The Minutes of the Public Hearing held in the Council Chamber of the Municipal Hall, 11995 Haney Place, Maple Ridge, British Columbia on September 16, 2008 at 7:00 p.m.

Mayor Robson called the meeting to order. The Manager of Legislative Services explained the procedure and rules of order of the Public Hearing. She advised that in accordance with the Local Government Act, once a Public Hearing item is closed, no further input into that item can be received by the Municipal Council until they are either adopted or defeated. The bylaws will be considered further at the next Council Meeting on September 30, 2008.

The Mayor then called upon the Manager of Development and Environmental Services to present the following items on the agenda:

1a) **RZ/096/06**

**Maple Ridge Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw No. 6600-2008**

**Legal:** Lots 55 & 56, Section 16, Township 12, New Westminster District, Plan 26073

**Location:** 11756 & 11774 236 Street

**Purpose:** To amend Schedule “B” of the Official Community Plan

**From:** Conservation and Residential
To: Residential and Conservation
And To amend Schedule “C” of the Official Community Plan to add to conservation and to remove from conservation.

1b) RZ/096/06
Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No.6601-2008

Legal: Lots 55 & 56, Section 16, Township 12, New Westminster District, Plan 26073

Location: 11756 & 11774 236 Street

From: RS-3 (One Family Rural Residential)

To: R-1 (Residential District), RT-1 (Two Family Urban Residential) & R-3 (Special Amenity Residential District)

Purpose: To permit a 12 lot subdivision.

The Manager of Legislative Services advised that correspondence opposing the application was received from Danielle and Sonny Nielsen and Bob and Maureen Andrews.

The Manager of Development and Environmental Services gave a power point presentation providing the following information:

- Application Information
- OCP Context
- Neighbourhood Context
- Site Characteristics
- Submitted Information

Casey Morrow
Mr. Morrow expressed concern with the affect this application will have on the environment. He cited the loss of an existing wildlife corridor, the lack of an environmental impact study, the removal of existing trees on the property and the impact of additional buildings on the light, view and privacy of neighbouring residences as negative aspects of the proposed development. He questioned the quality of the land being dedicated as conservation as it will be boxed in by the new residences compared to the open green space existing presently.

Robin Burdett
Ms. Burdett stated that she is vehemently opposed to this application. She expressed concern over the negative impact of the proposed development on the environment in
the area, particularly on wildlife, due to the loss of green space. She also expressed concern with the impact of additional traffic in the area. Ms. Berdette stated that she felt that poster boards presented at the development information meeting did not adequately explain aspects of the development.

**Wayne Bissky - Applicant**
Mr. Bissky addressed concerns of residents pertaining to the green space being developed. He advised that an environmental study has been done for the application.

**Audrey Jensen**
Ms. Jensen expressed her concern over the lack of an environmental study. She felt there will be a negative impact on the environmental and avian corridor running through the area and that the property is important to the community in its natural state. She asked for clarification on the definition of conservation area and was concerned that a decision to allow this application to go forward will set a precedent for further development in the area.

**Casey Morrow**
Mr. Morrow stated that he did not feel that the public will get adequate use out of the proposed green space dedication in the application and that the current green space should be retained. He expressed concern over a precedent being set to allow for further development and loss of green space in the area.

The Manager of Development and Environmental Services provided an explanation of the work done by District staff to preserve and protect the green space and the environment of the area.

**Nadia White**
Ms. White asked why the municipality was in agreement with the builder.

The Manager of Development and Environmental Services advised that the proposal meets policies of the Official Community Plan as well as District environmental policies.

**Chris Jensen**
Mr. Jensen questioned the concept of developers continuing to submit proposals which are scaled down repeatedly until they meet District standards. He expressed concern over the size of the development being proposed and asked why the single family home existing on the two properties could not just be replaced. He spoke to the impact on the surrounding environment and the loss of green space.
Robin Burdett
Ms. Burdett echoed Mr. Jensen's concern over the process of the acceptance of development proposals by the District. She emphasized the wish of the local residents for the preservation of this parcel of land as green space.

There being no further comment, the Mayor declared this item dealt with.

2) RZ/087/07
Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No. 6602-2008

Legal: East 105 feet Lot 29, Section 16, Township 12, New Westminster District, Plan 18230

Location: 23940 118 Avenue

From: RS-3 (One Family Rural Residential)

To: R-1 (Residential District)

Purpose: To permit a 5 lot subdivision

The Manager of Legislative Services advised that correspondence in opposition was received from Cyndy Johnson.

The Manager of Development and Environmental Services gave a power point presentation providing the following information:

- Application Information
- OCP Context
- Neighbourhood Context
- Site Characteristics
- Submitted Information
- Project Details

There being no comment, the Mayor declared this item dealt with.
3)  RZ/104/07
Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No. 6599-2008

Legal:    Lot 4 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 41673, Section 16,
          Township 12, New Westminster District, Plan 24650

Location:  11224 236 Street

From:    RS-3 (One Family Rural Residential)

To:    R-3 (Special Amenity Residential District)

Purpose:  To permit a 29 lot subdivision.

The Manager of Legislative Services advised that correspondence was received from
Robert and Patricia Baker expressing concern over the impact of the proposed
development on their house.

The Manager of Development and Environmental Services gave a power point
presentation providing the following information:

- Application Information
- OCP Context
- Neighbourhood Context
- Submitted Information
- Project Details

**Rick Wright**
Mr. Wright expressed concern over the impact of increased traffic on 236 Street and
asked whether improvements to the street will be made to accommodate the traffic. He
questioned the traffic study which has been submitted for the area and asked about
construction start times and the effect of heavy truck traffic on the structure of
neighbouring homes during the construction phase.

**David Laird - Applicant Engineer**
Mr. Laird provided information on the traffic study done for the area and provided details
of improvements which will be done to calm traffic. He advised that there will be no
access off 236 Street until Creekside Street is fully developed and open. He also
advised that construction start times are governed by a Maple Ridge bylaw and that a
geotechnical study has been carried out on the site which looked at impact on
neighbouring properties.

**Rick Wright**
Mr. Wright asked if the District has a geotechnical engineer on staff.
The General Manager, Public Works and Development Services advised that there is no geotechnical engineer on staff at the District, however should the municipality feel the necessity for a peer review this would be undertaken.

There being no further comment, the Mayor declared this item dealt with.

4) **RZ/037/07**  
**Maple Ridge Zone Amending Bylaw No. 6507-2007**

**Legal:** Lot 22, District Lot 241, Group 1, New Westminster District, Plan 29188

**Location:** 12110 206 Street

**From:** RS-1 (One Family Urban Residential)

**To:** RM-1 (Townhouse Residential)

**Purpose:** To permit the development of a 13 unit townhouse complex.

The Manager of Legislative Services advised that correspondence opposing the application was received from William & Dorothy Symons, Rob & Janice Boulet, Darlene Hagel, Lloyd Floris, Ian & Elinor Schroeder, Richard Mills, Guy & Diadema Pelletier, Hans Wilhelmson, Cleave & Diane Buckton, Darryl Gunn, Barrie Jones and one anonymous letter. A petition with 73 signatures opposing the application was also received.

The Manager of Legislative Services advised that correspondence in favour of the application was received from Ted & Maxine Thordarson, A. Giesbrecht, Matthew Flynn, Dennis Hancock, Lawrence Gourlay, Kathy & Pat McCaffery, Glenn Campbell, Donna Wong, Deborah Wong, Darren Hill, Cheryl Whitford, Faye Hunter, James Cresswell, Andrea & Paul Buckley, Maureen Mustvedt, Rob Mustvedt, Richard White, Shelley Stewart, Mr. & Mrs. Sahota, Mr. & Mrs. Carotentuto, Joylene Floris, David & Arleen Thordarson and one letter with an illegible signature.

The Manager of Development and Environmental Services gave a power point presentation providing the following information:

- Application Information
- OCP Context
- Neighbourhood Context
- Site Characteristics
- Submitted Information
- Project Details
**Murray Greissel**
Mr. Greissel provided a PowerPoint presentation demonstrating the negative effect of the proposed development on the existing neighbourhood. He cited the lack of compatibility of the proposed buildings with the existing residences and the impact of additional homes on traffic flow, street parking and public safety as major concerns. He suggested that improvements to 206 Street be given consideration prior to the approval of a development of this size.

**Randy Mulligan**
Mr. Mulligan stated that this development should not be built in the neighbourhood. He expressed concern with the size, particularly the height, of the buildings in the development and the negative affect on his property and the immediate area. He also stated that the proposed three storey complex will not blend in with the current neighbourhood and provided examples of complexes built in a manner to lessen impacts on existing residences. Mr. Mulligan expressed concern with work currently being done on the property and questioned the notification process undertaken by the developer. He asked that the quality of life of residents in the existing neighbourhood be preserved and protected. Mr. Mulligan provided a copy of his statements to the Manager of Legislative Services.

**Lisa Doucette**
Ms. Doucette indicated that she is opposed to the application as the proposed 3 storey townhouse complex did not fit with the neighbourhood. She provided correspondence opposing the development to the Manager of Legislative Services.

**Andrea Drummond**
Ms. Drummond stated that she is opposed to the proposed development. She outlined concerns with the higher density zoning, the negative impact of increased traffic on 206 Street, the incompatibility of the proposed complex with existing homes on 206 Street and the establishment of precedence for similar developments in the future. Ms. Drummond also expressed opposition to the designation of 206 Street as a major corridor.

**Darryl Gunn**
Mr. Gunn stated that he is adamantly opposed to the application. He expressed that the development is a poor fit for the neighbourhood in that the three storey buildings are not compatible with the surrounding area and the proposal did not meet the criteria or spirit of the Official Community Plan. He asked that future development in the area be done responsibly and in consideration of the existing neighbourhood. Mr. Gunn questioned the validity of some of the correspondence received in favour of the application.

**Hans Wilhelmson**
Mr. Wilhelmson felt this application is premature for the neighbourhood. He expressed concern with the lack of neighbourhood fit of the proposed development and the
precedence being set to encourage more development of this nature. He also expressed concern over impacts on street safety due to the increase in traffic. Mr. Wilhelmson spoke to the height of the buildings in the complex and the impact on neighbouring houses.

Richard Mills
Mr. Mills is opposed to the development as it stands presently. He questioned the linear format of the development in comparison to other properties. He felt that this type of infill is not responsible due to the height of the buildings compared to the surrounding properties and the lack of compatibility with the existing neighbourhood.

Felice Lucarino
Mr. Lucarino read from a previously submitted letter. He indicated that he is in total opposition to the application. He expressed that the proposed complex is a poor fit for the area, does not respect the existing character of the neighbourhood and that the height of the planned buildings as well as their orientation will negate any privacy his property currently has.

Jacqueline Goolevitch
Ms. Goolevitch voiced her opposition to the application.

Melody Greissel
Ms. Greissel expressed concern with the impact of increased traffic in the area, particularly 206 Street and spoke to existing traffic safety issues. She indicated that there is a need for improvements to 206 Street and surrounding routes prior to allowing a development of this size into the area.

Andrew Farkas
Mr. Farkas' main concern was the loss of privacy due to the removal of trees from the proposed development. He felt this type of development did not belong in the neighbourhood.

Murray Greissel
Mr. Greissel continued with his PowerPoint presentation. He indicated lack of improvements on 206 Street, congested traffic flow and dangerous areas at crosswalks. He expressed that infrastructure should be provided prior to further development. Mr. Greissel also expressed concern with the apparent lack of retention and preservation of trees and environmental features on the site.

Randy Mulligan
Mr. Mulligan questioned the designation of 206 Street as a major traffic corridor and also the impact of sewerline construction to the area. He expressed concern that some letters in favour of the development came from persons who did not live in the neighbourhood.
Allan Dunn
Mr. Dunn expressed concern regarding the negative impact of increased traffic from the proposed development on 122 Avenue. He felt that adding further traffic affecting 122 Avenue, 123 Avenue and 206 Street without upgrades was not advisable due to safety issues.

Darryl Gunn
Mr. Gunn indicated his concern with the current lack of onstreet parking on 206 Street and stated that the increase in vehicles from a development of this size will add to this issue. He stated that a smaller development would be able to accommodate cars on the property. He felt that this type of development will hurt smart sustainable growth.

Glenn Campbell
Mr. Campbell stated that he is a resident in the neighbourhood and is in favour of the application. He felt that a development of this nature did meet the Smart Growth development plan, will provide affordable housing and will boost enrolment at the local elementary school. He stated that he has been aware of the potential for development in the area since he purchased his own property.

Mark Lang
Mr. Lang spoke in support of the application. He expressed that higher density such as proposed in the development will help support local schools, is in character with the Official Community Plan and will eventually contribute to bringing in better transit and infrastructure.

Andrew Farkas
Mr. Farkas indicated that residents who spoke against the application are not opposed to development, however, they are opposed to the application as presented as it is felt the proposal is not acceptable for the existing neighbourhood.

Sheila Chequer
Ms. Chequer expressed concern that the correspondence she sent in opposing this development was not mentioned and hoped information coming in is properly stored and accounted for. She spoke to the uniqueness of the existing neighbourhood due to the larger single family properties and the quality of life open spaces provide for those choosing to leave in the area. She also expressed concern with the impact on traffic and safety due to increased traffic as a result of the addition of more homes.

Mark Shroeder - speaking on behalf of his parents
Mr. Shroeder indicated that his parents are not in favour of the application and read out a letter from them. The Schroeders expressed concern with the impact of the development on the privacy of the neighbouring residences and asked that the application for rezoning be refused. Mr. Schroder questioned why a single family dwelling could not be built on the property to replace the one which has been torn down.
Ms. Dunn questioned the lineal layout from east to west of the proposed development opposed to future development going north to south. She expressed that timing of the application was premature and that the development did not have to be as large as the one proposed.

There being no further comment, the Mayor declared this item dealt with.

Having given all those persons whose interests were deemed affected by the matters contained herein a chance to be heard, the Mayor terminated the Public Hearing at 8:55 p.m.

G. Robson, Mayor

Certified Correct