

April 19, 2004

**Re: RZ 03-251048
7840 Garden City Road**

Myself, my wife, my 8 year old son, and my newborn daughter are all categorically opposed to allowing access through 7733 Turnmill Street. The reasons are:

-the current "dead-end" play areas will be lost. They are currently used for playing catch, bike riding, skate boarding and, most importantly, playing hockey. When we purchased a unit here, this is one of our main considerations. Dead-end areas where kids can play close to home and without concern for traffic (i.e., it is "local" and there are only 27 units with vehicles):

-we are concerned about local noise increasing (e.g., with only 10 units added to our community, there will be a 37% increase in traffic and people). With increased traffic comes more air pollution (and the air vents to our homes face the roads). Also, there will be more "extra-curricular" traffic (delivery trucks, visitors, garbage and recycling trucks, construction traffic, etc.):

-the unique character, identity of our small neighbourhood will be lost. With access through our property, our development and the proposed one will be perceived as being one development by itself. The proposed development will detract from our neighbourhood's building scheme (e.g., the copper and chalet style, curved roofs, along with the style and spacing of our buildings.):

-we bought into a 27 unit development, not a 37+ unit development. In the market today, small developments like ours are rare. Our unique, small community will be lost:

-Somerset Crescent was marketed as a private and distinguished community, designed for only 27 townhomes to create a more personal, friendly and manageable community. This is what we bought in to: we paid a premium price for this concept. By opening up our community, by allowing access to our neighbour(s), our small, close-knit community becomes less attractive to buyers and, consequently, the value of our property goes significantly down:

-By allowing access through our small community, our amenities will be used beyond their design parameters (e.g., visitor parking will be filled, the park space will have a larger population using it, therefore, more maintenance required, our recycling facilities may be stretched beyond their capacity, etc.). Even if these amenities are in place next door, we have no guarantee that this will not happen, and we have no power to prevent or control it:

-why not leave access to 7840 Garden City Road as it exists now – from Garden City Road. 7831 Garden City Road is directly across the street from the proposed development where there are 80 strata units (with 5 more proposed) that have access to Garden City Road. Also, closer to the intersection, at the commercial lot (i.e., Malones Pub), there is unlimited access to Garden City Road. What is the problem

with leaving the existing access as it is? Why burden our families and why burden our property with giving 7840 Garden City Road access through our community? It seems to me that the community benefit to Richmond (i.e., access through 7733 Turnill Street)is negligible to the harm proposed to our small community. The impact of keeping the access from Garden City Road would be minimal. (Perhaps a traffic study could be done.):

-What about the costs involved with more traffic, the impact on our green space, the impact on our road system (e.g., the cobblestone sidewalk, pavement, etc..), snow removal, etc.? Currently, we pay for all these costs, and we have no legal way to get adjacent developments to pay their fair share. In effect, we are subsidizing the adjacent properties, the developers and the City of Richmond forever:

-the burden of the access easement on our land is too much. We gave up land for road dedication for free: we gave up a statutory right of way through our property for free. Now you want our neighbours to have unlimited access through our land for free. If we ever want to develop our land in the future, we are severely limited in what we can do because adjacent land parcels are dependent upon our land for access:

-in my initial research of our property and its development, there was no mention of an easement with our neighbours having unlimited access through our property forever. At the last minute, with the strata plan at City Hall, the approving Officer requested this easement. With us, the real, future property owners left with no recourse. With our deposit already in place, our family could not afford to walk away from closing the deal, as we would have lost over \$27,000 and we could have been sued for a breach of contract:

-it would be nice to plant small green spaces at the dead-ends to buffer us from next door and to enhance our community without limiting fire truck, ambulance, etc.. access:

-it seems to me that we are the only losers if access is allowed through our property. The developer, with more units, makes more money; and the City of Richmond makes more tax money because more units can be squeezed into 7840 Garden City Road.

In Summary, we oppose access through 7733 Turnill Street. It burdens our community too much. The financial costs, the loss of our community identity, the play areas for the children, the increased noise and air pollution, etc., are valid reasons to not allow access through our community. If my 8 year old son cannot see the rationale for allowing access, perhaps we should step back and also listen to our kids, who are the foundation and future of our society.

Brett Mullin
24-7733 Turnill Street
Richmond, B.C.
V6Y 4H9