



## Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004  
Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall  
Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair  
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt, Vice-Chair  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Harold Steves  
Absent: Councillor Rob Howard  
Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

### MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded  
*That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, May 4th, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, **June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2004**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

Chair advised that the agenda would be varied to hear Item 9 after Item 5.

The Committee extended their congratulations to the Public Works Department for putting on such an informational display at the Public Works Open House day.

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

In response to a query from the Committee, Mr. Crowe, Manager, Policy Planning, advised that staff had met with representatives from the airport and Mr. Laos about noise concerns. He noted that Mr. Laos had requested a community meeting, which included all Councillors and Richmond MLA's as well, however, the airport had decided to hold a community meeting facilitated by staff, about airport noise at night only. He stated that staff will ensure that Committee's original resolution for the airport to hold a community meeting on all noise concerns would be adhered to.

3. **APPLICATION BY SYEDA HUMA SHAH FOR REZONING AT 7660 NO. 2 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT (R2 - 0.7)**

(RZ 03-236469 - Report: May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7596) (REDMS No. 1241200, 1104215, 1247504)

In response to a query from the Committee, Mr. Crowe advised that a report concerning secondary suites would be brought to Committee in the near future.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7596, for the rezoning of 7660 No. 2 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Townhouse District (R2 - 0.7)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

4. **APPLICATION BY MICHAEL LI FOR REZONING AT 11511, 11551, 11571 AND 11591 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT (R2-0.6)**

(RZ 03-232158 - Report: May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7712, 7713) (REDMS No. 1221318, 1227695, 1229373, 1081817, 1110004, 1118745, 1120395, 1120335, 1221325)

Committee stated their concern that this development did not have vehicular access to the rear lane. In response Mr. Allueva advised that the residents in the area did not support this development accessing the rear lane because of increased traffic. Discussion then ensued concerning this issue and it was agreed that it was important for this, as well as other developments in the area, to have vehicular access to the lane.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaws 7712 and 7713 be referred to staff to ensure that the development has appropriate vehicular access to the rear lane.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

Councillor Barnes, in accordance with Section 100 of the *Community Charter*, advised that she was in a potential conflict of interest as she owned property which may be affected by the proposed regulation, and she then left the meeting (4:25 p.m.).

5. **APPLICATION BY G. & R. BASRA FOR REZONING AT 4180 GARRY STREET FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA A (R1/A)**  
(RZ 04-268290- Report: April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7715) (REDMS No. 1230355, 1231196, 822951, 1231509)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7715, for the rezoning of 4180 Garry Street from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area A (R1/A)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

9. **APPLICATION BY LES COHEN & AZIM BHIMANI FOR REZONING AT 4860 GARRY STREET FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA A (R1/A)**  
(RZ 04-267776 - Report: April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7719) (REDMS No. 1230553, 1237268, 822951)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7719, for the rezoning of 4860 Garry Street from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area A (R1/A)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

Councillor Barnes returned at 4:27 p.m.

6. **APPLICATION BY CHARAN SETHI FOR REZONING AT 9471 NO. 1 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1 - 0.6)**  
(RZ 04-268153 - Report: April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.: 12-8060-20-7716) (REDMS No. 1230348, 1232019)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7716, for the rezoning of 9471 No. 1 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1 - 0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

7. **APPLICATION BY KHALID HASAN FOR REZONING AT 9091 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1 - 0.6)**  
(RZ 04-268084; Report: April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2004; File No.:12-8060-20-7717) (REDMS No. 1230901; 1230929; 1235392)

In response to a query from Committee, Mr. Raul Allueva, Director of Development, advised that the depth of the lots made them unsuitable for coach house use. Discussion then ensued about density along arterial roads and staff advised that they would explore the opportunity for higher density on this site with the applicant.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Bylaw 7535, for the rezoning of 9091 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area A (R1/A)", be abandoned; and*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7717, for the rezoning of 9091 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1 - 0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

8. **APPLICATION BY FANTASY HOMES LTD. FOR REZONING AT 8511 NO. 1 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1 - 0.6)**  
(RZ 04-267891 - Report: April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7718) (REDMS No. 1232270, 1233900)

In response to a query from the Committee, Mr. Allueva, Director of Development advised that the developer had approached the owner of 8531 No. 1 Road with regards to a joint development proposal but was unsuccessful. He noted that the lots were quite shallow and not amenable to multifamily development. He stated that the area plan encouraged density on arterial roads and that this was being accomplished in an incremental fashion.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7718, for the rezoning of 8511 No. 1 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1 - 0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

10. **APPLICATION BY MATTHEW CHENG ARCHITECT TO DISCHARGE LAND USE CONTRACT 106 AND REZONE 8280 NO. 5 ROAD TO ASSEMBLY DISTRICT (ASY) AND AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT (AG1)**

(RZ 03-254766 - Report: May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7720; LUC 106) (REDMS No. 1111608, 1112315)

It was moved and seconded

*That "Land Use Contract 106" be discharged from 8280 No. 5 Road and that Bylaw No. 7720, to rezone the west 110 m of 8280 No. 5 Road" to "Assembly District (ASY)" and the remainder to "Agricultural District (AG1)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

11. **APPLICATION BY NCL REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT LTD. FOR OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT OF A PORTION OF 12251 NO. 2 ROAD FROM "INDUSTRIAL" TO "MULTIPLE FAMILY" AND FOR REZONING OF THAT PORTION FROM "LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (I2)" TO "COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/84)"**

(RZ 03-252028 - Report: May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7722, 7723) (REDMS No. 1230837, 1237193, 1237195)

In response to a query from Committee, Mr. Crowe advised that staff were meeting with developers and other stakeholders to discuss the displacement of Light Industrial/Marine Industrial and Service Commercial uses in the Trites Area. He advised that a report on this issue would not be forthcoming until late July 2004.

Mr. Raul Allueva, Director of Development, advised that this was a well designed congregate facility. The applicant had agreed to register a public rights-of-passage to provide a lane which could be accessed by future developments to minimize vehicular access to Moncton Road. He stated that the applicant had held a public information meeting and feedback from the community was positive. He advised that the applicant dealt with overshadowing by tapering a large part of the building away from single family houses.

Committee indicated their concern that this development may be premature since industrial uses in the Trites area had yet to be addressed. They were also concerned that owners of the ten properties (5560 to 5760 Moncton Street) would not be able to develop their properties if they had to contribute to a lane dedication.

In response to a letter from Jennifer Nakai to Councillor Howard (attached as Schedule 1 and forms a part of these minutes), Chair advised that the Committee did not give preferential treatment to Councillors and noted that if Councillor Howard were present, he would have excused himself for this item.

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

Mr. Greg Rafter, 5540 Moncton Street, advised that he did not oppose this development, however, he was concerned about the height of this building which was immediately behind single family homes.

Ms. Yvonne Kitade, 5600 Moncton Street, speaking for her mother, advised that she was concerned that her mother's property would be devalued because of the height of the building and the shadow it would cast on the property.

Mr. Peter Withers, applicant, introduced the team of Pat Fruer and Chris Block, advised that this was a much needed congregate facility for seniors. There would be minimal traffic since the residents would be transported by the Care Centre itself. He noted that he had met with and discussed Mr. Rafter's concerns.

Mr. Chris Block advised that the building had been designed with shallow roofs to help mitigate the height. With the aid of presentation material, he indicated that a shadow study indicated that shadowing did not affect single family houses on Moncton Street. He noted that access to the lane would be provided if back lots were subdivided.

Mr. Fruer advised that this facility was well designed and much needed in the community.

Mr. Kush Panatch, owner of the building, advised that none of the industrial tenants had been evicted. He stated that this industrial type building was low in height, in disrepair, and had a 20-30% vacancy. He noted that if this building were redeveloped as an industrial use building, it could be 10' higher than what was now proposed for this site. He advised that a comprehensive plan was needed for the area.

Discussion then ensued on the need for an Industrial/Commercial use study for the Trites/Steveston Area. In response to a query from the Committee, Mr. Erceg, General Manager, Urban Development Division, advised that staff would be able to provide a map outlining access options (e.g. lane and road) for the south end of properties on the south side of Moncton Street. He advised that this would be available for the June 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Planning Committee.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaws 7722 and 7723 be referred to staff so that a map which outlined access options (e.g. lane and roads) for the south end properties on the south side of Moncton Street could be provided.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

12. **APPLICATION BY GURMEET JAGDE FOR REZONING AT 9631 NO. 4 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1 - 0.6)**

(RZ 04-268666 - Report: April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7728) (REDMS No. 1237521, 1237708, 1237710)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7728, for the rezoning of 9631 No. 4 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1 - 0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

13. **APPLICATION BY MAX WORLD ENTERPRISES LTD. FOR REZONING AT 5220 BLUNDELL ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO COACH HOUSE DISTRICT (R9)**

(RZ 04-269065 - Report: May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7729) (REDMS No. 1238595, 1238798, 1238744)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7729, for the rezoning of 5220 Blundell Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Coach House District (R9)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

14. **APPLICATION BY TIEN SHER INVESTMENT GROUP INC. TO REZONE 7760, 7780, 7800, AND THE BACK HALF OF 7740 ASH STREET FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/35), TO AMEND COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/35) AND TO AMEND THE MCLENNAN SOUTH SUB-AREA PLAN**

(RZ 03-254898- Report: April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7731, 7732, 7733) (REDMS No. 1230512, 1230664, 1230568, 1245714)

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 7731, to amend Schedule 2.10D (McLennan South Sub-Area Plan) by introducing a map amendment affecting the area designated for "Residential, Historic Single-Family, 2½ storeys maximum 0.55 base FAR", be introduced and given first reading.*

(2) *That Bylaw No. 7731, having been examined in conjunction with the Capital Expenditure Program, the Waste Management Plan, the Economic Strategy Plan, and the 5 Year Financial Plan, is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3) of the Local Government Act.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

**15. MCLENNAN SOUTH SUB-AREA PLAN: SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SIZE POLICY**

(Report: April 29th, 2004, File No12-8060-20-7738/7611, xr 08-4045-20-10-MS) (REDMS No. 1232338, 1257743)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 7611, to amend Schedule 2.10D (McLennan South Sub-Area Plan) be abandoned.*
- (2) *That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 7738, to amend Schedule 2.10D (McLennan South Sub-Area Plan) by introducing a number of text and map amendments aimed at permitting:*
  - (a) *large-sized lots (e.g. 18 m/59 ft. minimum frontage) fronting Ash and Bridge Streets, and*
  - (b) *medium-sized lots (e.g. 12 m/39 ft. minimum frontage) fronting on new roads and General Currie Road,**in the area designated for "Residential, Historic Single-Family, 2 1/2 - storeys max., 0.55 FAR", be introduced and given first reading.*
- (3) *That Bylaw No. 7738, having been considered in conjunction with:*
  - (a) *The City's Financial Plan and Capital Program, and*
  - (b) *The Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans,**is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act.*
- (4) *That Bylaw No. 7738, having been considered in accordance with the City Policy on Consultation During OCP Development, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation.*

**CARRIED**

**16. APPLICATION BY AMAR SANDHU FOR A REZONING AT 7131 BRIDGE STREET FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/140)**

(RZ 02-218186- Report: May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.:12-8060-20-7734, 7522) (REDMS No. 1241111, 1249077)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Bylaw No. 7522, for the rezoning of 7131 Bridge Street from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)" be abandoned;*



# Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004

---

- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7734, to amend Richmond Zoning and development Bylaw 5300 by creating a new single-family residential zone, "Comprehensive Development District (CD/140)", and for the rezoning of 7131 Bridge Street from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/140)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

17. **AIRPORT BUILDING HEIGHT OPTIONS**

(Report: May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2004, File No.: 0153-01, xr0025-01) (REDMS No. 1227555)

Mr. Terry Crowe, Manager, Policy Planning, advised that staff, along with the Vancouver International Airport Authority, would explore the possibilities of if, where and how building height could be increased safely in the City.

It was moved and seconded

*That, staff be authorized to explore, along with the Vancouver International Airport Authority (VIAA), the possibility and implications of increasing building height in Richmond, as stated in the report (dated May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2004 from the Manager of Policy Planning).*

**CARRIED**

18. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Mr. Joe Erceg, advised that the Public Hearing on the City of New Westminster's designation casino had been postponed and that more material was being sent to staff for review and comment.

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (6:30 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004.

---

Councillor Bill McNulty  
Chair

---

Desiree Wong  
Acting Administrative Assistant

**MayorandCouncillors**

TO: MAYOR & EACH  
COUNCILLOR  
FROM: CITY CLERK

**From:** jennifer nakai [jrnakai@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** May 18, 2004 6:07 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Subject:** Objection to Development Proposal at 12251 No. 2 Road - Rezoning application

cc: Director, Development  
→ Re: Planning Committee, May 18,  
Item 11



12251 No. 2 Rd.doc

To: Mayor Malcolm Brodie, Councillor Linda Barnes, Councillor Derek Dang, Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt, Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt, Councillor Rob Howard, Councillor Rob Howard, Councillor Kiichi Kumagai, Councillor Bill McNulty, Councillor Harold Steves

I am strongly opposed to the rezoning application to change from "light industrial district (12)" to "comprehensive development district (CD/84)". My mother lives at 5600 Moncton Street which is next to the proposed development. I will be closing the purchase of 5620 Moncton Street in a couple of weeks.

At first, when I was discussing the purchase of the Moncton Street property, I had spoken with city planners who had advised me to wait for the October policy statement which was completed in October, 2003. In that report, there was no mention of a comprehensive development district immediately behind the single family homes on Moncton Street.

Please read the attached letter that I faxed to Raul Allueva BEFORE you meet at the planning meeting today at 4:00. Thank you very much.

Jennifer Nakai

Learn to simplify your finances and your life in Streamline Your Life from MSN Money. <http://special.msn.com/money/0405streamline.armx>



Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday, May 18th, 2004.

Jennifer Nakai  
5600 Moncton Street  
Richmond, BC V7E 3B4

May 17, 2004

Richmond Council and  
Policy Planning  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: **Objection to:** Development Proposal at 12251 No. 2 Road--Rezoning application for change from "light industrial district (12)" to "comprehensive development district (CD/84)"

This letter is to inform you that I am **strongly opposed** to the development of an **essentially 4 story** congregate care facility behind the residences on Moncton Street. Within the next couple of weeks, I will be closing the purchase of 5620 Moncton Street so that I could be next door to my mother who lives at 5600 Moncton Street. Although I am currently living in Los Angeles, there will come a time when I will return to Richmond, BC. Also, if, in the future, I should sell the Moncton Street property, any buildings that are built behind Moncton Street that devalues the Moncton Street property would, of course, be of concern to me. Therefore, I need to be involved with and aware of what happens in the Moncton Street neighbourhood. I have also included a copy of the May 10, 2004 e-mail that I sent to Rob Howard of NCL Real Estate Management Ltd. In the e-mail, I clearly voiced my objection to his development.

1. My first concern is that there is **no area plan** for south of Moncton Street. Any development will be **haphazard** at best. Also, I waited for the October 2003 area plan to be presented before I made any concrete decisions. In that plan, there was no mention of a comprehensive development district directly behind my property. In fact, I believe that plan mentioned a multi-family residential development. I have been told that the plan has been abandoned because in the past three attempts have been made to develop this area. However, three times, there has been disagreement from the public over the plan. Therefore, the planning department decided that it would be best to develop haphazardly and "go with whatever development came up" rather than follow an organized and well-developed plan.

The disagreement those past times resulted because the area residents wanted **low density developments** such as two or three story townhouses and not four story townhouses. One of the industrial area owners (I think it was Mr. Porter) resisted the development because he insisted on having his property rezoned for four story buildings. Since there could be no agreement between the developers and the residents, the plan was abandoned. Residents certainly did not want their

property devalued as the result of having higher density developments enveloping their property. The developers resisted because they wanted to make the higher profit which comes along with higher density developments. I would like to point out that developers **will make a profit** even if they build two or three story townhouses. Also, **area residents would welcome low density housing** replacing the current light industrial zoning.

2. Common sense and any **honest developer** will tell you that a 104 unit, four story congregate care facility will devalue the single-family properties it is adjacent to. Moncton Street sellers who live next to the facility will need to lower the listing price of their homes in order to sell their residences. The building will look down upon the back yards of the homes south of Moncton Street. Also, the facility will cast shadows upon the adjacent properties. I was told that by 12:00 noon, there would be no shadow upon the property at 5620 Moncton Street. That means that for half the day, there will be shadow created by the facility. Also, the morning sun is considered the best part of the day because that sunlight is not as hot as the afternoon sun.
3. I was told by persons at the planning department developers need to show that their projects will not impede the future development of the properties they are next to. By building a **four story** congregate care facility just south of Moncton Street, the **future development options of the deep lot** (240 ft. deep) three homes and very possibly, of the other seven homes, along Moncton Street are limited. If the development were low density residential (single family homes or multiple family townhomes), it would be quite easy to interest developers to purchase the Moncton Street properties and develop them. The location would be considered favourable because the homes would be surrounded completely by residential dwellings. However, when there is a **four story congregate care facility** in your back yard, it is considered a negative aspect of your home. Therefore, the residences would no longer be considered as desirable. Thereby reducing the prices that they might be sold for.
4. At the south end of Trites Road, there are new two story single family homes and three story townhouses separated by a road. Also, the single family homes had been built up so that there would be a more even line with the townhomes. Since the planning department made these requirements of the Trites Road development, why is there no plan to gradually even out the skyline between the single family homes and the four story congregate care facility? Even the townhomes and single family homes by the Steveston Community Centre have only a one story difference and have a road in between them. (Also, a road is normally **40 feet wide**. The buffer between my property line and the four story building will be only **25 feet wide**. In addition, there will be a **2 story** difference between the single family residence and the congregate care building!)
5. Finally, my greatest concern is for the welfare of my mother. She has lived on her property at 5600 Moncton Street for 44 years. During that time, she has worked hard and sacrificed much for the welfare and care of her family. She has waited patiently for the day when she could develop the back portion of her property. I do

not want the lack of sensitivity of developers or city workers to take away **any** opportunities she might have.

Note: Throughout this letter, I have referred to the facility as a four story building. This is because the bottom story is for parking, and, I have been told, it is underground by approximately three feet. The majority of that floor is above ground, not underground. Therefore, the three story plus parking level creates a four story building.

I hope that the policy planning department and city council will make clear responses to my questions and concerns.

Yours truly,

Jennifer Nakai

To: rob@ncl.ca

Subject: Development of your property near Moncton Street and No. 2 Road - senior citizen housing.

To Mr. Rob Howard:

I am opposed to you developing a senior citizen home adjacent to my property which faces Moncton Street. My property is at 5620 Moncton Street (I will be closing the purchase of it in the next couple of weeks).

1. What is the clearance of any structure on your property to the property line of my property?
2. If your structure is to be higher than the height of a single family home, your development will greatly reduce any chances that I have to redevelop the back of my property. In fact, my back property will become unsaleable to anyone but you.
3. Your structure will take away the sunlight from my property. If I plan to develop housing back there, along with my mother's property at 5600 Moncton Street, no one will want to buy any housing that sits next to a 40 or 50 foot building.
4. Your development does not allow for any break between your buildings and my property line.
5. What happened to the Richmond's Lane Establishment Policy that requires public lane access with subdivisions of four or more lots or townhomes? It should also apply to your development.
6. Are there special concessions that the Richmond council is making because of the status of senior citizen housing? How does Rob Howard's being a Council member affect the progress and acceptance of the development from the city council?

I would appreciate a response to the above issues and questions. I can be reached at either montemalagaroom7@yahoo.com or jrnakai@hotmail.com Thank you.

Jennifer Nakai