



REGULAR MEETING FOR THE PURPOSE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Monday, March 19, 2018 at 8:05 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 and R. Seifi

W. Bauer, S. Richardson, and K. Stepto

A. ADOPTION AND RECEIPT OF AGENDA ITEMS

A.1 Regular Meeting for Public Hearing and Development Permits - March 19, 2018

Moved by Councillor Fox,
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 March
19, 2018.

CARRIED

B. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

B.1 Winery Lounge Endorsement Application No. 000035 (Backyard Vineyards Corp. / 3033 - 232 Street) Report 18-31 File CD 10-20-0029

Moved by Councillor Whitmarsh,
Seconded by Councillor Quaale,
That Council consider the endorsement request for a new Winery Lounge
(indoor and outdoor) for Backyard Vineyards Corp. located at 3033 – 232
Street; and further

That Council adopt the following resolution, should it decide to endorse
Backyard Vineyard's request:

“That Council has considered and ENDORSED the request by Backyard
Vineyards Corp. to locate a 60 person winery lounge (32 person interior

and 28 person patio) serving the Backyard Vineyards Corp. located at 3033 – 232 Street, Langley, characterized as having liquor service from 11:00AM to 5:00PM seven days a week.

In ENDORSING this request, Council deems that it has considered and found acceptable the location of the winery lounge; the proximity of the winery lounge to other special or recreational facilities and public buildings; the person capacity of the winery lounge; 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 March 19, 2018 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. Tim, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about noise coming from the winery, especially the bell.

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. A. Kahaki and M. Sohrabi, Langley residents, expressing concerns about visitors touching their horses, lack of parking, excess garbage from visitors, and the use of drones for weddings which scares their horses.

Explanation by the proponent:

E. Stewart, owner, was in attendance and stated that they would dampen the bell and that this winery lounge application is for a wine tasting room and gazebo.

AMENDMENT

Moved by Councillor Ricther,

Seconded by Councillor Arnason,

That the second to last paragraph be amended to read as follows:

In ENDORSING this request, Council has considered the views of area

residents expressed to Council at a Liquor Licencing Hearing held on March 19, 2018 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; AND COUNCIL WISHES TO NOTE THE FOLLOWING ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED: NOISE FROM THE BELL, MUSIC, AND NEIGHBOURING HORSE CONTACT.
CARRIED

Councillors Quaale, Sparrow and Whitmarsh opposed

MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED

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

C. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

**C.1 Development Permit Application No. 100952
(Yorkson Downs West Developments Ltd. / 20673 - 78 Avenue)
Report 18-32
File CD 08-23-0123**

Moved by Councillor Fox,
Seconded by Councillor Arnason,
That Council authorize issuance of Development Permit No. 100952 to Yorkson Downs West Developments Ltd. for property located in the 20673 - 78 Avenue subject to the following conditions:

- a. Building and signage plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules "A" through "G";
- b. Landscape plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules "H" through "J" and in compliance with the Township's Street Tree and Boulevard Planting Policy and Age Friendly Amenity Area Requirements, to the acceptance of the Township;
- c. 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), to the acceptance of the Township;
- d. Rooftop mechanical equipment to be located so that it is not visible from adjacent roads or alternatively screened from view by compatible architectural treatments;
- e. Registration of a restrictive covenant requiring a minimum of 15 of units to be provided as adaptable housing and identifying the adaptable units; and,
- f. All refuse areas to be located within buildings and/or in enclosures and screened to the acceptance of the Township.

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. Completion of all items listed in, and discharge of, restrictive covenant BB4047896 to the acceptance of the Township;
- b. Completion of all items listed in, and discharge of, restrictive covenant BB4047897 to the acceptance of the Township;
- c. Completion of all items listed in, and discharge of, restrictive covenant BB1492122 to the acceptance of the Township;
- d. Landscaping and boulevard treatment being secured by letter of credit at the Building Permit stage;
- e. 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;
- f. Submission of a site specific on-site servicing, including construction of the works within the existing access right of way, 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 the 5% Neighbourhood Parkland Fee, applicable Development Cost Charges, supplemental development permit application fees and building permit administration fees.

Submissions from the public:

1. K. Grewal, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about their water supply and the condition and width of 78 Avenue.

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. K. Grewal, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the impact on their well water and condition of 78 Avenue and the impact on local traffic.

CARRIED

Councillor Davis opposed

D. PUBLIC HEARING

**D.1 Official Community Plan Amendment and
Rezoning Application No. 100150 and
Development Permit Application Nos. 100854 and 100870
(Vesta Properties Ltd. / 20100 Block 84 Avenue)
Bylaw No. 5339
Bylaw No. 5340
Bylaw No. 5349
Report 18-27
File CD 08-26-0183 / 0184 / 0190**

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Willoughby Community Plan) Bylaw 1998 No. 3800 Amendment (Carvolth Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw 2013 No. 4995 Amendment (Vesta Properties Ltd.) Bylaw 2018 No. 5339”;

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Willoughby Community Plan) Bylaw 1998 No. 3800 Amendment (Latimer Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw 2015 No. 5101 Amendment (Vesta Properties Ltd.) Bylaw 2018 No. 5340”; and

“Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw 1987 No. 2500 Amendment (Vesta Properties Ltd.) Bylaw 2018 No. 5349”

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5339

S. Richardson explained that Bylaw 2018 No. 5339 amends the Carvolth Neighbourhood Plan by permitting the development of property at 20144 – 84 Avenue consistent with the density provisions of the Latimer Neighbourhood Plan when developed in conjunction with the properties 20166, 20178 and 20210 – 84 Avenue and Lot 139 EPP71810. 325 Public Notices were mailed out.

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5340

S. Richardson explained that Bylaw 2018 No. 5340 amends the Latimer Neighbourhood Plan between the Single Family 3, Rowhouse / Townhouse A and Rowhouse / Townhouse B land use designations to accommodate a proposed rowhouse and townhouse development on lands located in the 20100 block of 83 Avenue. 325 Public Notices were mailed out.

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5349

S. Richardson explained that Bylaw 2018 No. 5349 rezones 4.16 ha (10.28 ac) of land located in the 20100 block of 84 Avenue from Suburban Residential Zone SR-2 to Residential Compact Lot Zone R-CL(RH) and Comprehensive Development Zone CD-119 to accommodate 25 rowhouse lots and 153 townhouses. 325 Public Notices were mailed out.

Development Permit No. 100854

Running concurrently with this Bylaw is Development Permit No. 100854 (Vesta Properties Ltd. / 20100 Block 84 Avenue) in accordance with Attachment A subject to the following conditions:

- a. Building plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “A” through “L”;
- b. On-site landscaping plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “M” and “N”, 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;

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. Completion of the subdivision to create 25 rowhouse lots;
- c. Registration of party wall and common element maintenance agreements on the title of all lots;
- d. Registration of an easement securing the required visitor parking stalls;
- e. On-site landscaping to be secured by letter of credit at building permit stage;
- f. Written confirmation from the owner and landscape architect or arborist that tree protection fencing identified in the tree management plan is in place; and
- g. Payment of supplemental development permit application fees, Development Cost Charges, and building permit administration fees.

Development Permit No. 100870

Running concurrently with this Bylaw is Development Permit No. 100870 (Vesta Properties Ltd. / 20100 Block 84 Avenue) in accordance with Attachment B subject to the following conditions:

- a. Building plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “A” through “DD”;
- b. On-site landscaping plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules “EE” through “HH”, 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;

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. On-site landscaping 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. 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;
- e. 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.

D.2

**Rezoning Application No. 100498
(Broatch / 0802881 BC Ltd. / 995 - 224 Street)
Bylaw No. 5350
Report 18-30
File CD 10-07-0022**

“Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw 1987 No. 2500 Amendment (Broatch) Bylaw 2018 No. 5350”

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5350

S. Richardson explained that Bylaw 2018 No. 5350 rezones a 1.2 ha (2.96 ac) portion of a 15.98 ha (39.5 ac) parcel of land located at 995 – 224 Street to Agricultural Processing Zone RU-6 to permit operation of an

abattoir facility. 42 Public Notices were mailed out.

Submissions from the public.

1. K. Ballantine, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that she tried to re-zone her farm for the same purposes in 2016 and was rejected. She further stated that the proponent has not provided a business plan and because of this, the impact on the environment and waterways is not known.
2. J. Carter, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated concerns regarding impact on the aquifer, vermin control, offal disposal, and having a processing facility in this area which may be better suited in an industrial area.
3. A. Deglan, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about chicken parts on his property and odour. He further commented on the impact on the aquifer, and traffic and noise.
4. E. Wrigley, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on health concerns with chicken farming, lack of regulations for slaughterhouses, and impact on the environment. She stated that this type of business should be in an industrial area that has municipal services.
5. V. Blinkhorn, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition due to lack of knowledge about the long term effects on water in the area. She further commented that this area does not have municipal services and that other chicken farms in the area send their chickens out for processing. She stated that there is no precedent for an abattoir on ALR land in the Township. She asked Council to refer this application back to staff for further investigation.
6. N. Clark, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition due to a lack of a business plan, insufficient notification of neighbours, water usage, effect on the aquifer and fish-bearing creeks on the property, and effect on agritourism in the area. She suggested moving this business to Gloucester Estates.
7. M. Freedel, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition due to odour and debris and the negative effect on her property. She suggested this business be in an industrial area.
8. B. Uden, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition due to impact on the aquifer and local wells.
9. M. Green, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns regarding water use, polluting surrounding lands, and health issues.
10. N. Sharbeno, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about disposing chickens in manure piles.
11. I. McKaig, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition due to the impact on groundwater and septic systems.
12. T. Yeeden, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his

opposition.

13. J. Barnes, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated opposition due to water usage, traffic impacts, scavenger animals and birds, and this type of business in a rural area.

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. N. Clark, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to a lack of a business plan, insufficient notification of neighbours, water usage, effect on the aquifer, fish-baring creeks on the property, and effect on agritourism in the area.
2. R. Debus, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to the effect on the aquifer and the environment, and lack of a business plan.
3. S. Bergmann a Langley resident, stating opposition due to increased traffic and polluting the aquifer.
4. A Langley resident, stating opposition due to the effect on the environment and streams on the property, odour, and lack of a business plan.
5. M. Yeoell, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to water supply, waste management, negative impact on neighbouring farms, effect on birds, and lack of a business plan.
6. P. Graham and K. Ragan, Langley residents, stating opposition due to the risk of contamination of the Little Campbell River waterways.
7. C. Bishop, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to poor farming practices, lack of business plan, contamination of watercourse, and odour.
8. R. Pandher, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to negative effects on his property.
9. B. Coote, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to lack of a business plan and effect on Little Campbell River.
10. L. Thomsan, a Langley resident, stating opposition.
11. C. Repka, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to the welfare of the chickens.
12. E. Wrigley, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to the effect on the aquifer and air quality.
13. B. and M. Degrazio, Langley residents, expressing concerns that large scale animal slaughter should be housed in more industrial areas where there is infrastructure to support the operation.
14. A. Jain, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to the effects on the environment and the ill effects of consuming animal products.
15. A. Keller, stating opposition.
16. C. Carnerie, stating opposition due to the effects on the environment and animal suffering.
17. A Langley resident, expressing concerns that no business or marketing plan has been made by the applicant, and that no business cases can be made for the applicant.

18. C. Tong, stating opposition to the effects on the environment and odour.
19. O. Surrensen, a Langley resident, stating opposition due the impact on his property value.
20. S. Clark, stating opposition.
21. J. Elliott, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to impacts on water quality, odour, and greenhouse gas production.
22. P. Nabuco, expressing concerns about environmental impact and mental health safety of the workers.
23. C. Cassidy, expressing opposition due to odour and it is wet and slippery.
24. C. Cassidy, expressing opposition due to odour, increased traffic, and mental health of the workers.
25. A. Dudziuk, expressing opposition due to environmental impact, pollution and waste, and mental health of workers.
26. D. Marsh, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to animal cruelty and decreased property values.
27. D. Traill, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to water consumption, increase in rats, odour, and impact on the neighbouring properties.
28. M. Miranda, expressing opposition due to the environmental impact, pollution, waste, odour, safety standards, and mental health of workers.
29. S. S. expressing opposition due to odour and cleanliness of farm.
30. J. Rigar, expressing opposition due to the environmental impact, greenhouse gas emissions, land degradation, deforestation, and acidic dead zones in the ocean, also the mental health of the workers.
31. S. Stretten, stating opposition.
32. I. McKaig, stating opposition due to the impact on groundwater and septic systems.
33. K. Ballantyne, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the impact on the environment and waterways.
34. B. Brocklebank, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to water supply and waste management.
35. N. and G. Johe, Langley residents, stating opposition due to contamination of the water table, waste disposal, noise, and impact on property values in area.
36. A. Hay, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to this type of business in a rural area.
37. V. Blinkhorn, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to water use, safety, and sustainability.
38. K. Ballantine, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the lack of a business plan and because of this, the impact on the environment and waterways is not known.
39. P. Nabuco, a Langley resident, stating opposition due to the environmental impact and the mental health of the workers.

40. Eugene Kwan, Chaperton Estate Winery, stating opposition due to noxious odours coming onto his winery, vineyard, and restaurant.

41. B. Wray, a Langley resident, stating support for the application as he has not experienced bad odours from other abattoirs.

E. TERMINATE

Moved by Councillor Davis,
Seconded by Councillor Long,
That the meeting terminate at 10:05pm.
CARRIED

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

Mayor

Township Clerk