIED

10. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

There were no reports.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (5:00 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, January 7th, 2003.

Councillor Bill McNulty
Chair

Deborah MacLennan
Administrative Assistant

Schedule 1 to the minutes of the
Planning Committee meeting held
on Tuesday, January 7th, 2003.

January 7, 2003
File: 4430-02

RE: 10291 Bridgeport Road, Richmond, BC

Dear Planning Committee,

We would like to take a moment of your time to respond to the staff report prepared by Rob Innes and further explain our situation. We understand that the purpose of the City's Single Family Lot Size Policy which permits lots along Bridgeport Road to subdivide to the R1/B zone and requires the dedication and construction of a 6m wide lane across the back of the two new properties, is to aid in the decongestion of the major arteries in the city, in this case Bridgeport Road. This is to be accomplished through the construction of back lanes which connect to side roads.

This plan shows foresight and good planning. We support this plan and would like to see a back lane constructed that extends to a side road, in our case McLennan or McLeod Avenue. Having access to such a back lane would not only ease the congestion of Bridgeport Road, it would also make entering and exiting Bridgeport Road much safer. As pointed out in the staff report, a lane has already been started on the east side of the block, namely at the northwest corner of McLennan Avenue. Unfortunately, our property is situated in the middle of the block and there are three properties which lie in between ours and the new lane. These houses do appear to be 30 to 35 years old, however one of these houses was substantially renovated 7 years ago. We are acquainted with the owners and they have informed us that they have no intention of selling their property, in fact their children will soon become joint owners (please see attached letter from them). As a result it is unlikely that the lane will extend through their property in *several* years as concluded in the staff report. On the west end of the block, at McLeod Avenue there is currently a house standing exactly in the path of the future lane. Consequently it is unlikely that a back lane will extend to our property to either side road in the near future.

In light of this situation, we would much prefer to retain the trees and the green space in our backyards until a lane which extends to a side road can be constructed. We are two families with young children and part of what draws us to building our own houses is having the opportunity to have a garden and a grassy back yard with trees for our children to play on. Constructing a lane on our property now serves no one. Without extending to a side road, the lane does nothing to ease the congestion of Bridgeport Road and we are left with 6 m of pavement across the property and a lamppost in our backyard. In fact we feel that not constructing the lane at this time would not complicate but simplify the City's long range goal of constructing lanes along arterial roads. Surely it would be easier to maintain sewers and lighting with the utilities row following the back lane instead of having a utility row on each lot that subdivides. In addition, it seems to make more sense to pave the lane at one time instead of ending up with a checkerboard of lane segments of varying ages.

Therefore, we propose that along with the rezoning/subdividing process, we pay a Neighbourhood Improvement Charge which would cover the cost of lane construction at a future date. We would also be more than happy to sign a covenant agreement in the wording of the city's choosing, dedicating the last 6m of our property to the construction of a lane when it will be truly useful and ease the congestion of Bridgeport Road.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jerry & Karin Giesbrecht
Jeff & Anne Hickling

Photographs of 10351 Bridgeport
(recently renovated)