



REGULAR MEETING OF TOWNSHIP COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

Monday, June 10, 2024 at 7:00pm
Fraser River Presentation Theatre
4th Floor, 20338 – 65 Avenue, Langley, BC

PRESENT: Mayor E. Woodward

Councillors T. Baillie, S. Ferguson, M. Kunst, B. Martens, M. Pratt, K. Richter, R. Rindt
and M. vanPopta

C. Kooner, S. Richardson, and J. Winslade

J. Chu, S. Little, and K. Stepto

A. ADOPTION AND RECEIPT OF AGENDA ITEMS

**1. Regular Meeting for Public Hearing and Development Permits –
June 10, 2024**

https://youtu.be/xh6p_mYLg_g?t=1099

Moved by Councillor Rindt,

Seconded by Councillor Baillie,

That Council adopt the agenda and receive the agenda items of the Regular
Meeting for Public Hearing and Development Permits held June 10, 2024.

CARRIED

B. PUBLIC HEARING

**1. Official Community Plan Amendment and
Rezoning Application No. 100278 and
Development Variance Permit No. 100157
(Qualico Communities / 8440 – 206 Street,
20701 – 84 Avenue and 8400 Block of 207A Street)**

Bylaw No. 5964

Bylaw No. 5965

Report 24-108

File CD 08-26-0231

https://youtu.be/xh6p_mYLg_g?t=1108

B. PUBLIC HEARING

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Willoughby Community Plan) Bylaw 1998 No. 3800 Amendment (Yorkson Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw 2001 No. 4030 Amendment (1124300 BC Ltd.) Bylaw No. 5964”, and

“Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw 1987 No. 2500 Amendment (1124300 BC Ltd.) Bylaw No. 5965”

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5964

S. Richardson explained that Bylaw No. 5964 amends Table 4.1 Residential Housing Mix and Densities of the Yorkson Neighbourhood Plan regarding the unit type and unit mix provisions for lands designated Mixed Residential located at 20701 – 84 Avenue, 8440 – 206 Street and 8400 Block of 207A Street. The amendments will allow the development of 18 rowhouse units, 10 semi-detached units and 28 single family lots. 495 public notices were mailed out.

Explanation – Bylaw No. 5965

S. Richardson explained that Bylaw No. 5965 rezones approximately 2.24 ha (5.54 ac) of land located at 20701 – 84 Avenue, 8440 – 206 Street and 8400 Block of 207A Street to Residential Zone R-1A and Residential Compact Lot Zones R-CL(A), R-CL(B), R-CL(SD) and R-CL(RH) to facilitate development of 18 rowhouse units, 10 semi-detached units and 28 single family lots.

Development Variance Permit No. 100157

Running concurrently with this Bylaw is Development Variance Permit No. 100157 (Qualico Communities / 8440 – 206 Street, 20701 – 84 Avenue and 8400 Block of 207A Street) in accordance with Attachment B subject to the following conditions:

- a. Section 401.5(1) – Siting of Buildings and Structures of Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw No. 2500 being varied to reduce the minimum front lot line setback requirement from 6 metres to 2.5 metres for the principal building on proposed Lots 1 – 4 as indicated in Schedule A.

Submissions from the public:

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. M. Devereux, a Langley resident, asking for ample parking spaces to be provided.
2. P. and D. Heine, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about parking and traffic and asked for two parking spots per unit.
3. K. Frederick, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about lack of parking in the area.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

MOTION

Moved by Councillor Kunst,

Seconded by Councillor Rindt,

That Council consider third reading of “Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Willoughby Community Plan) Bylaw 1998 No. 3800 Amendment (Yorkson Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw 2001 No. 4030 Amendment (1124300 BC Ltd.) Bylaw No. 5964”, and

“Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw 1987 No. 2500 Amendment (1124300 BC Ltd.) Bylaw No. 5965”.

CARRIED

MOTION

Moved by Councillor Ferguson,

Seconded by Councillor Pratt,

That Council give third reading of “Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Willoughby Community Plan) Bylaw 1998 No. 3800 Amendment (Yorkson Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw 2001 No. 4030 Amendment (1124300 BC Ltd.) Bylaw No. 5964”, and

“Township of Langley Zoning Bylaw 1987 No. 2500 Amendment (1124300 BC Ltd.) Bylaw No. 5965”.

CARRIED

2. Updates to Booth, Fernridge and Rinn Neighbourhood Plans after Second Reading

Bylaw No. 6007

Bylaw No. 6008

Bylaw No. 6009

Bylaw No. 6010

Report 24-112

File BLSI LRP00014

https://youtu.be/xh6p_mYLg_g?t=1304

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment Bylaw No. 6007”,

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment (Booth Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw No. 6008”,

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment (Fernridge Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw No. 6009”, and

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment (Rinn Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw No. 6010”

B. PUBLIC HEARING

Explanation – Bylaw No. 6007

C. Kooner explained that Bylaw No. 6007 amends the Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan by aligning the land use policies with the new regulations in the Local Government Act (commonly known as Bill 44, 2023) to require local governments to provide small-scale, multi-unit housing options that are ground-oriented and compatible in scale and form within single-family neighbourhoods; and the revised Neighbourhood Plans for Booth, Fernridge and Rinn. 2,608 public notices were mailed out.

Explanation – Bylaw No. 6008

C. Kooner explained that Bylaw No. 6008 amends the Langley Official Community Plan and Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan by incorporating the Booth Neighbourhood Plan.

Explanation – Bylaw No. 6009

C. Kooner explained that Bylaw No. 6009 amends the Langley Official Community Plan and Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan by incorporating the Fernridge Neighbourhood Plan.

Explanation – Bylaw No. 6010

C. Kooner explained that Bylaw No. 6010 amends the Langley Official Community Plan and Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan by incorporating the Rinn Neighbourhood Plan.

Submissions from the public:

1. J. Winton, Jim Patterson Developments, was in attendance and asked Council to approve the revised plans.
2. R. Seguin, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns regarding the landscape buffer west of 200 Street which negatively impacts his property value. He asked Council to amend this requirement.
3. B. Langston, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented that the new SSMUH requirements could have negative impacts on property values. He stated that this is Provincial overreach.
4. F. Santelli, a Langley resident, was in attendance and requested that the 18 units per acre on his street be increased to 24 units per acre.
5. D. Spruyt, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns that Fernridge Crescent had been changed to a lower density. He asked Council to reconsider this change in density.
6. J. Makkar, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed support for the revised Neighbourhood Plans.
7. A. Brah, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns regarding lowering the density on 40 Avenue. He asked for rental buildings of three to four storeys to be permitted.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

8. K. Saran, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns regarding shifting the landscape buffer on 30 Avenue which will decrease employment lands. He asked Council to reconsider this amendment.
9. D. McDonald, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the increase to a 40 metre setback from the Little Campbell River running through his property will decrease his property value. He asked for proper compensation.
10. M. Scott, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the new 40 metre setback from the Little Campbell River will limit his ability to develop his property. He asked for proper compensation.
11. M. Gloanec, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about his property being designated for a school/park and the indefinite timeline of this future development.
12. H. Kaler, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that he submitted an application for a medical clinic on 200 Street in 2017.
13. M. Peterson, a community planner, was in attendance and asked Council to designate 200 Street as village/commercial to accommodate a medical clinic.
14. E. Nathanielsen, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns that Fernridge Crescent had been changed to a lower density.
15. N. O'Brien, a Langley resident, was in attendance and asked Council to revert Fernridge Crescent back to 10,000 square foot lots.
16. T. Lohn, a Langley resident, was in attendance and asked Council to reconsider development on Fernridge Crescent,.
17. L. Sandhu, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that the 10 metre setback is negatively impacting development of his property.
18. A. Banwait, on behalf of K. Sidhu, was in attendance and asked Council to designate his property back to 10,000 square feet.
19. R. Dhaliwal, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated that his site is zoned for 196 lots along Anderson Creek. He asked Council to cap the townhouse density which would align lots on 205 Street to match with adjacent sites to the east.
20. R. Puri, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated a smaller scale approach to development may be beneficial.
21. P. Wasmuth, a Langley resident, was in attendance and asked for Fernridge Crescent to have increased density.
22. R. Verma, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed support.
23. N. Bhullar, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed concerns about his property being designated as school/park site. He asked for a specific timeline of acquisition of this property.
24. M. Wadhawa, a Langley resident, was in attendance and asked for townhomes to continue to 30 Avenue.
25. M. Singh Saran, a Langley resident, was in attendance and thanked Council and staff for their hard work on these plans.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

26. J. Dhillon, a Langley resident, was in attendance and stated he would like his property to be reverted back to 10,000 square foot lots on Fernridge Avenue.

MEETING RECESSED

The meeting recessed at 8:33pm

MEETING RECONVENED

The meeting reconvened at 8:44pm.

27. L. Burrige, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed opposition about changing the lots from 10,000 square foot lots to one acre lots on Fernridge Crescent.
28. H. Randhawa, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented that his property is losing 10 metres on each side of the Little Campbell River and asked to be fairly compensated. He asked for 22-26 units per acre on his property with flex units.
29. Dr. M. Davies, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented that the Little Campbell River is a threatened salmon river that needs to be protected with a buffer.
30. N. Takhar, a Langley resident, was in attendance and asked for office uses to be allowed in the commercial areas. He further asked for more commercial space at the intersection of 32 Avenue and 200 Street.
31. R. Agnello, a Langley resident, was in attendance and expressed opposition to the large landscape buffer on 30 Avenue which negatively impacts his property value.
32. U. Mehta, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on Bill 44 and Bill 46 and the requirements for school and parks to be built before development can proceed.
33. R. Sanghera, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented on the intersection of 32 Avenue and 200 Street and suggested apartments with higher density be permitted in this area to encourage a more walkable and affordable community.
34. M. Connerty, a Langley resident, was in attendance and commented that Brookwood should not turn into an area like Willoughby. She further stated that environmental protection and tree canopy should be considered with development.

The following written submissions were received from the public:

1. H. Johal, asking Council to take out the phasing criteria for development.
2. N. Toy, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about increasing lot sizes, park/school sites, transfer of land for greenway, and requiring porches on homes.
3. D. Tweety, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about increased density and lack of infrastructure.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

4. M. and L. Gloanec, Langley residents, expressing concerns about their property being zoned for future park/school site.
5. Little Campbell Watershed Society stating their support for the proposed creation of a Fernridge Nature Park and Environmentally Sensitive Areas at the Former Horne Pit site.
6. P. Wasmuth, a Langley resident, expressing support for lots smaller than 10,000.
7. G. and M. Jawanda, Langley residents, expressing support.
8. R. Lam, a Langley resident, expressing support.
9. J. Dhillon, a Langley resident, stating they want lots to be 10,000 sqft or smaller.
10. C. Davies, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about having 196 Street as a through road.
11. J. Riarh, a Langley resident, expressing support.
12. I. Hans, a Langley resident, asking to extend the townhouse zoning southward to the intersection of 28 Avenue and 200 Street.
13. J. Strain, a Langley resident, expressing support.
14. G. Grewal, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to changing the lot sizes from 10,000 sqft to one acre.
15. J. Dhillon and R. Wall, Langley resident, expressing opposition to one acre lots.
16. S. Aranas, a Langley resident, expressing support.
17. R. and M. Tingvoll, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about their property being zoned for future park/school site.
18. Bal, a Langley resident, expressing support.
19. R. Singh, a Langley resident, stating that the intersection of 200 Street and 32 Avenue should be considered for mixed-use with higher density,
20. S. Aune, a Langley resident, stating that the park trails should maintain the 30 metre setback.
21. T. and J. Kleiberg, Langley residents, expressing support.
22. M. Choi, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the zoning changes to his property.
23. Z. Binder, a Langley resident, expressing support for paragraph 4.2 – 1, 2 and 3 remaining in the community plan.
24. B. Collins, a Langley resident, expressing support.
25. N. and R. Edge, Langley residents, expressing support.
26. J. Chahal, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about his property not receiving a zoning change.
27. S. Singleton and B. Shaw, Langley resident, expressing opposition to increasing the density,
28. J. Evanochko, a Langley resident, asking for the greenway on 40 Avenue be continued to 212 Street and beyond.
29. Z. Binder and L. Gerbracht, Langley residents, asking that the polices on page 25, line 3, are written into the new community plan.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

30. M. Lamont, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about Horne Pit.
31. S. Hindmarch, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about 27 Avenue not remaining natural.
32. S. Aune, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about no basements.
33. L. Scott, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to the 40 metre setbacks for development.
34. T. McNicol, on behalf of several homeowners on 27 Avenue, north and south of the Little Campbell River, expressing opposition to changing the setback to 40 metres.
35. G. Boseley, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to 1 acre lots and would like to see 7000 sq ft lots.
36. R. Brar, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to changing the zoning of his property to school/park.
37. R. Brar, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to changing the zoning of her property to school/park.
38. R. Singh, a Langley resident, asking to designate his property for 7000 sq ft lots.
39. D. Rangi, a Langley resident, asking if 3-4 storey rental, low-rise apartments would be considered on his property.
40. B. Nagra, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to the green buffer at the back of his property.
41. L. Sandhu, Housing Advocacy Society of British Columbia, requesting the removal of the proposed setbacks.
42. R. and L. Seguin, Langley residents, expressing concerns about the proposed buffer straddling their property line.
43. K. Aujla, a Langley resident, expressing support for townhouses between 28 Avenue and 32 Avenue on 202 Street.
44. T. Rawle, Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, expressing support for the proposed amendments to add approximately 135 acres of employment lands to this area.
45. R. Tingvoll, representing five property owners, expressing concerns about their property being zoned for future park/school site.
46. H. Uppal, a Langley resident, expressing support for the proposed amendments.
47. K. Sidhu, a Langley resident, asking Council to amend the designation of properties front 32 Avenue on the south side, east of 206 Street, to SSMUH-2, to match the designation on the north side of 32.
48. K. Saran, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to the amendment regarding shifting the landscape buffer along "Employment" to the western shared property lines with rowhouse/townhouse extended further west.
49. A. Yiu, Landmark Investments Inc., asking for an increase in density for townhouses to 35 units per acre and an increase in apartment density.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

50. S. Rush, a Surrey resident, asking for the area southeast of 27 Avenue where it is a wildlife area on the Surrey side and connecting to Langley, be natural greenspace.
51. F. Santelli, representing owners on 28 Avenue, asking to increase the proposed density from 18 units per acre to 24 units per acre.
52. S. Hall, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to one acre lots.
53. W. Crossen, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about the shifting of all the proposed density reduction within the three new neighbourhood plans to the current developed area of Brookwood.
54. M. Scott, Langley residents, expressing opposition to protecting the dry stream bed on their property and prohibiting development.
55. D. Spruyt, a Langley resident, submitted a 22 signature petition in favour of reverting their properties back to SSMUH2 and SSMUH3.
56. M. Choi, Tom Lee Pacific Reality Holdings, expressing concerns regarding rezoning of properties located on 208 Street at 36 Avenue to school/park.
57. N. Bhullar, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about this property being changed to a future school/park site.
58. H. Grewal, a Langley resident, stating the townhomes are a better, more livable option with less wasted space for his property.
59. M. Dhillon, a Langley resident, asking to designate his property for 5,000 square feet lots, aligning it with the neighbouring properties on the north side of the four-lane road.
60. G. Sangha and B. Grewal, Langley residents, asking to be compensated fairly if their property is bought for a future school/park site.
61. G. Bosley, a Langley resident, expressing opposition to one acre lot size as it will depreciate his property value.
62. H. Riarh, a Langley resident, stating support.
63. N. Wala, a Langley resident, stating opposition to amendment #9 regarding adding a provision for non-profit childcare and one acre of outdoor nature and park spaces potentially located elsewhere.
64. S. St-Onge, a Langley resident, asking to be fairly compensated for the additional setbacks on both sides of the Little Campbell River that runs through her property.
65. S. Messar, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about his property being designated as a future school/park site.
66. B. Sahota, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about his property being designated as a future school/park site.
67. P. Deving, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about his property being designated as a future school/park site.
68. G. Gill, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about his property being designated as a future school/park site.
69. K. Ranson, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about his property being designated as a future school/park site.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

70. B. Wilson, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about his property being designated as a future school/park site.
71. H. Uppal, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about his property being designated as “low-density residential”. He would like this changed to SSMUH 3 zoning.
72. S. Jones, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about his property being designated as a future school/park site.
73. G. Schultz, a Langley resident, expressing concerns about increased density and lack of parking.

MOTION

Moved by Mayor Woodward,
Seconded by Councillor Rindt,
That Council consider third and final reading of “Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment Bylaw No. 6007”,

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment (Booth Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw No. 6008”,

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment (Fernridge Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw No. 6009”, and

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment (Rinn Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw No. 6010”.

CARRIED

Councillor Richter opposed

MEETING RECESSED

The meeting recessed at 9:23pm

MEETING RECONVENED

The meeting reconvened at 9:32pm.

MOTION

Moved by Mayor Woodward,
Seconded by Councillor Rindt,
That Council grant third and final reading of “Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment Bylaw No. 6007”,

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment (Booth Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw No. 6008”,

B. PUBLIC HEARING

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment (Fernridge Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw No. 6009”, and

“Langley Official Community Plan Bylaw 1979 No. 1842 Amendment (Brookwood-Fernridge Community Plan) Bylaw 2017 No. 5300 Amendment (Rinn Neighbourhood Plan) Bylaw No. 6010”.

AMENDMENT #1

Moved by Councillor Baillie,

Seconded by Councillor Rindt,

That the landscape buffer within the Booth Neighbourhood Plan be aligned with the landscape buffer of 28 Avenue within the Fernridge Plan and its width be reduced to 20 metres in the Booth and Fernridge Plans.

CARRIED

Councillors Pratt and Richter opposed

AMENDMENT #2

Moved by Mayor Woodward,

Seconded by Councillor Pratt,

That Section 4.3, Policy 4 in the Small-Scale Multi-Unit Land Use Designation Policies in each Neighbourhood Plan be revised to read as follows: “That all new subdivided lots and new townhouse developments must be rear loaded with vehicle access from a municipal lane, with straight and aligned grid patterns, except where not feasible due to slope or other site constraints as determined by the Township.”

CARRIED

AMENDMENT #3

Moved by Mayor Woodward,

Seconded by Councillor Rindt,

That Section 4.2, Policy 4c be added to in each Neighbourhood Plan to read as follows: “For lands designated as Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing, a maximum lot coverage of 28.5% will be applied to new development with the intent to be a reduced lot coverage.”

CARRIED

AMENDMENT #4

Moved by Mayor Woodward,

Seconded by Councillor Rindt,

That the proposed Apartment designation within the Booth Neighbourhood Plan directly fronting the west side of 200 Street be revised to permit optional Mixed-Use development for medical-related uses on a case-by-case basis.

CARRIED

B. PUBLIC HEARING

AMENDMENT #5

Moved by Mayor Woodward,
Seconded by Councillor Rindt,
That Section 9.1(1) in the Booth and Fernridge Neighbourhood Plans and
9.1(4) in the Booth Neighbourhood Plan be amended to add:
“This prerequisite does not apply to lands designated Employment.”

CARRIED

AMENDMENT #6

Moved by Mayor Woodward,
Seconded by Councillor Rindt,
That in the Rinn and Booth Neighbourhood Plans 9.1(4) be amended to be
“until one-half”.

CARRIED

Councillor Pratt opposed

MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED

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

Councillor Richter opposed

MOTION

Moved by Mayor Woodward,
Seconded by Councillor Rindt,
That Council adopt the Community Amenity Contributions Policy No. 07-166,
as amended.

CARRIED

Councillor Richter opposed

MOTION

Moved by Mayor Woodward,
Seconded by Councillor Rindt,
That Council adopt the Brookwood-Fernridge Greenway Amenity Policy
No. 07-235, as amended.

REFERRAL

Moved by Councillor Baillie,
Seconded by Mayor Woodward,
That Council refer the proposed Brookwood-Fernridge Greenway Amenity
Policy No. 07-235 back to staff to add the Landscape Buffer in the Booth and
Fernridge Neighbourhood Plans, where the cost of provision and construction
of the amenity feature will be shared by all eligible development properties in
an equitable manner.

CARRIED

B. PUBLIC HEARING

MOTION

Moved by Mayor Woodward,
Seconded by Councillor Rindt,
That Council adopt the Brookwood-Fernridge Arterial Road Completion
Amenity Policy No. 07-236, as amended.

CARRIED

Councillor Richter opposed

ASSOCIATED MOTION #1

Moved by Mayor Woodward,
Seconded by Councillor Pratt,
That Council direct staff to petition the Fernridge Crescent area and report to
Council on a potential Fernridge area amendment for additional density.

CARRIED

C. TERMINATE

Moved by Councillor Rindt,
Seconded by Councillor Baillie,
That the meeting terminate at 10:02pm.

CARRIED

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

Mayor

Township Clerk