



## REGULAR MEETING FOR THE PURPOSE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Monday, October 26, 2020 at 7:00 PM  
Fraser River Presentation Theatre  
4th Floor, 20338 – 65 Avenue, Langley, BC

---

### MINUTES

Clerk's Note: The meeting was conducted with Council members and staff attending electronically as per Council Procedure Bylaw 2016 No. 5199 Amendment Bylaw 2020 No. 5592.

PRESENT: Acting Mayor, P. Arnason

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

R. Seifi and J. Winslade

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

### **A. ADOPTION AND RECEIPT OF AGENDA ITEMS**

#### **A.1 Regular Meeting for Public Hearing and Development Permits - October 26, 2020**

Moved by Councillor Ferguson,  
Seconded by Councillor Davis,  
That Council adopt the agenda and receive the agenda items of the  
Regular Meeting for Public Hearing and Development Permits held  
October 26, 2020.  
CARRIED

### **B. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS**

### **C. PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **C.1 Official Community Plan Amendment and Rezoning Application No. 100173 and Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 101031 (Grayrose / 21600 Block 48 Avenue) Bylaw No. 5640 Bylaw No. 5641 Report 20-127 File CD 10-31-0160**

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Murrayville Community Plan) Bylaw 1988 No. 2661 Amendment (Grayrose) Bylaw 2020 No. 5640”; and

“Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw 1987 No. 2500 Amendment (Grayrose) Bylaw 2020 No. 5641”

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5640

S. Richardson explained that Bylaw 2020 No. 5640 amends the Murrayville Community Plan by changing the designation of 0.2 ha (0.5 ac) of vacant land located in the 21600 block of 48 Avenue from “Single Family Two” to “Limited Commercial”. Bylaw 5640 also adds policy for the “Limited Commercial” land use designation. 96 public notices were mailed out.

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5641

S. Richardson explained that Bylaw 2020 No. 5641 rezones 0.2 ha (0.5 ac) of vacant land located in the 21600 block of 48 Avenue from Suburban Residential Zone SR-1 to Comprehensive Development Zone CD-153 to permit a comprehensive development consisting of two mixed use buildings. 96 public notices were mailed.

Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 101031

Running concurrently with this Bylaw is Heritage Alteration Permit No. 101031 (Grayrose / 21600 Block 48 Avenue) in accordance with Attachment A subject to the following conditions:

- a. Building plans being in substantial compliance with Schedule “A”;
- b. Landscape plans being in substantial compliance with Schedule “B” and in compliance with the Township’s Street Tree and Boulevard Planting Policy requirements;
- c. All signage being in compliance with the Murrayville Heritage Conservation Area Guidelines (Bylaw 2661), Schedule “A”, and the Township’s Sign Bylaw;
- d. Rooftop and ground level mechanical and service equipment to be screened from view by compatible architectural and landscape treatments;
- e. All refuse areas to be located within a building in substantial compliance with Schedule “A”;

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

- a. Payment of supplemental Heritage Alteration Permit application, Murrayville Pedestrian Overpass Fees, Development Cost Charges, and Building Permit Administration Fees;
- b. Landscaping and boulevard treatment being secured by letter of credit at the Building Permit stage;
- c. Written confirmation from owner and landscape architect or arborist that the 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, including onsite detention, 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;
- e. Registration of a restrictive covenant requiring onsite detention.

Submissions from the public:

1. T. Van der Hoef, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed support as the proposal respects the heritage of the area and the additional parking is much needed.
2. V. Smith, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed support as it will enrich the community.
3. S. Martin, Princess and the Pea, was in attendance and expressed opposition due to the quality of the staff report, the Parks Canada document not being adhered to, height of the building, access to the property, and safety and security issues at the hotel.
4. W. Martin, Princess and the Pea, was in attendance and expressed concerns with the staff report.
5. A. Martin, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed opposition as 5 corners is a heritage jewel and needs to be protected. She stated that this development does not fit in with historic precedent.
6. M. Rodriguez, a Vancouver resident, was in attendance and expressed opposition as the history in the area needs to be protected.
7. T. Broad, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed support for the revised proposal as the developer has addressed the concerns of the residents and the buildings fit in with area.
8. C. Sayer, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed support as this project fits in well with the community and is a perfect solution to preserve history.
9. J. Michael, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed support for this project fits in with the quaint feel of the neighbourhood and respects the history while promoting local businesses.
10. M. McGill, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed support as the project will enhance the neighbourhood.
11. K. Loveys, a Surrey resident, was in attendance and expressed

opposition as the development will take away from the uniqueness of the area.

12. J. Reid, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns regarding the public being unaware of the plans and the public hearing process.

13. W. Martin spoke for a second time and expressed further concerns regarding the staff report and the proximity of the development to the Princess and the Pea.

14. J. Reed spoke for a second time and expressed further concerns regarding the public hearing process.

15. W. Martin spoke for a third time and fourth time and expressed further concerns regarding the staff report and losing the quiet enjoyment of their property.

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. J. Alton, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings negatively affecting the heritage buildings.
2. E. Seguin, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings negatively affecting the heritage buildings.
3. T. Martin, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings negatively affecting the heritage buildings.
4. W. Breckner, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings negatively affecting the heritage buildings.
5. S. and E. Weber, Langley residents, expressing opposition to the commercial development.
6. K. Hepper, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due as the proposed development is not in alignment with the neighbourhood identity or the character of the Five Corners.
7. N. Breckner, expressing opposition due to increased traffic and not keeping the heritage in the area.
8. C. and R. Bragg, Langley residents, expressing opposition as the development does not suit the area or adjacent businesses and community.
9. H. Etsebeth, expressing opposition as the development is out of line with the character of the historic five corners neighbourhood.
10. S. Tigar, expressing opposition.
11. C. Sanders, expressing opposition.
12. K. and J. Rhindress, expressing opposition as the development is too much for the property size and location.
13. T. and L. Mayes-Won, expressing opposition as the heritage value of five corners needs to stay consistent with the plans passed in former years.
14. E. Mayes, expressing opposition as five corners should stay either residential or the buildings should be similar to what has always been

there.

15. C. Higgins, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as building an apartment or condos would be tacky and take away from the charm of five corners.

16. M. Jones, asking Council to demand significant changes to the planned structure, its placement in respect to its proximity to the heritage building, or reject it outright.

17. K. Hepper, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the location is not suitable and there is not enough parking.

18. K. Wylie, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to large apartments and overcrowding in the area.

19. S. Reich, expressing opposition as two condo buildings are too much congestion.

20. Nell Haygarth, Royal Lepage Wolstencroft Realty, Langley, expressing opposition as the proposal seems out of line with the character of the historic five corners neighbourhood.

21. J. Harvey, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to introducing a large commercial building in this delicate heritage area would hinder the beauty of the existing buildings.

22. L. Cowan, expressing opposition due to this being the wrong place to build apartments as this is a heritage area.

23. J. Wilson, expressing opposition.

24. J. Warkentin, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings at that small corner are out of place would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

25. I. Mori, a Richmond resident, expressing opposition as the buildings will change the character of this historic area.

26. K. Loveys, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings on this small lot being out of place in the area.

27. B. and F. Charlton, Langley residents, expressing opposition as commercial buildings on the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

28. A. Charlton, a Calgary resident, asking Council to send this project back to the drawing board for buffering, scale, and culturally contextual design, or just reject it outright.

29. A. Charlton, expressing opposition due to the Princess and the Pea will be ruined by a larger scale commercial strip mall development.

30. C. Woodward, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

31. M. Martin, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

32. C. Porcina, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to the proposed density is excessive and the architectural style is a feeble attempt at mimicking the heritage structures in the area.

33. S. Demeter, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.
34. E. Jantzen, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.
35. N. Hall, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the property would serve the community better as a park, the roundabout is too small, and losing too much heritage in Langley.
36. D. McLaren, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.
37. Ferne Northcott, Re/Max Performance, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.
38. G. Street, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the Traveller's Hotel and Porter's General Store are valuable historical landmarks that deserve to be preserved and respected, as does the surrounding area.
39. M. Foster, a Delta resident, expressing opposition as this is a lovely area with all of the restored heritage buildings and should be protected.
40. C. Nord, expressing opposition due to commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.
41. K. and P. Hawkings, expressing opposition as this is not the area for a commercial development.
42. A. and E. Poyntz, expressing opposition as putting a large commercial building on a small lot is out of character with the area and will block sight lines on the already complex intersection.
43. M. Foster, a Delta resident, expressing opposition as a commercial building would change the neighbourhood with increased noise and traffic, and the history should be preserved in the area.
44. J. Li, stating the current residential zoning should be retained.
45. T. Handel, expressing opposition as putting a large commercial building on a small lot is out of character with the area and will block sight lines on the already complex intersection.
46. J. McLaren, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as this historic site should remain residential and not become another busy area for businesses.
47. E. Funk, expressing opposition as the proposal is inconsistent with the existing heritage nature of the area and would be a huge loss to the Murrayville area.
48. E. Mayes, expressing opposition as there are so few historic buildings and areas left that five corners needs to be kept as close to historically accurate as possible.
49. Linda Barron, Murrayville Community Memorial Hall Association, stating that Board of Directors for the Murrayville Community Hall supports this

development.

50. B. Casalini, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

51. D. Hirsch, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

52. K. Dawso, a Nova Scotia resident, expressing opposition as this is a historical area.

53. G. Tomblin, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that small corner would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

54. G. Olaybal, a Langley resident, expressing opposition and asking that the current zoning be retained.

55. B. Cox, expressing opposition as this is not a place for shopping.

56. M. Brooks, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that small corner would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

57. G. and R. Cape, Victoria residents, expressing opposition as adding a commercial development to this site would diminish the history.

58. B. Wagner, expressing opposition as the lot should remain a greenspace.

59. B. and S. Jones, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

60. N. Haygarth, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

61. M. MacNeil, expressing opposition as it is important to place heritage and community ahead of commercial developer profit.

62. P. Deschamps, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the development is out of place on this heritage corner and will obstruct the integrity of the Princess and the Pea hotel.

63. G. Strauss, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

64. K. Hamon, expressing opposition as a commercial building in the area is inconsistent with the existing heritage setting.

65. J. Mann, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as Murrayville needs to stay untouched and need to preserve any suburban living that is left along with the history and heritage of the area.

66. H. Benson, expressing opposition as commercial development will take away from the heritage appeal of this corner.

67. J. Van Spronsen, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as it would be wrong to compromise the integrity of this historical corner.

68. M. Brown, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

69. M. Barnard and K. Kersey, former Councillors, expressing opposition as

Council should make improvements to the conditions it set out originally and incorporate amendments to the proponents plan reflecting these factors.

70. David Ratzlaff, HR Pacific Construction Management, Golden, BC, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

71. R. Cuthbertson, J. Claypool, and K. Kersey, Langley resident, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

72. J. Street, expressing opposition as there are few remaining areas of longstanding historical locations in Langley and efforts should be made to preserve them.

73. M. Maine, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as he values the residential character and historic sense of the neighbourhood.

74. T. Board, a Langley resident, expressing support as this project will be a nice and fitting addition to the neighbourhood.

75. C. Breure, a Langley resident, expressing support as the proposal covers all the aspects of what this area is about.

76. Ross, Flexion Fitness Studio, expressing opposition as the corner cannot handle anymore traffic and the area needs to stay historical.

77. M. Miri, a Langley resident, expressing support as Murrayville is in need of more housing and opportunities for small business owners.

78. N. Djuric, a Langley resident, expressing support as it will improve access to the B&B and is a well thought out development that incorporated the community feedback.

79. F. Dupuis, expressing opposition as the history deserves to be preserved and respected.

80. J. Hunter, a Langley resident, expressing support as the plan will fit in to the ambience of the neighbourhood and will help provide services for the community.

81. Paul Walker, Hagerty House Accounting in Murrayville, expressing support as the plan will make the corner useful.

82. R. Phillips, expressing opposition as the corner cannot handle any more traffic and it should stay historical.

83. Tiffany Daniel, Tenold Transportation, expressing opposition as the proposal does not fit the best interest of the neighbourhood.

84. M. Howard, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as it nice to have a place that is not congested with modern buildings and traffic.

85. G. McRae, expressing opposition as a commercial building would be an eyesore.

86. G. Lessard, a Langley resident, expressing support as the public spaces will enhance the neighbourhood and the density is not too much for such a large lot.

87. M. Cheng, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to traffic on 216 Street and adding density.



88. J. Isaak, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as this development will ruin the heritage look and feel of Murrayville.

89. K. Quinn, a Langley resident, expressing support as the development will make a lovely addition to the community.

90. V. Stephens, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

91. I. Thompson, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as there is already enough traffic at this intersection and the development would change the dynamic of this portion of the community.

92. M. McGarry, expressing opposition and asked Council to retain the basic heritage of the area.

93. C. Hipwell, expressing opposition.

94. D. Sokolov, an Ontario resident, expressing opposition.

95. S. Radatzke, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about vehicle pollution, noise, lack of parking, and pedestrian safety.

96. Yasmin Virani, Cirrius Fiance Corp, asking Council to preserve and respect the historically significant Murrayville 5 corners by keeping it small, quiet, and residential.

97. N. Jacobson, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the proposal is inconsistent with the existing heritage nature of the area and would be a loss to the Murrayville area.

98. M. Losin, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

99. D. Chambers, expressing opposition due to increased traffic in the area.

100. G. Ashwell, an Edmonton resident, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

101. N. McManus, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the development will change the character of the neighbourhood and increase traffic.

102. V. Venema, expressing opposition as a strip mall has no place in this small, heritage section.

103. The Postma family, expressing opposition as putting a large commercial building on a small lot is out of character with the surrounding and will also block sightlines in the intersection.

104. G. Betemps, expressing opposition.

105. J. Rogers, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

106. A. Tucker, a Kelowna resident, expressing opposition as the development will grossly overbuild the small lot with significant sightline and noise impacts on the existing businesses and property owners.

107. E. Clare, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the

development will impact the area and decrease the desirability of the quiet, small, and residential feel of 5 corners.

108. R. Carolsfeld, expressing opposition as the heritage should be preserved.

109. C. Martin, expressing opposition.

110. B. and S. Hoffmann, Interior resident, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

111. D. Redden, a Langley resident, expressing support as Grayrose has met the community's concerns and changed their design to better suit the community.

112. S. Shaliwal, a Langley resident, expressing support.

113. A. Routley, a Langley resident, expressing support as the project will fit in with the area with respect to height and appearance, and the businesses will be a positive addition to the heritage corner.

114. R. Reefschlaeger, a Langley resident, expressing support as the application is entirely appropriate for the area.

115. L. Holmes, expressing opposition as the heritage site should be saved.

116. R. MacLean, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as it will increase density and congestion.

117. C. and J. Hansen, Langley residents, expressing opposition as it will increase density and congestion.

118. C. Schmidt, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the area is not set up to accommodate additional traffic and residents.

119. H. Lai, a Richmond resident, expressing opposition as this is a unique, historical area.

120. J. Hunt, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as history needs to be preserved.

121. G. Barber, a Langley resident, expressing support as the scale and look of the project fits well with the location and the community.

122. K. Neudort, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.

123. J. Michael, a Langley resident, expressing support as the project fits the quant feel of Muurayville and introduces a contemporary element to this historic neighbourhood.

124. B. Yearwood, a Langley resident, expressing support as the project takes into account the aesthetics, feel, and history of the area while providing much needed housing and opportunities for small business.

125. D. Morgan, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as this land is too important to the historic 5 corners for this aggressive, dense commercialization.

126. J. Richardson, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as valuable heritage should be preserved.

- 127. L. Sorley, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as there is enough multi-family development in the Township.
- 128. J. and Y. Adkins, expressing opposition, as commercial buildings at the small corner are out of place and would negatively affect the heritage buildings.
- 129. K. and L. Kellough, Langley residents, expressing opposition as 5 corners should be left historical.
- 130. T. Bilmer, expressing opposition.
- 131. T. Spring, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the special character of 5 corners should be preserved.
- 132. K. Gleeson, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as a new build does not belong in this area.
- 133. B. and C. Keene, Langley residents, expressing opposition as the development will not fit in with the historical buildings and will cause traffic congestion.
- 134. S. Lindsay, a Langley resident, expressing opposition.
- 135. L. Parkes, a Langley resident, expressing opposition.
- 136. S. Siak, a Langley resident, expressing support as the area is best suited for commercial, the land is an eyesore and needs to be developed, and the development goes well with the heritage area.
- 137. V. and B. Moropito, Langley residents, expressing opposition.
- 138. S. Barratt, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the proposal is inconsistent with the existing heritage nature of the area.
- 139. G. and W. Burton, Langley residents, expressing opposition as it will add too much dangerous traffic in the area.
- 140. R. De Bonis, expressing opposition as protecting heritage and history comes before financial gain.
- 141. Tracy Dueck, CEO/Owner, Tracycakes Bakery, expressing support as it will help make Murrayville vibrant and strong.
- 142. G. DuPont, a Langley resident, expressing opposition.
- 143. M. Fischer and C. Simning, Langley residents, expressing opposition until the objections of the owners of Princess and the Pea are addressed in a way that does not compromise the operation of their business.
- 144. N. Girard, a Langley resident, expressing opposition.
- 145. C. Hamilton, expressing opposition as this corner should be deemed a heritage area and no-rezoning or changes should be allowed.
- 146. K. Moropito, expressing opposition.
- 147. Karen Lescisin, Owner, Porter's General Support, expressing support as this commercial/residential is the right choice for this property and the historic 5 corners.
- 148. W. Penwell, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that corner are out of place would negatively affect the heritage buildings.
- 149. M. Rodrigues, a Langley resident, expressing opposition.

- 150. S. Smith, a Langley resident, expressing opposition.
- 151. H. Warman, expressing opposition as the proposed building does not fit with the historic feel of 5 corners.
- 152. D. Whitaker, expressing opposition as the proposal is inconsistent with the existing heritage nature.
- 153. Pauline Currie, Owner of the history Mathew's Cash Grocery Building, expressing opposition as the development will increase traffic and congestion.
- 154. K. and D. Haakonsen, Langley residents, expressing concerns regarding limited parking in the area, and pedestrian and traffic safety.
- 155. R. and S. Hather, Langley residents, expressing opposition due to increased noise, blocking sightlines, and increased traffic.
- 156. Nell Haygarth, Royal LePage Wolstencroft Realty, expressing opposition.
- 157. D. Warren, a Langley resident, expressing support as the plan fits well with the existing buildings.
- 158. R. Mielnicki, a Location Manager in the film industry, expressing opposition as adding this building will erode some of the charm as well as make Murrayville far more travelled.
- 159. E. May and J. Won, expressing opposition.
- 160. S. and S. Cane, Langley residents, expressing opposition.
- 161. A. Jung, expressing opposition.
- 162. A. Dragovic, expressing support as the developer is trying to listen and preserve the heritage of the area.
- 163. G. and R. Lyles, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that corner are out of place would negatively affect the heritage buildings.
- 164. A. Martin, Princess and the Pea, expressing opposition as 5 corners is a heritage jewel and needs to be protected.
- 165. L. Gennai, expressing opposition as this unique enclave would be destroyed by this commercial development.
- 166. S. Martin, Princess and the Pea, expressing opposition due to several issues.
- 167. K. Pawlak, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the property would better serve the community as a park.
- 168. L. Bourdages, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as commercial buildings at that corner are out of place would negatively affect the heritage buildings.
- 169. J. and T. Ezinga, Langley residents, expressing opposition as the proposal will increase traffic, increase density, ruin the history of the area.
- 170. S. Thomas, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to the setback of the building, adding a parking lot, and the access to the property from 216 Street.
- 171. A. Remenik, a Langley resident, expressing opposition due to noise levels and the road access to the development being located immediately beside the residence to the south.

172. A. Vandeburgt, a Langley resident, expressing support as it will create economic growth in Langley.
173. R. Siebert, a Langley resident, expressing opposition as the development will increase noise, crime, and safety concerns.
174. Hans Rawlings, GrayRose Developments Ltd, submitted an email stating the team has engaged the community over the past two years in order to come up with a design that will be a well-loved addition to the neighbourhood.
175. D. Shnitka, a Langley resident, expressing opposition and submitted a 130 signature petition in opposition.
176. W. Martin, expressing opposition with multiple submissions.

Explanation by the proponent:

G. Klassen, Sightline Architects, was in attendance and stated that this project honours the history of the 5 corners. He stated that this is a revised proposal that took into consideration the residents' concerns. Two public input opportunities have taken place and meetings have also taken place with the surrounding businesses. A traffic consultant has provided input and the density has been reduced by half. The outdoor space will be usable by all community members. The wetlands have been retained and the parking lot has been moved away from the bed and breakfast. The entire front of the bed and breakfast will be visible from the street.

Hans Rawlins, Grayrose Development Ltd., was in attendance and stated that this is a well-designed project that pays homage to the history of the area. The project will maintain the view to the bed and breakfast and be a welcoming community gathering place. They have responded to the community's requests and desires for the neighbourhood.

#### **D. TERMINATE**

Moved by Councillor Davis,  
Seconded by Councillor Ferguson,  
That the meeting terminate at 9:00pm.  
CARRIED

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Township Clerk