



Corporate NO: R249

Report COUNCIL DATE: November 6, 2000

REGULAR COUNCIL			
TO:	Mayor & Council	DATE:	November 1, 2000
FROM:	General Manager, Planning & Development	FILE:	7997-0054-00
SUBJECT:	Status Report on the Proposed Rezoning from RA to RF - 11402 and 11410 - 142 Street - By-law No. 13225 Owners: Resland Development Corporation		

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Development Department recommends that Council receive this report as information.

INTENT

In accordance with Council's direction on October 2, 2000, (Resolution No. R00-2266), the intent of this report is to apprise Council of the current status of the above-noted application and in particular, the outcome of the meetings with the community.

BACKGROUND

The proposed development involves a rezoning of the site at 11402 and 11410 - 142 Street from RA to RF to allow subdivision into approximately 14 single family lots (Appendix I). The Public Hearing for the related Rezoning By-law No. 13225 was held on October 6, 1997. Council deferred Third Reading of the by-law, and requested that the applicant address the concerns (generally with regard to the subdivision layout) that were raised by the public at the Public Hearing.

Subsequently, a layout (Appendix II) that was acceptable to the concerned residents was forwarded to Council on November 9, 1998, which was the basis on which Council granted Third Reading to the rezoning by-law on the same date.

In January 2000, the applicants requested that the file be closed to facilitate a new application involving an expanded site and new subdivision layout. On January 10, 2000, Council denied the applicants' request. Following Council's decision, the applicants confirmed that they would proceed on the basis of the original application.

On February 21, 2000, the applicants scheduled a Public Information Meeting for the neighbourhood. A letter was sent to the individual who the applicants understood was the neighbourhood spokesperson. It was understood that this person would make other neighbourhood residents aware of the meeting. However, no residents attended the said meeting.

On April 17, 2000, staff forwarded Corporate Report No. R089 (copy attached as Appendix IV) advising Council of the following:

- the status of the application;
- the applicants' desire to amend the layout; and
- the need to conduct another Public Information Meeting to apprise and seek input from the residents related to the revised layout.

Council was also advised that staff would prepare a further report for Council's consideration following the second Public Information Meeting.

DISCUSSION

On June 22, 2000, the applicants conducted a Public Information Meeting at James Ardiel Elementary School located at 13751 - 112 Avenue. Approximately 17 residents were in attendance. In that meeting, residents were shown the revised layout (Appendix III), which significantly departs from the original layout (Appendix II) that was endorsed by the residents' committee and approved by Council.

Four (4) comment sheets were filled out by residents at the meeting indicating opposition to the proposed revision. In addition, the applicants, as well as City staff, were verbally advised by the residents that they cannot support the revised layout. In the same meeting, staff also received petition letters from 68 residents who indicated opposition to the proposed revision of the subdivision layout.

The day after the Public Information Meeting, staff received a letter from the applicants requesting staff to defer the submission of the requisite report to Council until they have further consulted with the concerned neighbours.

Several weeks after the Public Information Meeting, staff received calls from the residents' committee members, inquiring on the status of the application. Specifically, the residents were concerned that staff may have submitted a report to Council without their input. Staff informed the residents that, on the request of the applicants, staff have deferred submission of the said report until the applicants further consulted with the concerned neighbours.

The neighbourhood residents are frustrated with the fact that the applicant is not proceeding with the subdivision layout which was accepted by the neighbourhood and Council.

In a recent discussion with the applicant, staff have been advised that no subsequent meetings have taken place. The applicant has also been non-committal about an intended course of action. However, staff have sent a letter (October 5, 2000) to the applicants requesting advice on their intended course of action. To date, no response has been received and, in accordance with the letter, if no response is received within 30 days of the date of the letter, Council could be requested to close the file (see copy of letter attached as Appendix IV).

CONCLUSION

The neighbourhood residents are opposed to any revision to the subdivision layout approved by Council based on input received at the Public Information Meeting held in June 2000 and conversations since that meeting. In recent conversations, the applicant has not provided advice to staff regarding their intended course of action. As such, staff have forwarded a written request to the applicant requesting information on their intended course of action. Staff will continue to monitor the situation and will keep Council apprised of any new information as it becomes available.

Murray D. Dinwoodie

General Manager

Planning & Development Department

JDM/kms

Appendix I - Location of the Subject Site

Appendix II - Council-Approved Layout

Appendix III - Revised Layout

Appendix IV - Copy of Letter to Applicant

Appendix V - Copy of Corporate Report R089

v:\wp-docs\planning\00data\oct-dec\10111000.jdm.doc

KMS 11/2/00 9:28 AM