



SPECIAL MEETING FOR THE PURPOSE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Tuesday, June 27, 2017 at 6:00 PM
Fraser River Presentation Theatre
4th Floor, 20338 – 65 Avenue, Langley, BC

MINUTES

PRESENT: Mayor J. Froese

Councillors P. Arnason, D. Davis, C. Fox, B. Long, A. Quaale, K. Richter,
M. Sparrow, and B. Whitmarsh

M. Bakken, S. Gamble, and R. Seifi

W. Bauer, J. Chu, R. Nelson, and K. Stepto

A. ADOPTION AND RECEIPT OF AGENDA ITEMS

A.1 Special Meeting for Public Hearing and Development Permits - June 27, 2017

Moved by Councillor Fox,
Seconded by Councillor Davis,
That Council adopt the agenda and receive the agenda items of the
Special Meeting for Public Hearing and Development Permits held June
27, 2017.

CARRIED

B. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

C. PUBLIC HEARING

C.1 Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan Bylaw No. 5300 Report 17-59 File CD LRP000013

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment
(Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300”

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5300

J. Chu explained that Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 amends the Langley Official
Community Plan to provide an updated Community Plan for
Brookwood-Fernridge. 5,832 public notices were mailed out.

Submissions from the public:

1. M. Brown, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on the need for more seniors and adaptable housing in the Brookwood-Fernridge area. She suggested that all future development proposals include seniors housing.
2. E. Faulkner, a Langley resident, was in attendance and submitted an 83 signature petition from Cedar Ridge South residents asking for this area to be developed and have Township water and sewer.
3. K. Jarvie, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on the zoning of Cedar Creek Mobile Home Park being changed to multifamily in the proposed OCP. She asked Council to maintain the current zoning.
4. R. Seguin, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the tree bylaw is too restrictive and further commented on the negative impacts of increased density. He asked Council to stay with the 1987 plan.
5. T. Morrissey, a Langley resident, was in attendance and asked Council to maintain the current zoning for Cedar Creek Mobile Home Park.
6. E. West, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on increased density and the strain on municipal water and sewer. He further expressed concerns about building height in the new OCP.
7. M. McGarry, a Langley resident, was in attendance and suggested more definitive wording in the plan, 5,000 sq ft lots minimum, stricter fines in the tree bylaw, and to shift commercial properties to the south west side of 200 Street.
8. B. Cameron, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his opposition due to 4,000 sq ft lots and increased density.
9. D. Todosychuk, a Langley resident, was in attendance and asked for more mobile home parks in the new OCP, no high density, and more definitive language.
10. G. Beauchamp, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that 4,000 sq ft lots are appropriate and expressed concerns about Cedar Creek Mobile Home Park property being divided into two different zonings.
11. C. Bratvold, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that Cedar Creek Estates should maintain its current zoning.
12. J. MacPherson, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that Cedar Creek Estates should maintain its current zoning as there is not enough affordable housing for seniors in the area.
13. L. Daigneault, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that Cedar Creek Estates should maintain its current zoning.
14. D. Brown, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that Cedar Creek Estates should be grandfathered under the 1987 plan.
15. K. Roberts, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about increased density. He asked Council to add stronger language to the OCP.
16. D. Ramdour, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that lots

should be no less than 10,000 sq ft.

17. A. R., a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the new plan is too similar to the proposed 2014 plan, that 10,000 sq ft lots should be the minimum, and that the aquifer will be strained with increased density.

18. B. McKenzie, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the proposed OCP does not fit the definition of an OCP and further commented on land use, the implementation plan, and administration.

19. B. Allen, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that 4,000 sq ft lots are too small, and that the wording in the plan is too loose.

20. M. Allen, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that 4,000 sq ft lots are too small.

21. S. Singleton, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the OCP does not reflect the wishes of the community.

22. L. King, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about increased density and traffic, and safety concerns.

23. K. Marsden, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the plan due to environmental concerns.

24. M. Connerty, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated the proposed plan is too similar to the 2014 plan and that the density is too high. She stated that schools and the hospital are already at, or over, capacity.

25. C. Schneider, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on the implementation of the Energy Step Code and the impact on the new OCP.

26. B. Langston, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about the four-lane arterial routes that are proposed and using DCC's to fund them.

MEETING RECESSED

The meeting recessed at 8:45pm.

MEETING RECONVENED

The meeting reconvened at 8:51pm.

27. J. Strain, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns regarding SF-2 and SF-3 designations. She asked for new designations of SF-4 and SF-5 with minimum of 7,000 sq ft lots. She further expressed concerns about lack of infrastructure, bike lanes, and recreation areas.

28. T. Williams, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on the loss of farmland in the new OCP.

29. A. Bergstrom, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the plan.

30. P. Heppner, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her

support of the plan but asked for the commercial area and high density areas to be moved to the west of 200 Street.

31. D. Islas, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support of the plan.

32. D. Harpur, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition to 4,000 sq ft lots.

33. J. Makkar, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the plan.

34. H. Marsden, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about the impact on the environment. He stated that cluster development could be beneficial as it could eliminate urban sprawl.

35. C. Jetau, a Surrey resident, was in attendance and commented on the Integrated Stormwater Management Plan. She stated that there needs to be an inventory of the natural elements in the area.

36. T. Ziggach, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the density is too high and should not change.

37. K. Motherwell, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the density is too high.

38. K. Couette, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the density is too high and does not support 4,000 sq ft lots.

39. S. St. Onge, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition due to high density, tree removal, and loose wording in the plan. She prefers the 1987 plan.

40. K. Ross, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about high density and safety issues. She asked for tighter wording in the OCP.

41. J. Gill, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the plan is not dense enough.

42. M. Moffat, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the plan.

43. H. Jacobsen, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that 4,000 sq ft lots are too small. He further commented on roadways in and out of the area and that they are insufficient.

44. K. Jarvie spoke for a second time and stated that the area does not need another commercial centre.

45. K. Marsden spoke for a second time and there needs to be areas designated for conservation.

46. M. Connerty spoke for a second time and stated that DCC's need to be earmarked for Brookwood-Fernridge, and that mobile home parks need to be protected.

47. R. Seguin spoke for a second time and commented that too much parkland is costly for taxpayers.

48. J. Gill spoke for a second time and stated that more density is needed to support businesses.

49. M. Allen spoke for a second time and commented on the 32 Avenue

connector and visibility issues.

50. P. Hepner spoke for a second time and thanked Council and staff for the work they have done on the plan.

51. D. Harper spoke for a second time and commented that large lots will accommodate large coniferous trees.

52. K. Couette spoke for a second time and stated that Brookwood needs a tree bylaw.

53. B. Cameron spoke for a second time and commented on the “creep” effect.

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. H. Marsden, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the impact the OCP will have on the environment.
2. Louie Loberti, Senior Manager, Loblaw Companies Limited, (Shoppers Drug Mart), expressing support for the plan.
3. J. Chahal, a Langley resident, expressing support for the plan.
4. M. McGarry, a Langley resident, suggested edits to the Bylaw.
5. L. Frewing, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about 4,000 sq ft lots, and suggested fining those who take down more trees than allowed.
6. K. Marsden, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to the OCP due to the effects on wildlife and the natural environment.
7. J. Richardson, a Langley resident, suggested edits to the Bylaw.
8. Ryan Jones, Vice President, Qualico Communities, expressing opposition due to:
 - a. Density on Qualico's holdings, and other lands designated Single Family 2, are reduced from 7,000 sq ft lots to 10,000 sq ft resulting in lower land values;
 - b. There is not enough lower prices multifamily product to provide housing for young families and downsizers;
 - c. The overall density is too low to support the infrastructure and amenities contemplated in the 2017 Community Plan.
9. G. Dhesi, a Langley resident, expressing support for the Plan but would like to see more townhouse and condominium development to provide lower cost housing.
10. C. Vecchiato, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about not definitive wording in the Plan, and whether Development Cost Charges will cover all of the servicing components for new residents.
11. Gerald Minchuk, Director of Developer Services and Economic Development, City of Langley, providing comments on: residential development, commercial development, transportation network, and sewer and water servicing.
12. K. Marsden, a Langley resident, expressing concerns that the Tree Protection Bylaw doesn't include the developed area of Brookwood, that the fines are too low, and potential problems with allowing property owners

to cut down two to four trees per year.

13. A. and S. French, Langley residents, expressing concerns about preserving trees and green space.

14. R. and L. Seguin, Langley residents, providing comment on the Tree Protection Bylaw and the different land uses in the OCP. Also stating that the 1987 Plan is a better overall plan and when used in concert with the Subdivision and Servicing Bylaw #4861 is perfectly acceptable.

15. B. Cameron, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the “creep effect” between the OCP and Neighbourhood Plans.

16. B. Oraas, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about protection of mobile home parks in Brookwood-Fernridge.

17. L. Flather, a Langley resident, expressing concerns regarding density and tree protection.

18. B. Schroeder, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about manufactured home parks being included in the new Plan.

19. K. Motherwell, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about having more clarity in the new OCP Tree Protection Bylaw.

20. C. & J. Glendenning, J. Glendenning, and E. & K. Boettcher, Langley residents, asking for an area between 206 Street and 208 Street, along 20 Avenue, be changed to SF-1 zoning.

21. D. Tocher, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the wording for SF-3 zoning, and the Tree Protection Bylaw.

22. H. Marsden, a Langley resident, stating opposition to removing ALR land in Fernridge for development.

23. S. Grierson, a Langley resident, stating support.

24. A. Morose, a Langley resident, stating there needs to be stronger and clearer language regarding: residential cluster development, SF-2, SF-3, phasing, rezonings, and the tree protection bylaw.

25. P. Michels, a Langley resident expressing concerns regarding: density changes, parking, non-major access ways, green spaces, sewer and water, and trails and bike paths.

26. C. Schneider, a Langley resident, expressing concerns regarding implementation of the Energy Step Code and the impact on the new OCP.

27. J. Strain, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about lot sizes, walking and bike paths, and traffic increases.

28. A. Sagher, a Langley resident, stating support.

29. D. and H. Gilhooly, Langley residents, stating support.

30. A. Kelly, a Langley resident, stating support.

31. L. Warren, a Langley resident, expressing support with concerns about protecting mobile home parks.

32. K. Warren, a Langley resident, expressing support with concerns about protecting mobile home parks.

33. E. Morrison, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about protecting mobile home parks.

34. C. Pintea, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about lot sizes,

height of townhomes, density, and the Tree Protection Bylaw.

35. D. Morrison, a Langley resident, stating support.

36. R. Kostyshin, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to increased density and traffic and protecting trees.

37. R. Seguin, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about too much parkland and the tax implications.

38. R. and L. Seguin, Langley residents, expressing concerns about land use, density, and tree retention.

39. C. Burns, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about 4,000 sq ft lots, loose wording in the plan, approving developments prior to completion of the OCP, the tree cutting bylaw, and shifting density and commercial to the west side of 200 Street.

40. R. Sproule, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about 4,000 sq ft lots, loose wording in the plan, approving developments prior to completion of the OCP, the tree cutting bylaw, and shifting density and commercial to the west side of 200 Street.

41. A. and S. French, Langley residents, expressing concerns about protecting lakes in the area.

42. M. McPhee, a Langley resident, expressing support with concerns about 208 Street as an artery and affecting driveways and access, lots sizes, and planning good neighbourhoods.

43. J. van de Weteringe Buys, a Langley resident, asking for her property to be included in the townhouse/rowhouse designation.

44. M. McDonald, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about protecting the aquifer.

45. S. Harman, a Langley resident, expression opposition due to lots sizes and tree protection.

46. N. Toy submitted a 19 signature petition opposed to the plan due to their properties not being dense enough.

47. N. Bot, a Langley resident, expressing support with a concern about increased traffic on 204 Street.

48. T. W. Crossen, a Langley resident, expressing support with concerns about zoning, mobile home parks, tree bylaw, commercial development, and vague language in the OCP.

49. E. Day, a Langley resident, expressing support with concerns about protecting a mobile home park and lot size.

50. M. & L. Patchett, Langley residents, expressing concerns about protecting the aquifer and trails.

51. B. Dawe, a Langley resident, requesting that her property be included in the developable area.

52. M. Joslin, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about vague wording in the OCP, having commercial development on the south west corner of 200 Street, and stiffer fines in the tree bylaw.

53. C. & B. Humphrey, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about increased traffic and keeping green space.

54. K. Thomas, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to lot sizes being too small.
55. E. Faulkner, submitted an 83 signature petition requesting the area of Cedar Ridge South be included in the developable area.
56. R. Carey, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to increased density and the impact on the environment.
57. J. Strain, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the need for more SF-1 and SF-2 designations, bike paths, and extra traffic.
58. S. St-One, a Langley resident, and expressed concerns regarding high density, tree removal, and loose wording in the plan. She prefers the 1987 plan.
59. K. Roberts, a Langley resident, stating he does not want to see lots less than 7,000 sq ft, but would rather 10,000 sq ft minimum.
60. P. Booni, Tarsem, a Langley resident, asking for his property to be included with the townhouse/rowhouse designation.
61. K. Jarvie, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about changing the zoning of Cedar Creek Estates.
62. M. Brown, a Langley resident, commented on the need for more seniors and adaptable housing in the Brookwood-Fernridge area.
63. A. Uppal, a Langley resident, stating support for the plan.
64. D. Todosychuk, a Langley resident, commenting on land use, tree bylaw and aquaifer protection, language, development guidelines, and infrastructure.
65. T. Morrissey, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about changing the zoning of Cedar Creek Estates.
66. D. Dawson, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about vague language in the OCP, protecting wildlife and the environment, and 4,000 sq ft lots.
67. B. Maxwell, a Langley resident, stating opposition to any lots under 7,000 sq ft.
68. T. Patton, a Langley resident, stating opposition to 4,000 – 7,000 sq ft lots.
69. D. Motherwell, a Langley resident, stating opposition to 4,000 sq ft lots.
70. F. Ekkert, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about densification, road system not designed for increased population, 4,000 sq ft lots, and Cedar Creek rezoning.
71. D. Kramarik, a Langley resident, stating support for the plan.
72. R. Boyce, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to increased density.
73. B. Rost, a Langley resident, stating opposition to 4,000 sq ft lots.
74. C. Eddy, a Langley resident, stating opposition to 4,000 sq ft lots.
75. R. Eisler, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to increased density and demands on roads, schools, emergency services, environment, and hospital.
76. A. Logan, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to increased

density.

77. R. Senghera, a Langley resident, stating support for the plan.

54. S. St. Onge, a Langley resident, stated opposition due to high density, tree removal, and loose wording in the plan. She prefers the 1987 plan.

78. D. Ryan, a Langley resident, provided edits to the Bylaw.

79. Gillan Family, Langley residents, expressing concerns about increased density, lot sizes, and impact on the aquifer and sewer system.

80. R. Fitz-Patrick, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the plan.

81. Y. Tedaka, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to density and health impacts.

82. T. and C. Kozak, Langley residents, expressing concerns about increased density.

83. R. Grant, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about density, tree protection, overcrowding in local schools and hospitals.

84. L. Boivin, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about increased density.

85. C. Eddy, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about density and overcrowding in schools.

86. K. Singh, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the tree replacement policy and its cost burden on future homeowners, cluster housing, and the high community amenity charge.

87. S. Trummler, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about providing all of Brookwood with sewer, a tree bylaw for private land owners, and lack of affordable housing in Brookwood.

88. M. Belling, a Langley resident, stating support for the plan with tightening of language and principles of design.

89. P. Minten, a Langley resident, stating support but asking to amend the language in the OCP to reflect the staff report.

90. M. and C. Brown, Langley residents, expressing concerns about 4,000 sq ft lots, lack of infrastructure, and the effect on the aquifer.

91. J. Ellis, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to increased density.

92. G. Brah, a Langley resident, stating support for the plan.

93. A. Brah, a Langley resident, stating support for the plan.

94. B. Allen, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about 4,000 sq ft lots and tree removal.

95. S. Singleton, a Langley resident, provided edits to the OCP.

96. G. Beauchamp, a Langley resident, and stated that 4,000 sq ft lots are appropriate and expressed concerns about Cedar Creek Mobile Home Park property being divided into two different zonings.

97. N. Belling, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about a new trail proposed that will cross a portion of his property.

98. N. Saleh, a Langley resident, stating support for the plan with some environmental concerns.

D. TERMINATE

Moved by Councillor Davis,
Seconded by Councillor Fox,
That the meeting terminate at 10:23pm.
CARRIED

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

Mayor

Township Clerk