



REGULAR MEETING FOR THE PURPOSE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Tuesday, September 12, 2017 at 6:00 PM

George Preston Recreation Centre
20699 - 42 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 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 - Tuesday, September 12, 2017

Moved by Councillor Arnason,
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
September 12, 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.

J. Chu explained that Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 amends the Langley Official
Community Plan to provide an updated Community Plan for
Brookwood-Fernridge. 5,781 public notices were mailed out.

AMENDMENT

Moved by Mayor Froese,

Seconded by Councillor Whitmarsh,

That the revisions listed below regarding Single Family 2 and Single Family 3 be approved:

Single Family 2

That the Single Family 2 recommendation be amended as follows:

The Single Family 2 designation accommodates single family dwellings with a minimum lot size of 930 m² (10,000 ft²), except for the area that is both east of 208 Street and north of 43 Avenue where a minimum lot size of 650 m² (7,000 ft²) may be considered. To support the application of residential cluster development (see Section 3.4) and the retention of significant trees, tree stands and other natural features, the Single Family 2 designation provides for the consideration of single family dwellings with a lot size between 650 m² (7,000 ft²) and 930 m² (10,000 ft²) to be determined through more detailed neighbourhood planning. Single family dwellings with a lot size between 650 m² (7,000 ft²) and 930 m² (10,000 ft²) may only be considered where land is being protected for conservation, open space, and/or ALR buffer purposes, through residential cluster development (see Section 3.4) and other regulatory mechanisms, subject to more detailed neighbourhood planning and Council's consideration at time of development.

These policies are intended to ensure large and medium-sized lot, single family housing for lands furthest away from the centres and to encourage the retention of significant trees and other natural features through residential cluster development.

Policies:

1. Accommodate single family dwellings on a minimum lot size of 930 m² (10,000 ft²) within areas designated Single Family 2.
2. Permit the area that is both east of 208 Street and north of 43 Avenue to be used as single family dwellings on a minimum lot size of 650 m² (7,000 ft²), despite Policy #1 of this subsection.
3. Consider a lot size between 650 m² (7,000 ft²) and 930 m² (10,000 ft²) through more detailed neighbourhood plans where land is being protected for tree retention, conservation, open space, and/or ALR buffer purposes through residential cluster development (see Section 3.4). The neighbourhood plan will provide a more detailed land use plan that indicates more specifically where a lot size less than 930 m² (10,000 ft²) will be considered and policies regarding the amount of land that must be protected to allow the consideration of a lot size less than 930 m² (10,000 ft²). For clarity, 650 m² (7,000 ft²) is the smallest lot size that may be

considered through more detailed neighbourhood planning; a neighbourhood plan will consider other lot sizes between 650 m² (7,000 ft²) and 930 m² (10,000 ft²).

4. Require single family lots that are directly across a street from lands designated Single Family 1 to maintain a minimum lot size of 930 m² (10,000 ft²), despite Policy #3 of this subsection.

Single Family 3

That the Single Family 3 recommendation be amended as follows:

The Single Family 3 designation accommodates single family dwellings with a minimum lot size of 650 m² (7,000 ft²). To support the application of residential cluster development (see Section 3.4) and the retention of significant trees, tree stands and other natural features, to provide a range of housing types and to facilitate appropriate transitions between different land uses and densities, the Single Family 3 designation provides for the consideration of smaller lots and other complementary dwelling types, to be determined through more detailed neighbourhood planning.

Single family dwellings with a lot size between 371 m² (4,000 ft²) and 650 m² (7,000 ft²), manufactured home parks, detached and duplex strata developments, cottage housing / pocket neighbourhoods, duplexes, and semi-detached dwellings may be considered subject to more detailed neighbourhood planning. For clarity, the range of lot sizes and housing types described in this Section may only be considered where land is being protected for conservation, open space, and/or ALR buffer purposes, through residential cluster development (see Section 3.4), along arterial and collector roads, and within a community or neighbourhood centre, as shown on Map 1. Other regulatory mechanisms will be explored subject to more detailed neighbourhood planning and Council's consideration at time of development.

The purpose of these policies is to guide medium- and small-lot, single family housing and other complementary residential types in walkable neighbourhoods that are within or adjacent to centres and to encourage the retention of significant trees, tree stands and other natural features through residential cluster development.

Policies:

1. Accommodate single family dwellings on a minimum lot size of 650 m² (7,000 ft²) within areas designated Single Family 3.
2. Consider a lot size between 371 m² (4,000 ft²) and 650 m² (7,000 ft²) through more detailed neighbourhood plans if one or more of the following conditions exist:
 - a. where land is being protected for tree retention, conservation, open space, and/or ALR buffer purposes through residential cluster

development (see Section 3.4);

b. where the proposed lots are located along arterial and collector roads;

c. where the proposed lots are located within a community or neighbourhood centre, as shown on Map 1.

The neighbourhood plan will provide a more detailed land use plan that indicates more specifically where a lot size less than 650 m² (7,000 ft²) may be considered. In the case of residential cluster development, the neighbourhood plan will also provide policies regarding the amount of land that must be protected to allow the consideration of a lot size less than 650 m² (7,000 ft²). For clarity, 371 m² (4,000 ft²) is the smallest lot size that may be considered through more detailed neighbourhood planning; a neighbourhood plan will consider other lot sizes between 371 m² (4,000 ft²) and 650 m² (7,000 ft²) (e.g. 464 m² (5,000 ft²) or 557 m² (6,000 ft²) lots).

3. Explore manufactured home parks, detached and duplex strata developments (including rancher-style developments), and cottage housing/pocket neighbourhoods through more detailed neighbourhood plans if one or more of the following conditions exist:

a. where land is being protected for tree retention, conservation, open space, and/or ALR buffer purposes through residential cluster development (see Section 3.4);

b. where the proposed development is located along arterial and collector roads;

c. where the proposed development is located within a community or neighbourhood centre, as shown on Map 1.

The neighbourhood plan will provide a more detailed land use plan that indicates more specifically where these housing types may be considered. In the case of residential cluster development, the neighbourhood plan will also provide policies regarding the amount of land that must be protected to allow the consideration of these housing types.

4. Consider duplexes and semi-detached dwellings in neighbourhood plans along arterial and collector roads and on corner lots. The neighbourhood plan may provide further policies regarding these types of housing.

5. Restrict residential uses that are directly across a street from lands designated Single Family 1 or Single Family 2 to single family dwellings on a minimum lot size of 650 m² (7,000 ft²), despite Policies #2, #3, and #4 of this subsection."

AMENDMENT

A) Single Family 2

That the Single Family 2 recommendation be amended as follows:

The Single Family 2 designation accommodates single family dwellings

with a minimum lot size of 930 m² (10,000 ft²), except for the area that is both east of 208 Street and north of 43 Avenue where a minimum lot size of 650 m² (7,000 ft²) may be considered. To support the application of residential cluster development (see Section 3.4) and the retention of significant trees, tree stands and other natural features, the Single Family 2 designation provides for the consideration of single family dwellings with a lot size between 650 m² (7,000 ft²) and 930 m² (10,000 ft²) to be determined through more detailed neighbourhood planning. Single family dwellings with a lot size between 650 m² (7,000 ft²) and 930 m² (10,000 ft²) may only be considered where land is being protected for conservation, open space, and/or ALR buffer purposes, through residential cluster development (see Section 3.4) and other regulatory mechanisms, subject to more detailed neighbourhood planning and Council's consideration at time of development.

These policies are intended to ensure large and medium-sized lot, single family housing for lands furthest away from the centres and to encourage the retention of significant trees and other natural features through residential cluster development.

Policies:

1. Accommodate single family dwellings on a minimum lot size of 930 m² (10,000 ft²) within areas designated Single Family 2.
2. Permit the area that is both east of 208 Street and north of 43 Avenue to be used as single family dwellings on a minimum lot size of 650 m² (7,000 ft²), despite Policy #1 of this subsection.
3. Consider a lot size between 650 m² (7,000 ft²) and 930 m² (10,000 ft²) through more detailed neighbourhood plans where land is being protected for tree retention, conservation, open space, and/or ALR buffer purposes through residential cluster development (see Section 3.4). The neighbourhood plan will provide a more detailed land use plan that indicates more specifically where a lot size less than 930 m² (10,000 ft²) will be considered and policies regarding the amount of land that must be protected to allow the consideration of a lot size less than 930 m² (10,000 ft²). For clarity, 650 m² (7,000 ft²) is the smallest lot size that may be considered through more detailed neighbourhood planning; a neighbourhood plan will consider other lot sizes between 650 m² (7,000 ft²) and 930 m² (10,000 ft²).
4. Require single family lots that are directly across a street from lands designated Single Family 1 to maintain a minimum lot size of 930 m² (10,000 ft²), despite Policy #3 of this subsection.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT

Moved by Councillor Richter,
Seconded by Councillor Fox,

That a new Policy 5 be added to read as follows:

Where land is being protected for conservation (including tree stands), open space, and/or urban-rural edge buffer purposes, based on analysis conducted as part of a more detailed neighbourhood planning process, single family lots between 650 m² (7,000 ft²) and 930 m² (10,000 ft²) may be considered, subject to no more than 10% of the total land area being less than 930 m² (10,000 ft²) lots per neighbourhood.

CARRIED

AMENDMENT, AS AMENDED

The question was called on the Amendment, as amended, and it was CARRIED

AMENDMENT

B) Single Family 3

That the Single Family 3 recommendation be amended as follows:

The Single Family 3 designation accommodates single family dwellings with a minimum lot size of 650 m² (7,000 ft²). To support the application of residential cluster development (see Section 3.4) and the retention of significant trees, tree stands and other natural features, to provide a range of housing types and to facilitate appropriate transitions between different land uses and densities, the Single Family 3 designation provides for the consideration of smaller lots and other complementary dwelling types, to be determined through more detailed neighbourhood planning.

Single family dwellings with a lot size between 371 m² (4,000 ft²) and 650 m² (7,000 ft²), manufactured home parks, detached and duplex strata developments, cottage housing / pocket neighbourhoods, duplexes, and semi-detached dwellings may be considered subject to more detailed neighbourhood planning. For clarity, the range of lot sizes and housing types described in this Section may only be considered where land is being protected for conservation, open space, and/or ALR buffer purposes, through residential cluster development (see Section 3.4), along arterial and collector roads, and within a community or neighbourhood centre, as shown on Map 1. Other regulatory mechanisms will be explored subject to more detailed neighbourhood planning and Council's consideration at time of development.

The purpose of these policies is to guide medium- and small-lot, single family housing and other complementary residential types in walkable neighbourhoods that are within or adjacent to centres and to encourage the retention of significant trees, tree stands and other natural features through residential cluster development.

Policies:

1. Accommodate single family dwellings on a minimum lot size of 650 m² (7,000 ft²) within areas designated Single Family 3.
2. Consider a lot size between 371 m² (4,000 ft²) and 650 m² (7,000 ft²) through more detailed neighbourhood plans if one or more of the following conditions exist:
 - a. where land is being protected for tree retention, conservation, open space, and/or ALR buffer purposes through residential cluster development (see Section 3.4);
 - b. where the proposed lots are located along arterial and collector roads;
 - c. where the proposed lots are located within a community or neighbourhood centre, as shown on Map 1.

The neighbourhood plan will provide a more detailed land use plan that indicates more specifically where a lot size less than 650 m² (7,000 ft²) may be considered. In the case of residential cluster development, the neighbourhood plan will also provide policies regarding the amount of land that must be protected to allow the consideration of a lot size less than 650 m² (7,000 ft²). For clarity, 371 m² (4,000 ft²) is the smallest lot size that may be considered through more detailed neighbourhood planning; a neighbourhood plan will consider other lot sizes between 371 m² (4,000 ft²) and 650 m² (7,000 ft²) (e.g. 464 m² (5,000 ft²) or 557 m² (6,000 ft²) lots).

3. Explore manufactured home parks, detached and duplex strata developments (including rancher-style developments), and cottage housing/pocket neighbourhoods through more detailed neighbourhood plans if one or more of the following conditions exist:
 - a. where land is being protected for tree retention, conservation, open space, and/or ALR buffer purposes through residential cluster development (see Section 3.4);
 - b. where the proposed development is located along arterial and collector roads;
 - c. where the proposed development is located within a community or neighbourhood centre, as shown on Map 1.

The neighbourhood plan will provide a more detailed land use plan that indicates more specifically where these housing types may be considered. In the case of residential cluster development, the neighbourhood plan will also provide policies regarding the amount of land that must be protected to allow the consideration of these housing types.

4. Consider duplexes and semi-detached dwellings in neighbourhood plans along arterial and collector roads and on corner lots. The neighbourhood plan may provide further policies regarding these types of housing.
5. Restrict residential uses that are directly across a street from lands designated Single Family 1 or Single Family 2 to single family dwellings on a minimum lot size of 650 m² (7,000 ft²), despite Policies #2, #3, and #4 of

this subsection.”

AMENDMENT

Moved by Councillor Whitmarsh,

Seconded by Councillor Quaale,

That in response to concerns received at the Public Hearing, Section 4.4 (Single Family 3) of the Residential Land Use policy provisions of the 2017 Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan (Schedule B of Bylaw 2017 No. 5300) be amended to include the following as a second paragraph under Policy 2 of said Section:

Where land is being protected for conservation (including tree stands), open space, and/or urban-rural edge buffer purposes, based on analysis conducted as part of a more detailed neighbourhood planning process, single family lots less than 650 m² (7,000 ft²) may be considered, subject to the following:

- no more than 5% of the total land area being less than 464.5 m² (5,000 ft²) up to 371 m² (4,000 ft²) per neighbourhood; and
- no more than 5% of the total land area being less than 650 m² (7,000 ft²) up to 464.5 m² (5,000 ft²) per neighbourhood.

AMENDMENT

Where land is being protected for conservation (including tree stands), open space, and/or urban-rural edge buffer purposes, based on analysis conducted as part of a more detailed neighbourhood planning process, single family lots less than 650 m² (7,000 ft²) may be considered, subject to the following:

- no more than 5% of the total land area being less than 650 m² (7,000 ft²) up to 464.5 m² (5,000 ft²) lots per neighbourhood

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT

Moved by Councillor Fox,

Seconded by Councillor Whitmarsh,

That the maximum allowable area allocated having a minimum lot size of 464.5 m² (5,000 ft²) be increased from 5% to 10% of the total land area per neighbourhood.

CARRIED

Councillors Arnason, Davis, Sparrow, and Richter opposed

AMENDMENT, AS AMENDED

The question was called on the Amendment, as amended, and it was CARRIED

Councillors Arnason, Davis, Sparrow, and Richter opposed

AMENDMENT

C) Single Family 3 – 371 m2 (4,000 ft2) lots

Moved by Councillor Whitmarsh,

Seconded by Councillor Arnason,

That the Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan Schedule B of Bylaw 5300 be amended by replacing all references to “371 m2 (4,000 ft2)” with “464.5 m2 (5,000 ft2)”.

CARRIED

AMENDMENT

D) Projected Population - overall

Moved by Councillor Richter,

Seconded by Councillor Fox,

That the last sentence of Section 4 of the Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan Schedule B of Bylaw 5300 be amended to read as follows:

“The Land Use Plan for the entire Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan area accommodates an ultimate projected population of 39,000 at build-out”.

CARRIED

Councillor Long opposed

AMENDMENT

E) Projected Population – per neighbourhood

Moved by Councillor Richter,

Seconded by Councillor Arnason,

That the following projected build-out populations for the individual neighbourhoods be added to the end of Section 4 of the Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan Schedule B of Bylaw 5300:

Rinn - 5,200

Booth – 11,700

Fernridge – 9,000

Glenwood – 3,500

CARRIED

Mayor Froese and Councillors Long and Quaale opposed

AMENDMENT

F) Priority

Moved by Councillor Fox,

Seconded by Councillor Richter,

That Policy 7 be added to Section 9.1 of the Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan Schedule B of Bylaw 5300 as follows:

Growth and change in Brookwood-Fernridge should proceed with priority given to development proposals in Booth and Rinn neighbourhoods that interface with the existing developed area of Brookwood.

CARRIED

Councillors Davis, Long, and Quaale opposed

AMENDMENT

G) Properties at 20633 and 20685 – 20 Avenue

Moved by Mayor Froese

Seconded by Councillor Arnason,

That the designation for properties located at 20633 and 20685 - 20 Avenue be changed from Single Family 2 to Single Family 1.

CARRIED

AMENDMENT

H) Protection of the existing lakes

Moved by Councillor Richter,

Seconded by Councillor Arnason,

That Policy 6.2 be added to read as follows:

That the existing lakes in Brookwood-Fernridge be included as watercourses to be protected as environmentally sensitive areas.

CARRIED

Mayor Froese and Councillor Quaale opposed

AMENDMENT

I) Cedar Creek Manufactured Home Park (3031 – 200 Street)

Moved by Councillor Long,

Seconded by Councillor Quaale,

That upon adoption of Bylaw 5300, staff be directed to immediately bring forward the necessary bylaw amendments to designate the Cedar Creek Manufactured Home Park located at 3031 – 200 Street in the Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan as “Manufactured Home Park” (MHP), and schedule the required Public Hearing.

CARRIED

Councillor Richter opposed

AMENDMENT

J) Age Friendly Strategy

Moved by Councillor Arnason,

Seconded by Councillor Richter,

That Council confirm the Age Friendly Strategy is an important social component to ensure that community development is accessible and inclusionary for all ages and that the built environment reflects these values.

CARRIED

Mayor Froese and Councillors Quaale, Sparrow, and Whitmarsh opposed

AMENDMENT

K) Commercial Village

Moved by Councillor Long,

Seconded by Councillor Fox,

That Policy 8 of Section 4.8 of the Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan, Schedule B of Bylaw 5300 be amended by adding the words "Big Box Retail" as a prohibited use.

CARRIED

Councillor Quaale opposed

MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED

The question was called on the Main Motion, Bylaw No. 5300, as amended, and it was

DEFEATED

Councillors Arnason, Fox, Quaale, Richter, and Sparrow opposed

Submissions from the Public

1. D. Tocher, Brookwood Fernridge Community Association, was in attendance and commented that the Association supports the 2017 Plan with their suggested amendments.
2. A. Bergstrom, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the 2017 Plan.
3. D. Seymour, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support for both Plans.
4. R. Seguin, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his opposition to the 2017 Plan due to it being overcomplicated and the use of NCP's.
5. B. Alderliesten, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the 2017 Plan due to its creation of lower cost housing.
6. T. Morrissey, a Langley resident, was in attendance and thanked Council for their support of Cedar Creek Estates.
7. S. Trummler, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on

sewer needs, the tree bylaw for private lands, and affordable housing for seniors and lower income residents.

8. B. Langston, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the 2017 Plan with concerns about the loose language.

9. A. Morose, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support of the 2017 Plan with the amendments with, as well as the amendments proposed by the BFCA.

10. S. Singleton, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition to the 2017 Plan due to loose language and small lot size. She suggested having electric vehicle charging stations in each new complex built.

11. L. Bortolazzo, owner of Cedar Creek Mobile Home Park, was in attendance and stated his opposition to changing the zoning of Cedar Creek Mobile Home Park.

12. R. Ross, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his opposition to the 2017 Plan.

13. M. McGarry, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the 2017 Plan with the amendments from staff and the BFCA proposed amendments.

14. M. Connerty, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density.

15. W. Crossen, a BFCA, was in attendance and stated his support of the 2017 Plan with the amendments from staff and the BFCA proposed amendments.

16. K. Marsden, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the 2017 Plan.

17. J. Makkar, a Langley resident, was in attendance and his opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased cost of housing.

18. L. Flather, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support of the 2017 Plan but feels the wording is ambiguous.

19. R. Seguin, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density.

20. D. Morrison, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the original 2017 Plan without the amendments. He asked Council to go back to the original 2017 Plan.

21. K. Ingenthron, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the 2017 Plan.

22. S. Rees, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support of the 2017 Plan.

23. D. Horn, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support of the 2017 Plan.

24. R. Clapton, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the 2017 Plan.

25. G. Karls, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about development and the effects on Anderson Creek.

26. D. Rhondenizer, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support of the 2017 Plan.
27. L. Crawford, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated support of the 2017 Plan due to housing costs.
28. K. Sahota, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his opposition to the 2017 Plan due to the use of NCP's.
29. H. Gill, a Langley landowner, was in attendance and stated his support of the 2017 Plan.
30. J. Strain, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about the ambiguous language in the 2017 Plan.
31. P. Minten, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated support of the 2017 Plan.
32. N. Sivia, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition to the 2017 Plan due to development costs.
33. B. Sakhon, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the 2017 Plan.
34. P. Pattar, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about reducing single family from 80% to 75%, and a smaller commercial area and stated opposition to the 2017 Plan.
35. C. Juteau, a Surrey resident, Little Campbell Watershed Society, was in attendance and expressed concerns about an having an ecological assessment done before the Plan is adopted.
36. N. Sivia, a Langley landowner, was in attendance and stated his opposition to the 2017 Plan due to the projected timeline of implementation. He asked to stay with the 1987 Plan.
37. D. Harpur, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition to the 2017 Plan due to lot size and parking concerns.
38. C. Paley, a Surrey resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about lack of ecological surveys needed.
39. R. Benson, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that Cedar Creek Mobile Home would like to maintain its MH-1 zoning.
40. D. Mooney, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his support of the 2017 Plan.
41. J. MacDonald, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support of the 2017 Plan due to lower housing costs. She would like to see more townhouses in the core of Brookwood.
42. D. Islas, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support of the 2017 Plan due to lower housing costs.
43. A. R. a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on protecting the aquifer and asked Council to conduct environmental studies before voting on the Plan.
44. T. Horton, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about not having enough mobile home parks for affordable housing. He asked Council to designate Cedar Creek Mobile Home Park as MH-1.

45. D. Gujral, a Langley landowner, was in attendance and stated support of the 2017 Plan.
46. T. Kozak, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density.
47. E. Weisner, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition to the 2017 Plan.
48. R. Brown, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his opposition to the 2017 Plan due to lot size.
49. K. Keyworth, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about making a hasty decision.
50. M. Fischer, Triple A Senior Housing, was in attendance and stated support of zoning Cedar Creek Mobile Home Park as MH-1.
51. E. Swartz, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about needing more environmental studies before a Plan is approved.
52. K. Motherwell, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density and lack of infrastructure.
53. M. Moffat, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density.
54. R. Dushell, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated support of the 2017 Plan.
55. H. Chandi, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated support of the 2017 Plan.
56. J.P. Long, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about increased density.
57. J. Juggernat, a Langley resident, was in attendance and asked Council to move ahead with either Plan.
58. H. Gill, a Langley landowner, was in attendance and stated support of the 2017 Plan.
59. R. Benson, spoke for a second time, and commented on not widening 32 Avenue.
60. V. Sekhon, spoke a second time and stated support of the 2017 Plan.

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. K. Marsden, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan, due to lot size.
2. G. and M. Edwards, Langley residents, expressing concerns regarding zoning of their property and land value.
3. T. Morrissey, a Langley resident, expressing concerns regarding the Cedar Creek Mobile Home Park zoning.
4. L. Dhaliwal, a Langley resident, expressing support for the 2017 Plan.
5. S. Trummler, a Langley resident, expressing concerns regarding sewer, trees, and affordable housing.

6. A. Morose, a Langley resident, asking Council to implement Neighbourhood Planning and Phased Development in Brookwood-Fernridge.
7. G. and M. Thomas, Langley residents, stating opposition due to increased density.
8. N. Johnson, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to increased density.
9. B. Nagra, a Langley property owner, expressing concerns regarding reducing the zoning density around the property and no longer having his property zoned for commercial use.
10. M. D'Angelo, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about increased traffic on 36 Avenue between 208 and 200 Street.
11. H. Mahil, a Langley property owner, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
12. R. Gujral, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about only allowing 4k to 7k square foot lots immediately in the vicinity of schools and parks. Would like to see further development opportunities.
13. J. Chahal, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
14. L. Bould, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan on the basis it is not all encompassing as it excludes part of the community.
15. M. Baker, a Langley resident, expressing concerns regarding environmental impact of development.
16. L. Norris, a Langley resident, asking Council to maintain the zoning of Cedar Creek Park as Manufactured Home Park.
17. D. Stansfeld, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
18. D. Tackerman, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
19. G. Twisser, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
20. D. Smith, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
21. A. Henderson, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
22. S. Balvinder, a Langley landowner, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
23. J. Bradford, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density.
24. MP Singh, a Langley landowner, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to additional costs for developers.
25. P. Mahil, a Langley landowner, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
26. A. and H. Harms, Langley residents, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density.
27. P. Dhunna, a Langley landowner, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
28. K. Hillan, Chair of Housing Committee, LSCAT, asking Council to maintain current zoning for Cedar Creek Mobile Home Park.
29. R. and M. Tingvoll, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
30. R. Nelson, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
31. R. Verma, a Langley landowner, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
32. M. Wadhawa, a Langley landowner, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.

33. J. Grewal, a Langley landowner, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
34. H. Chandi, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
35. J. Dhesi, a Langley landowner, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
36. R. Grewal, a Langley landowner, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
37. N. Toy, a Langley resident, 19 signature petition stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
38. S. and G. Grierson, Langley residents, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
39. P. Johal, a Langley resident, asking Council to make the lot sizes smaller on 206 Street.
40. B. Lidderdale, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the costs associated with multiple meetings for the 2017 Plan.
41. A. Kelly, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
42. E. Witt, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
43. G. Dhesi, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to density.
44. G. Brah, a Langley landowner, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
45. R. Pereira, Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2107 Plan due to density.
46. M. and L. Gloanec, Langley residents, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
47. H. and A. Can Hove, Langley resident, expressing concerns about extending 32 Avenue to 208 Street.
48. L. Crawford, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
49. J. Ensing, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
50. L. and D. Adams, Langley residents, expressing concerns about extending 32 Avenue and suggested widening 16 Avenue instead.
51. K. Wong, a Langley resident, 19 signature petition stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
52. J. Prasad, a Langley resident, 12 signature petition stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
53. K. Dennis, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density, traffic, school capacity, and reduction of trees.
54. S. Owens, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to density.
55. N. Saleh, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the Ag Viability Strategy not being implemented into the 2017 Plan.
56. R. and B. Gibbons, Langley residents, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to density.
57. M. Baker, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about not addressing environmental impacts until the Neighbourhood Plan level.
58. M. Collins, a Langley resident, asking Council to build more mobile home parks in Brookwood/Fernridge.
59. M. Fischer, Chair, Triple A Senior Housing, asking Council to zone Cedar Creek Manufactured Home Park as MH-1.

60. J. Parmar, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
61. P. Minten, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
62. L. Loberti, Senior Manager, Real Estate Development, Loblaw Companies, stating that Shoppers Drug Mart at 2421-200 Street supports the 2017 Plan.
63. D. Morrison, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan, without amendments.
64. D. and H. Gilhooly, Langley residents, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
65. Blinkhorn Family, Langley residents, expressing concerns about preserving green spaces.
66. A. and S. French, Langley residents, stating cautious support for the 2017 Plan.
67. M. Joslin, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to the 2017 Plan.
68. A. Logan, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to the 2017 Plan.
69. Kamelli Mark, ALC, providing comment on the 2017 Plan.
70. M. Chatha, R. Chatha, and B. Mann, Langley landowners, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
71. K. Marsden, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about protecting the environment.
72. H. Landry, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
73. Jaspal Marwah, Regional Planner, Metro Vancouver, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
74. L. and S. Fuller, Langley residents, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
75. R. Kosthshin, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
76. B. Sidhu, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
77. R. Mann, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
78. P. Parhar, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
79. B. Mann, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
80. S. Sidhu, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
81. G. Moore, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan, due to density and infrastructure.
82. J. Strain, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the clarity of the designations.
83. J. and T. Davies, Langley residents, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
84. A. Parmar, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
85. L. and S. Fuller, Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
86. W. Black, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about changing 204 Street to a connector road.
87. M. Rauf, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
88. S. Rees, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
89. D. Tocher, BFCA, provided a summary of amendments for the 2017 Plan.
90. D. Todosychuk, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
91. K. Mann, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.

92. A. Morose, BFCA, asking Council to adopt the amendments they put forward.
93. H. Bath, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
94. M. McDonald, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about damage to the aquifer.
95. R. and L. Seguin, Langley residents, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
96. B. Brah, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
97. S. Samra, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
98. R. Seguin, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
99. B. Rost, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to density.
100. M. Williams, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to the effects on the environment.
101. S. and S. McKay, Langley residents, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
102. G. Hara, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
103. D. Tocher, BFCA, stating support for the 2017 Plan with suggested amendments.
104. B. Fraser, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
105. M. Bannister, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to impact on the aquifer and wildlife.
106. M. Connerty, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to the impact on the aquifer, trees, and density.
107. P. and B. Forsyth, Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
108. Letzrockthis, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
109. C. and T. Patton, Langley residents, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan and would like a completely new Plan.
110. B. Collins, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
111. A and S. Frost, Langley residents, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan but would like the 1987 Plan improved.
112. K. Sahota, Langley property owner, submitted a 25 signature petition against the 2017 Plan due to the financial burden on property owners in the undeveloped area.
113. K. Bains, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to cluster development.
114. A. and P. Lyon, Langley residents, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
115. R. Ross, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.
116. S. Hindmarch, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the aquifer, waterways, and fish populations.
117. C. and L. Lewis, Langley residents, stating support of the 2017 Plan.
118. B. Coote, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the aquifer, waterways, and fish populations. They suggested the proposed

wildlife corridors be widened south of 32 Avenue.

119. A. R., and Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to the impact on the aquifer, and also submitted a 295 signature petition against the Plan due to environmental protection.

120. S. Dennis, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to lot size.

121. G. Dhesi, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.

122. M. Truong, Environmental Health Officer, Fraser Health, providing comment on the 2017 Plan.

123. D. Dawson, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to density and environmental impacts.

124. K. Dhesi, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to lot size and increased traffic.

125. S. Dhesi, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density.

126. J. Dhesi, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density.

127. A. Clendening, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.

128. M. Bryce, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to increased density.

129. M. McPhee, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan with concerns about developing 200 and 32 Avenue as a retail centre, 208 Street as an artery, and lots sizes.

130. S. Samra, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.

131. C. Heath, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to lack of infrastructure.

132. J. Campbell, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.

133. S. Gill, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.

134. M. Lanki, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to density.

135. R. Eisler, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about development and the impact on the environment.

136. S. St-Onge, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.

137. D. Mooney, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.

138. H. Lotay and M. Mann, Langley landowners, stating support for the 2017 Plan.

139. J., S., and R. Senghera, Langley resident, stating support of the 2017 Plan.

140. R. Bains, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.

141. C. Juteau, Conservation Science Director, A Rocha Canada, expressing concerns about the need for an environmental assessment, impact on the environment and wildlife.

142. M. Virk, Langley property owner, submitted a 30 signature petition against the 2017 Plan due to the financial burden on property owners in the undeveloped area.

143. J. Makkar, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to development and housing costs.
144. J. Smith, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about lots smaller than 7,000 sq ft, tree protection, and overcrowding in schools.
145. S. Singleton, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan due to density.
146. B. Fraser, a Langley resident, stating support for the 2017 Plan.
147. N. Kooner, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about not enough commercial area in the 2017 Plan.
148. K. Ingenthron, a Langley resident, stating opposition to the 2017 Plan.

D. TERMINATE

Moved by Councillor Fox,
Seconded by Councillor Davis,
That the meeting terminate at 9:11pm.
CARRIED

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

Mayor

Township Clerk