

**City of Richmond
Planning Committee Meeting – July 17, 2007.
Chairman Harold Steves & Committee Members**

From the items I have put in your hands over the last four months or so, you will know where I am coming from.

I am very disappointed in what is now presented to you. As I see it, Onni's priority continues to be the protection of the residential density of 69 units at all costs. This excessive density and 3 storey structures, fail to respect the stated concerns and preferences of the public dating back to December of 2003.

At the same time, some real negatives have been created in the adjustments now proposed for the commercial element of Areas A & B.

- . While additional public open space has been created to the west of the Easthope throughway, this effectively limits usage and development, because the throughway results in two divided areas of public space, rather than a single larger one.**
- . Elimination of the 11 above ground parking spaces adjacent to the commercial units, for a person looking for commercial space, would be cause for concern, as easy access is now not readily available.**
- . The vacant commercial space remaining on the corner of No.1 Road and Bayview Street may be an indicator that easy access is very important for a business to thrive.**

I am on record as recommending that the 11 unit townhouse complex be rejected. I haven't changed my mind. Instead it has grown by 1,089 sq. ft.

My reasons: - It is an unacceptable conglomeration of housing units and is pretty valid evidence of the extent to which Onni will go to press for density.

***3/4* ~~3/4~~ths of this complex is at the 3 storey height.**

- It borders the walkway too closely.

- The Design Panel Meeting of May 3, 2006, states – “residential blocks seem to fit to the east, but the townhouses seemed out of place or inappropriate”.

- IT DOES NOT FIT AND SHOULD GO!!


You will be aware of my concerns for the noise, nuisance and pedestrian safety in placing 26 parking stalls in the English throughway. They come almost up to the walkway border. I believe that it should be eliminated and taken care of by establishing a parking area for the public and commercial use, in the new area opened up to the west of Easthope Passage.

You may remember the outline of ‘Residential Unit Alternatives’, which I had provided. It is essential for public acceptance, to limit Condominium Building D to 2 storeys. In suggesting 4 storeys for Condominium Building E, this was an offset for D.

A move to 4 storeys with the south end cut back, would result in a total of 50 Units (D 19 + E 31), or without the cut back, 58 (D 19 + E 39). This well exceeds the maximum of 40 now approved for the east residential sections.

I sincerely hope that the City will recognize the importance of creating a special public place on the Imperial Landing site, to commemorate the important history and role that this part of the waterfront played in the development of the Steveston community.

It is my feeling that if the above are given serious consideration, you may have a good chance of gaining public approval.


Dave Fairweather - #328 – 12931 Railway Ave