

To Public Hearing	
Date:	Jan 15, 2007
Item #	2
Re:	Bylaw 8105
_____	

To: Mr. Mayor and Members of Council

From: Ms. Surjeet Kaur Sidhu  
Address: 7640 Ash Street, Richmond, B.C. V6Y 2S1

Re: West-East Access Road from Ash Street backlands

---

**As one of the oldest (23 years) Ash Street property owner:**

I am requesting that a consideration be made to allow the road to run immediately south of my property for the following reasons:

- 1. To ensure increased OPTIONS for all owners of Ash Street:**
  - currently all owners south of my property have now been designated as "multi-housing."
  - All owners North including my property have been designated as "single" family "heritage" lots. We can only develop fewer lots for the same size lots as those north of me.
2. The access road I am proposing was in the earlier and/or original plan. This plan got changed due to a presentation made by individuals that did not live on Ash Street and the letter of the other property owner has since sold and moved from Ash Street.
3. The "original" plan had designated all of the properties on Ash Street facing West up to the designated General Curry Road (with the exception of those bordering Blundell Road) as "single" family (larger) lots.
4. There has been dramatic departure from the "original" plan to what has transpired to date and continues to do so. While I have no issue with the townhouse development North of my property, I would like to see a more equitable, fair and meaningful consideration to homeowners such as myself.
5. Ash Street has been a home, neighbourhood and community for our three grown daughters. It has been wonderful source of memories for their friends, our neighbours (renters included). With our eldest daughter expecting her first born any day, and our first grandchild, I would like see another generation continue to enjoy what our children had for the past two decades.
6. The road access next to my property will provide a "natural" divide between two types of structures/designations. This would be develop a more appealing Ash Street with a diversity of structures, landscaping, natural beauty vs continuous rows of "uniform and cookie-cut" structures.

7. I believe a “real” neighbourhood is reflected by a diversity of people, generations, homes, gardens, diversity of trees etc. If our part of Ash Street facing West is developed as “single” family homes, we will have greater opportunity to develop our part of Ash Street as a place of pride and history. Coming from a Sikh heritage, extended family members are a big part of the “family” and community. I have several uncles who have also raised their families on Ash Street. We (including myself) were all born in the Village of Manuke, Punjab India. Our roots go a very long way. I would like to see my daughters and their families feel their own sense of “roots” on Ash Street.
8. I have been so inspired by the now City-owned “heritage/legacy” Park left by a Heather Street owner (do not have name) whose son is the current park caretaker. I would like all the properties on my side, do justice to the wonderful legacy the owner has left for Ash Street and the adjoining neighbourhoods to enjoy. As well, I would like to see the local schools “adopt” and learn from this park about the value of time, effort, dedication, respect and commitment as I believe was the true spirit of the “lady with the big yard.” There are numerous of species of plants, trees, birds, wild life. Without a doubt, this park will be enjoyed by generations to come. This park has been one of my reasons for digging my heels to stay on Ash Street when my house has needed numerous repairs. If today’s application goes through, I will have little incentive to
9. I am most directly impacted with the current application (subject of today’s Public Hearing). I do not want to see my property to have seven townhouses overlooking my property. I will not have privacy at any single part of my property. Having my property designated as a “single” family, larger lot subdivision will be devalued greatly. Why would anyone willing to buy a large lot/yard want to have their reason for buying it – be diminished by a row of seven townhouse. Since the north part has already been developing that way and the owners have sold and moved out. Why not create consistency even if it has happened “accidentally?”
10. I do not want to see my 85+ year old house be impacted structurally, I do not want my yard to start to sink alongside of the proposed development. For the past year my neighbour north of me has been doing extensive renovations and filling on their property. While I have welcomed the new changes, it has not been without structural changes to my backyard ground.
11. I have expressed my concerns to the City Staff at the last Public Hearing. I was assured a number of times the Developers will likely contact me and discuss my concerns as I was “the most” impacted property owner. It was only after received this Public Notice that I again contacted the City Staff. Subsequently the Developer contacted me. In my conversation with Mr. A. Wong, I learned:
  - a) he did not know there was a park designated on Ash Street. He indicated he originally wanted to put the road alongside my property but felt the City wants him to do differently. He could not have any dialogue with me until after this

Public Hearing. I have called the City Staff again and again to clarify what is protocol for me to raise my issues, how do I voice them, what information do I need to bring to the table for tonight's hearing so I will be heard.

12. I have also spoken with Lynda Clark, property owner opposite Keefer Street to see if she had any problem with having the proposed town houses on south side. She did not. In fact she indicated she would prefer the road to be a bit further down as she has already experienced and observed traffic issues at that end of the street. I also understood that her home and the two properties north of her are designated as "townhouses."

Respectfully,

Ms. Surjeet Kaur Sidhu