



REGULAR MEETING FOR THE PURPOSE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Monday, July 22, 2019 at 8:28 PM
Fraser River Presentation Theatre
4th Floor, 20338 – 65 Avenue, Langley, BC

MINUTES

PRESENT: Mayor J. Froese

Councillors P. Arnason, D. Davis, S. Ferguson, M. Kunst, B. Long,
K. Richter, B. Whitmarsh, and E. Woodward

M. Bakken, R. Seifi, and J. Winslade

W. Bauer and K. Stepto

A. ADOPTION AND RECEIPT OF AGENDA ITEMS

A.1 Regular Meeting for Public Hearing and Development Permits - July 22, 2019

Moved by Councillor Arnason,
Seconded by Councillor Whitmarsh,
That Council adopt the agenda and receive the agenda items of the
Regular Meeting for Public Hearing and Development Permits held July
22, 2019.

CARRIED

B. PUBLIC HEARING

B.1 Rezoning Application No. 100580 (Urbanex Walnut Grove Development Corp. / 9497 - 201 Street) Bylaw No. 5489 Report 19-107 File CD 08-35-0181

“Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw 1987 No. 2500 Amendment (Urbanex)
Bylaw 2019 No. 5489”

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5489

R. Seifi explained that Bylaw 2019 No. 5489 amends the Comprehensive
Development Zone CD-14 by adding group children’s daycare to the list of
permitted uses to accommodate a proposed daycare facility at 9497 – 201
Street. 114 public notices were mailed out.

Submissions from the public:

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. Leslie Joole, Director of Real Estate, Benchmark Realty, expressing support for this proposal as daycares are in high demand in this area and it serves a valuable purpose to the community.

B.2

**Rezoning Application No. 100489 and
Development Permit Application No. 100935
(Sikham / Saran / 20448, 20460 and 20492 - 74B Avenue)
Bylaw No. 5483
Report 19-106
File CD 08-23-0160**

“Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw 1987 No. 2500 Amendment (Sikham / Saran) Bylaw 2019 No. 5483”

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5483

R. Seifi explained that Bylaw 2019 No. 5483 rezones 1.47 ha (3.63 ac) of land at 20448, 20460 and 20492 – 74B Avenue from Suburban Residential Zone SR-2 to Residential Compact Lot Zones R-CL(A) and R-CL(SD) to accommodate 29 lots (17 single family lots and 12 semi-detached lots). 56 public notices were mailed out.

Development Permit No. 100935

Running concurrently with this Bylaw is Development Permit No. 100935 (Sikham / Saran / 20448, 20460 and 20492 – 74B Avenue) in accordance with Attachment A subject to the following conditions:

- a. An exterior design control agreement shall be entered into for all lands zoned Residential Compact Lot Zone R-CL(A);
- b. Building plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “A” through “T”;
- c. On-site landscaping plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “U” and “V”, and in compliance with Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw (Schedule I Tree Protection) and the Township’s Street Trees and Boulevard Plantings Policy, to the acceptance of the Township of Langley;

Although not part of the development permit requirements, the applicant is advised that prior to issuance of a building permit, the following items will need to be finalized:

- a. Issuance of an Energy Conservation and GHG Emissions Reduction

Development Permit;

- b. Registration of party wall and common element maintenance agreements on the title of all Residential Compact Lot R-CL(SD) zoned lots;
- c. Registration of an easement securing the required visitor parking stalls for lands zoned Residential Compact Lot R-CL(SD);
- d. On-site landscaping to be secured by letter of credit at building permit stage;
- e. Written confirmation from the owner and landscape architect or arborist that tree protection fencing identified in the tree management plan is in place; and
- f. Payment of supplemental development permit application fees, Development Cost Charges, and building permit administration fees.

Submissions from the public:

The following written submissions were received from the public:

- 1. C. Abrahams, a Langley resident, expressing concerns regarding the proposed roads going through her property, and potentially her home. She would like to see these roads moved or eliminated.

B.3

**Rezoning Application No. 100584 and
Development Permit Application No. 101006
(Mitchell Group / between 198A and 200 Streets and
86 and 88 Avenues)
Bylaw No. 5494
Report 19-112
File CD 08-27-0062**

“Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw 1987 No. 2500 Amendment (Mitchell Group) Bylaw 2019 No. 5494”

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5494

R. Seifi explained that Bylaw 2019 No. 5494 rezones rezoning 5.67 ha (14.01 ac) of land located between 198A and 200 Streets and 86 and 88 Avenues, to Comprehensive Development Zone CD-138 to facilitate development of a 264 room hotel with banquet / conference facility and two (2) eleven (11) storey office buildings. 310 public notices were mailed out.

Development Permit No. 101006

Running concurrently with this Bylaw is Development Permit No. 101006 (Mitchell Group / between 198A and 200 Streets and 86 and 88 Avenues) in accordance with Attachment A subject to the following conditions:

- a. Building plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “A” through “N”;
- b. On-site landscaping plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “O” through “V”, and in compliance with Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw (Schedule I Tree Protection) and the Township’s Street Trees and Boulevard Plantings Policy, to the acceptance of the Township;
- c. All signage being in compliance with the Township’s Sign Bylaw and Schedules “I” through “L” with the exception of the following variances:
 - i. Section 8.1.2 of the Township’s Sign Bylaw 2012 No. 4927 being varied to permit a maximum fascia and projecting sign area of 26.28 square metres (283 square feet) for signs B3, B6, B7 and B8 combined on the office building as shown in Schedule “L”;
 - ii. Section 8.1.5 of the Township’s Sign Bylaw 2012 No. 4927 being varied to permit a maximum of six non-accessory tenant sign panels on proposed lot 1 (hotel lot) to a maximum total size of 10.6 square metres (114 square feet) as indicated for signs C1 and C4 in Schedule “L”;
- d. Rooftop mechanical equipment to be screened from view by compatible architectural treatments in compliance with Schedules “M” through “N”;
- e. All refuse areas to be located underground, with the exception of staging areas, and screened to the acceptance of the Township;
- f. Section 107.3 of the Township’s Zoning Bylaw No. 2500 being varied to reduce the required number of parking spaces for proposed lot 1 (hotel lot) from 415 to 177 parking spaces and for proposed lot 3 (office 2 lot) from 689 to 642 parking spaces.

Although not part of the development permit requirements, the applicant is advised that prior to issuance of a building permit, the following items will need to be finalized:

- a. Issuance of an Energy Conservation and GHG Emissions Reduction Development Permit No. 101109;
- b. Landscaping and boulevard treatment to be secured by letter of credit at building permit stage;
- c. Written confirmation from the owner and landscape architect or arborist that tree protection fencing identified in the tree management plan is in place;
- d. Provision of an exterior lighting impact plan prepared by an electrical engineer in compliance with the provisions of the Township’s Exterior Lighting Impact Policy to the acceptance of the Township;
- e. Preparation of a CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) report to the acceptance of the Township and incorporation of its recommendations into the final development design;
- f. Submission of a site specific on-site servicing and stormwater

management plan in accordance with the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw, and an erosion and sediment control plan in accordance with the Erosion and Sediment Control Bylaw, to the acceptance of the Township; and

g. Payment of supplemental development permit application fees, Development Cost Charges, and building permit administration fees;

Submissions from the public:

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. P. O'Shea, a Langley resident, expressing support for the project.

C. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

**C.1 Development Permit Application No. 100956
(Duffy Hills / 20053 - 68 Avenue)
Report 19-126
File CD 08-14-0189**

Moved by Councillor Long,
Seconded by Councillor Ferguson,
That Council authorize issuance of Development Permit No. 100956 to 412903 BC Ltd. and 412906 BC Ltd. for property at 20053 – 68 Avenue, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Building plans being in compliance with Schedules “A” through “F”;
- b. Landscape plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “G” through “H” and in compliance with the Township’s Street Tree and Boulevard Planting Policy to the acceptance of the Township of Langley General Manager of Engineering and Community Development;
- c. Registration of a restrictive covenant acceptable to the Township identifying the units (minimum 10%) required in accordance with the Schedule 2 - Adaptable Housing Requirements of the Township’s Official Community Plan;
- d. Section 985.4 – Lot Coverage of Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw 1987 No. 2500 being varied to increase the maximum permitted lot coverage of buildings and structures for Lot 3 from 42% to 53%.

Although not part of the Development Permit requirements, the applicant is advised that prior to issuance of a building permit the following items will need to be finalized:

- a. Compliance with Schedule 2 - Adaptable Housing Requirements of the Township’s Official Community Plan;
- b. Discharge of the restrictive covenant CA3817365 from the subject portion of the lands prohibiting clearing of the subject lands until such time

- as a Development Permit is issued;
- c. Submission of a site specific on-site servicing and stormwater management plan in accordance with the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw and erosion and sediment control plan in accordance with the Erosion and Sediment Control Bylaw, to the acceptance of the Township of Langley General Manager of Engineering and Community Development;
 - d. Tree retention, replacement, and protection in compliance with the Township's Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw (Schedule I – Tree Protection) being secured by letter of credit, including payment of associated administration fees;
 - e. Written confirmation from owner and landscape architect or arborist that the tree protection fencing identified in the tree management plan is in place;
 - f. Landscaping and boulevard treatment being secured by letter of credit;
 - g. Final interior road design to the acceptance of the Township Fire Department;
 - h. Submission of an exterior lighting plan to the acceptance of the Township of Langley General Manager of Engineering and Community Development; and
 - i. Payment of supplemental Development Permit application fees, Development Cost Charges, and Building Permit administration fees.

Submissions from the public:

There were no submissions received from the public.

CARRIED

Councillor Davis opposed

C.2

**Winery Lounge and Special Event Area
Endorsement Application No. 000048
(Festina Lente Estate Winery / 21113 - 16 Avenue)
Report 19-120
File CD 07-13-0027**

Moved by Councillor Richter,
Seconded by Councillor Ferguson,
That Council consider the endorsement request for a winery lounge and special event area for Festina Lente Estate Winery located at 21113 – 16 Avenue; and further

That Council adopt the following resolution, should it decide to endorse Festina Lente Estate Winery's request:

“That Council has considered and ENDORSED the request by Festina

Lente Estate Winery to locate a 24 person winery lounge (10 person interior and 14 person exterior area) and a 65 person special event area serving the Festina Lente Estate Winery located at 21113 – 16 Avenue, Langley, characterized as having liquor service from 11:00AM to 6:00PM, seven days a week.

In ENDORSING this request, Council deems that it has considered and found acceptable the location of the winery lounge and special event area; the proximity of the winery lounge and special event area to other special or recreational facilities and public buildings; the person capacity of the winery lounge and special event area; the hours of liquor service of the winery lounge and special event area; potential traffic, noise and parking impacts; zoning; and the impact on the community if the application is approved.

In ENDORSING this request, Council has considered the views of area residents expressed to Council at a Liquor Licencing Hearing held on July 22, 2019 at the Township of Langley Civic Facility (Fraser River Presentation Theatre), 20338 – 65 Avenue, Langley, BC, the minutes of which and written submissions provided by the public being attached to this resolution.

ENDORSEMENT of this request is subject to compliance with Municipal Bylaws and Policies and Liquor Control and Licensing Act Regulations.”

Submissions from the public:

1. J. Bramley, a Langley resident, was in attendance and asked Council to re-consider pedestrian and traffic safety on 16 Avenue.

The following written submission was received from the public:

1. W. and D. McKenzie, Langley residents, expressing concerns about additional noise in this rural setting.

Explanation by the proponent:

T. Townsley, General Manager and Owner of Festina Lente Estate Winery, was in attendance and stated that they have only had one event when Township 7 asked them to use their parking lot. There is no agreement between the sites to share parking.

CARRIED

**C.3 Brewery Lounge Endorsement Application No. 000047
(Smuggler's Trail Caskworks / 140 - 9339 - 200A Street)
Report 19-116
File CD 08-35-0259**

Moved by Councillor Richter,
Seconded by Councillor Kunst,
That Council consider the endorsement request for a new brewery lounge for Smuggler's Trail Caskworks located at 140 – 9339 – 200A Street; and further

That Council adopt the following resolution, should it decide to endorse Smuggler's Trail Caskworks request:

“That Council has considered and ENDORSED the request by Smuggler's Trail Caskworks to locate a 102 person brewery lounge serving Smuggler's Trail Caskworks located at 140 – 9339 – 200A Street, Langley, characterized as having liquor service from 11:00AM to 9:00PM on Sunday and Monday; 11:00AM to 10:00PM on Tuesday; 11:00AM to 11:00PM on Wednesday and Thursday; and 11:00AM to 1:00AM on Friday and Saturday.

In ENDORSING this request, Council deems that it has considered and found acceptable the location of the brewery lounge; the proximity of the brewery lounge to other special or recreational facilities and public buildings; the person capacity of the brewery lounge; the hours of liquor service of the brewery lounge; potential traffic, noise and parking impacts; zoning; and the impact on the community if the application is approved.

In ENDORSING this request, Council has considered the views of area residents expressed to Council at a Liquor Licencing Hearing held on July 22, 2019 at the Township of Langley Civic Facility (Fraser River Presentation Theatre), 20338 – 65 Avenue, Langley, BC, the minutes of which and written submissions provided by the public being attached to this resolution.

ENDORSEMENT of this request is subject to compliance with Municipal Bylaws and Policies and Liquor Control and Licensing Act Regulations.”

Submissions from the public:

There were no submissions received from the public.
CARRIED

**C.4 Development Variance Permit Application No. 100108
(Sidhu / Johal / Gill / 20450 - 93A Avenue)
Report 19-123
File CD 08-35-0266**

Moved by Councillor Long,
Seconded by Councillor Ferguson,
That Council authorize issuance of Development Variance Permit
No.100108 for property located at 20450 – 93A Avenue, subject to the
following conditions:

- a. Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw 2011 No. 4861, as amended, is hereby varied to reduce the road dedication for the western portion of 204A Street from 8.5 metres (28 feet) to 5.3 metres (17 feet) as indicated in Schedule A, subject to provision of a right of way to meet Township of Langley Standard TLR 8 (LR1-B).
- b. Registration of a restrictive covenant requiring setbacks to be measured from the edge of a right of way for Zoning Bylaw purposes; and
- c. Registration of an exterior design control agreement at the time of subdivision, to the acceptance of the General Manager, Engineering and Community Development.

Submissions from the public:

There were no submissions received from the public.
CARRIED

Councillor Whitmarsh opposed

**C.5 Development Permit Application No. 100988
(1081370 BC Ltd. / Chenier Management Corp /
27200 Block of Gloucester Way)
Report 19-122
File CD 14-05-0089**

Moved by Councillor Long,
Seconded by Councillor Davis,
That Council authorize issuance of Development Permit No.100988 to
Chenier Management Corporation and 1081370 BC Ltd. for property
located in the 27200 block of Gloucester Way, subject to the following
conditions being satisfied to the acceptance of the Township of Langley
General Manager of Engineering and Community Development:

- a. Building plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “A” through “E”;
- b. A Servicing Agreement being entered into with the Township to secure

- required road and utility upgrades and extensions in accordance with the Township's Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw;
- c. Landscape plans being in substantial compliance with Schedule "F" and in compliance with the Township's Street Tree and Boulevard Planting Policy;
 - d. Provision of a final tree management plan incorporating tree retention, replacement and protection details in compliance with the Township's Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw (Schedule I - Tree Protection);
 - e. All signage being in compliance with Schedules "C" and "D", the Gloucester Development Permit Guidelines and the Township's Sign Bylaw;
 - f. Comply with all conditions of Restrictive Covenant BR148231;
 - g. Rooftop mechanical equipment to be screened from view by compatible architectural treatments in compliance with Schedules "A" through "E";
 - h. All refuse areas to be located indoors or alternatively in a substantial enclosure and screened;
 - i. All outdoor storage areas being covered by a dust free surface; and
 - j. All chain link fences being black vinyl with black posts and rails.

Although not part of the Development Permit requirements, the applicant is advised that prior to issuance of a building permit the following items will need to be finalized:

- a. Submission of a site specific on-site servicing and storm water management plan in accordance with the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw;
- b. Replacement trees being secured by a letter of credit in compliance with the Township's Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw (Schedule I - Tree Protection);
- c. Submission of an erosion and sediment control plan or exemption in accordance with the Erosion and Sediment Control Bylaw;
- d. Register a restrictive covenant pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act regarding on site biofiltration and infiltration systems;
- e. On-site landscaping being secured by a letter of credit at the Building Permit stage; and
- f. Payment of applicable Development Cost Charges, Building Permit administration fees and supplemental Development Permit application fees.

Submissions from the public:

There were no submissions received from the public.

CARRIED

COUNCILLOR DECLARES CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Councillor Woodward declared a Conflict of Interest under Section 100 of the Community Charter, and left the meeting at 9:05pm.

C.6 Heritage Alteration Permit
Application No. 101082
(Statewood Properties Ltd. / 9123 and 9135 Church Street;
9148, 9150, 9205, 9213 and 9217 Glover Road; and
23272 Mary Avenue)
Report 19-121
File CD 11-33-0131

Moved by Councillor Richter,
 Seconded by Councillor Long,
 That Council authorize issuance of Heritage Alteration Permit No. 101082 for property located at 9123 and 9135 Church Street; 9148, 9150, 9205, 9213 and 9217 Glover Road; and 23272 Mary Avenue, to allow demolition of buildings, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Demolition of buildings and structures as shown in Schedules “A” and “B”;
- b. Restoration plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “A” and “B” to the acceptance of the General Manager of Engineering and Community Development;
- c. Provision and maintenance of turf over the subject site in substantial compliance with Schedules “A” and “B”;
- d. Retention of the existing trees on the subject sites until time of Heritage Alteration Permit issuance for redevelopment of the subject sites, subject to the conditions of the future Heritage Alteration Permit; and
- e. Provision of a final tree management plan incorporating tree retention, protection details, and security in compliance with Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw (Schedule I - Tree Protection), to the acceptance of the General Manager of Engineering and Community Development.

Although not part of the Heritage Alteration Permit requirements, the applicant is advised that prior to issuance of a demolition permit, the following items will need to be finalized:

- a. Disconnection of municipal services;
- b. Security of a driveway removal permit;
- c. Written confirmation from owner and landscape architect or arborist that the tree protection fencing identified in the tree management plan is in place; and
- d. Payment of applicable administration fees.

Submissions from the public:

1. G. Otty, a Langley resident, was in attendance and provided the history of Billy Brown homes in Fort Langley. He asked for an alternative to demolition.
2. S. Yee, a Langley resident, was in attendance and provided the history of the Lamplighter building, Mr. Young house, and some commercial buildings in Fort Langley. She asked Council to preserve these buildings and repurpose.
3. L. Weih, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that these buildings are very important and should not be demolished. She further read a letter on behalf of O. MacKenzie which commented on the history of Fort Langley.
4. A. Bisset, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support for the demolition. She further read a letter from E. Brewer-White and G. White which commented on the fracturing of the community and suggested moving the buildings instead of demolishing them.
5. D. Hind, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that he has worked in the heritage and environment industries. He commented on the distinct character of Fort Langley and stated that 80% of the conservation area has been redeveloped or boarded up. He further stated that the essence of Fort Langley is being eroded.
6. K. Hind, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on defining a Heritage Conservation Area and heritage buildings. She asked Council to commission a Heritage Conservation Plan.
7. T. Jones, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that demolition should not occur until a new Community Plan has been developed.
8. C. Kraemer, a Langley resident, was in attendance and challenged Council to only permit demolition when a re-development plan is in place.
9. D. Kask, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated support for the demolition of the buildings due to their dilapidated state.
10. L. Braddell, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support for the demolition. Every building has history, but not every building is historical.
11. G. Sawatsky, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support for the demolition.
12. J. Twist, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the demolition and further stated that streetscapes are public spaces.
13. J. Neufeld, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support for the demolition.
14. M. Campbell, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed opposition to the demolition.
15. A. Schildhorn, Fort Langley Community Association, was in attendance

and provided public comments on the proposed building demolitions. Of the 147 responses received, 99 were opposed, 10 were not sure, and 36 were in favour.

16. C. Fox, a Langley resident, was in attendance and read a letter on behalf of G. Walsh which stated his opposition to the demolition. He asked for this permit to be referred back to staff to turn it into a Heritage Revitalization Permit.

17. L. Elias, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the demolition of these buildings, and asked for more time to access the buildings for their heritage value.

18. R. Wyatt, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concern that the permit is to demolish 12 buildings instead of having a permit for each individual building.

19. J. Allan, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed his support for the demolition.

20. J. Kell, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the demolition of the buildings as removing these buildings will negatively alter the heritage look of Glover Road. She stated that these buildings should be repaired.

21. L. Thain, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the demolition.

22. B. Black, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the demolition due to the importance of history.

23. A. Hewitt, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the demolition of the buildings due to their historical significance.

24. A. Reminick, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the demolition.

25. I. MacKay, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the demolition.

26. S. Neersaker, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support for the demolition.

27. G. Muller, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the demolition.

28. S. Rempel, Country Lane Antiques, was in attendance and stated her support for the demolition.

29. P. Kravchuke, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support for the demolition.

30. L. Hunniford, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about what the future development will look like.

31. M. Neufeld, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support for the demolition as the buildings are not heritage buildings. She asked Council to approve the permit.

32. M. Bridges, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support for the demolition as the buildings are not heritage buildings.

MEETING EXTENDED

Moved by Councillor Kunst,
Seconded by Councillor Whitmarsh,
That the meeting be extended to 12:00am.

CARRIED

MEETING RECESSED

The meeting recessed at 11:01pm

MEETING RECONVENED

The meeting reconvened at 11:06

33. J. Rempel, Rempel Mercantile, was in attendance and stated his support for the demolition.
34. K. Rempel, Rempel Mercantile, was in attendance and stated her support for the demolition.
35. H. Whittell, a Langley resident, was in attendance and suggested that some of the buildings could be moved or restored and that a re-development plan should be in place before demolition. If the buildings are demolished that the properties have a restrictive covenant that states the new buildings comply with the Heritage Conservation Plan.
36. D. Akriam, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his opposition to the demolition.
37. W. Crossen, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his opposition to the demolition.
38. M. Fischer, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the demolition.
39. M. vanPopta, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support for the application.
40. S. Yee spoke for a second time and asked Council to stop demolition of all the buildings as one group, and that the proponent be required to have a re-development plan before demolition.
41. P. Kravchuke spoke for a second time and commented on parking in Fort Langley.

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. G. Otty, a Langley resident, calling attention to the importance of certain buildings in the Fort Langley Heritage Conservation Area that are included in the Heritage Alteration Permit request.
2. J. Williams, a Langley resident, expressing concerns regarding matters in Fort Langley and the community consultation process.
3. A. Quaale, a Langley resident, expressing concerns regarding the demolition of these buildings and the effect on the commercial core of Fort

Langley.

4. S. Sawatsky, a Langley resident, stating that these buildings are not legal heritage buildings and should be taken down.
5. S. Campbell, a Langley resident, stating that these buildings are derelict and should be taken down.
6. M. Rueff, a Langley resident, stating that these buildings are a fire hazard and should be demolished.
7. R. Buchanan, a Langley resident, stating that these buildings are past their economic lives and beyond restoration and should be taken down.
8. R. Gale, a Langley resident, stating that the demolition permits should be given to the properties on the east side of Glover, but not to the properties on the west side of Glover until an approved plan and construction date is set.
9. R. Buchanan, a Langley resident, asking Council to approve the Heritage Alteration Permit.
10. C. Goldschmidt, a Langley resident, expressing support for the demolition of these buildings as long as it occurs after the summer tourist season.
11. S. Hull, a Langley resident, expressing support for the demolition.
12. P. and Cobi Verhoeff, Langley residents, expressing support for the demolition as the buildings are derelict and unsafe.
13. G. Derksen, a Langley resident, stating the buildings should not be torn down, but kept in good repair by the owner.
14. B. McKay and C. Hamilton, Langley residents, asking what the criteria is for designating a home/building as heritage, providing comment regarding conflict of interest issues with an elected official, and asking that the BC Heritage Conservancy be consulted regarding these buildings.
15. D. Kask, a Langley resident, expressing support due to the dilapidated state of the buildings.
16. M. Rankin, a Langley resident, expressing support for the demolition.
17. Tom Kirstein, Board Chair of Eric Woodward Foundation, providing a written rationale/report from the Foundation for removing the buildings.
18. S. Hull, a Langley resident, expressing support for the demolition.
19. B. Black, a Langley resident, stating that the Township has a responsibility to restore, preserve, and maintain these buildings for future generations to enjoy.
20. J. Marjanovic, a Langley resident, asking Council to put this application on hold until the ownership of these properties is clarified, and a proper plan exists for future development once demolition proceeds.
21. M. and R. Hoyt, Langley residents, stating opposition to demolishing the buildings before a redevelopment plan is in place.
22. D. Wall, a Langley resident, asking Council to reject the demolition because the buildings have heritage value.
23. S. Cameron, a Langley resident, stating opposition to demolishing the buildings.

24. E. and S. Warzel, Langley residents, expressing support for the demolition.
25. T. Jones, a Langley resident, asking Council to bring an Engage TOL process in Fort Langley to develop a new Community Plan.
26. O. McKenzie, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to demolishing the buildings.
27. E. and G. Brewer-White, Langley residents, expressing support for demolishing the buildings, or if they have heritage significance, moving the buildings.
28. K. Hind, a Langley resident, stating that a Heritage Conservation Area Management Plan must be commissioned before making any further decisions in Fort Langley.
29. L. Elias, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the demolition of so many buildings all at once.
30. Fort Langley Community Association, providing comments and a survey on the proposed demolition.

Explanation by the proponent:

M. van der Zalm & Associates, was in attendance stated that the application is complete and no further comments were provided.

DEFERRAL

Moved by Councillor Long,

Seconded by Councillor Whitmarsh,

That this application be deferred to September.

CARRIED

D. TERMINATE

Moved by Councillor

Seconded by Councillor

That the meeting terminate at 11:35pm.

CARRIED

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

Mayor

Township Clerk