



SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING FOR A PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

Monday, June 10, 2019 at 8:51 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

R. Seifi

W. Bauer and K. Stepto

A. ADOPTION AND RECEIPT OF AGENDA ITEMS

A.1 Special Council Meeting for a Public Input Opportunity and Development Permits - June 10, 2019

Moved by Councillor Davis,
Seconded by Councillor Kunst ,
That Council adopt the agenda and receive the agenda items of the
Special Council Meeting for a Public Input Opportunity and Development
Permits held June 10, 2019.

CARRIED

B DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

B.1 Development Permit Application No. 101041 (Langcorp Developments Ltd. / 5350 - 272 Street) Report 19-94 File CD 14-05-0101

Moved by Councillor Whitmarsh,
Seconded by Councillor Woodward,
That Council authorize issuance of Development Permit No.101041 to
Langcorp Developments Ltd. for property located in the 5350 - 272 Street,
subject to the following conditions:

- a. Building plans being in substantial compliance with Schedules "A" through "D";
- b. Landscape plans being in substantial compliance with Schedule "E" and in compliance with the Township's Street Tree and Boulevard Planting Policy to the acceptance of the Township;
- c. All signage being in compliance with the Gloucester Development

Permit Guidelines and the Township's Sign Bylaw;

- d. Rooftop mechanical equipment to be screened from view by compatible architectural treatments;
- e. All refuse areas to be located indoors or alternatively in a substantial enclosure and screened to the acceptance of the Township;
- f. All chain link fences being black vinyl with black posts and rails; and
- g. All outdoor storage areas being covered by a dust free surface.

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, to the acceptance of the Township;
- 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, to the acceptance of the Township;
- d. On-site landscaping being secured by a letter of credit at the Building Permit stage; and
- e. 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.

REFERRAL

Moved by Councillor Richter,

Seconded by Councillor Arnason,

That Development Permit No. 101401 be referred to staff to provide updated diagrams.

DEFEATED

Mayor Froese and Councillors Ferguson, Kunst, Long, Whitmarsh, and Woodward opposed

MAIN MOTION

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

Councillors Arnason, Davis, and Richter opposed

C. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY**C.1 Tree Protection Bylaw
Bylaw No. 5478
Report 19-78
File CD BA000025**

“Tree Protection Bylaw 2019 No. 5478”

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5478

R. Seifi explained that Bylaw 2019 No. 5478 is to regulate, prohibit and impose requirements for tree cutting and tree protection.

Submissions from the public:

1. R. Bater, a Langley resident, was in attendance, and commented that his property value will decrease if the bylaw passes, and that some allowances should be made for tree removal.
2. R. Iverson, a Langley resident, was in attendance, and stated that property owners should be grandfathered and be able to cut the trees that they planted 40 years ago, for example.
3. H. Sakurai, a Langley resident, was in attendance, and commented that adoption of a tree bylaw is a step forward for the Township. She expressed concerns about the definition of “tree”, definition of “hazardous tree”, and that the bylaw does not include the lands of development applications.
4. C. Grey, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed opposition to species exclusion and stated that any tree can be considered high risk.
5. R. Seguin, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that there is no urgency for a tree bylaw and that it is too burdensome and costly to go through the permit application process.
6. S. Gilder, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated his opposition to the proposed bylaw as it should be the right of the property owner to do what they like to their property.
7. B. Whitelaw, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that there is no need for a tree bylaw.
8. H. Guinan, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support of the bylaw.
9. Z. Rutteridge, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her opposition to the tree bylaw.
10. K. Vecchiato, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated her support for the proposed bylaw.
11. K. Coulette, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that a tree bylaw is necessary.

12. M. Connerty, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that a tree bylaw is a good first step towards tree preservation. She expressed concerns about the size of trees that are permitted for removal, and the hazardous tree removal during the night. She would like to see a yearly review with further public input if the bylaw is passed.

13. J. Evanochko, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on the importance of trees to mitigate climate change.

14. L. Gilder, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented that she had to remove trees on her property but that she planted new ones. She stated that clear cutting seems to only happen with development. She asked for more time for the public to review the bylaw.

15. A. Reminik, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that she is in support of the proposed bylaw.

16. R. Seguin spoke for a second time and that tree removal hours should match the noise bylaw with the same hours. He asked Council to not pass the bylaw.

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. G. Lambert, submitting questions for clarification regarding the bylaw.
2. J. Newstead, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to the proposed bylaw.
3. H. Choi, a Langley resident, expressing several concerns with the bylaw and stating that Council and staff should require more retention/protection of mature trees as part of any proposed development.
4. A. Morose, a Langley resident, expressing concern with section 6.2 where owners are permitted to cut down two trees within a 24 month period with a permit of arborist report.
5. T. Bettles, a Langley resident, expressing concerns regarding the effectiveness of the bylaw in ensuring healthy, mature trees are protected, and stating the proposed bylaw is more a tree cutting bylaw, rather than tree protection.
6. S. Thompson, a Langley resident, expressing concerns that the bylaw will not be enforced, and that there should be a 24 hour tip line for people to report offenders.
7. M. Ellison-Thomas, a Langley resident, asking Council to endorse the tree bylaw.
8. D. Kask, a Langley resident, stating that most of the destruction of trees comes from development and that a better job needs to be done to retain trees while developing. She further states that fruit trees need to be excluded from the bylaw and that there needs to be detail in the bylaw regarding fines.
9. L. Lassam, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about not having enough staff to enforce the bylaw and that it would have been better to copy the Surrey bylaw instead of Richmond.

10. B. Cameron, a Langley resident, expressing support for the bylaw but stating that the bylaw needs to maintain the existing character of the Township's many unique areas.

11. T. Bettles, a Langley resident and Professional Biologist and Agrologist, stating that as the bylaw is written, it is actually a tree cutting bylaw, rather than tree protection. She further suggested including provisions similar to the City of Surrey bylaw.

12. N. Toy, J. Toy, S. To, A. Toy, C. Meu, and K. Wong, stating their opposition to the bylaw.

13. R. and L. Seguin, Langley residents, stating that the bylaw is trying to cover too much area from urban to rural and that it is too burdensome and costly to go through the permit application process and hire a tree contractor.

14. K. Sahota, M. Sahota, and M. Virk, Langley residents, expressing opposition to the proposed bylaw as they feel it is flawed and unfairly punishes property owners who have to care for trees on their property. They asked Council to defeat this bylaw.

15. L. Elias, a Langley resident, expressing support for the bylaw but feels it has too many loopholes and exemptions for developers.

16. R. Bater, a Langley resident, stating that the proposed bylaw will decrease his property value.

17. R. Tapp, a Langley resident, asking Council to not pass a tree bylaw as he feels that property owners should have the right to control the trees on their property.

18. S. Hindmarch and B. Coote, Langley residents, suggesting changes for the bylaw including Alder, Birch, and Cedar trees being considered "trees", reducing the number of trees allowed to be removed to one every 24 months, and ensure that development permit applications need to adhere to the bylaw.

19. K. Lind, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to the proposed bylaw due to property owners right to remove trees if they need to.

D. TERMINATE

Moved by Councillor Davis,

Seconded by Councillor Woodward

That the meeting terminate at 10:05pm.

CARRIED

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

Mayor

Township Clerk