



Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, August 24th, 2004
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt, Vice-Chair
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Harold Steves
Absent: Councillor Linda Barnes
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, July 20th, 2004, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Wednesday, September 8th, 2004, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

At this point the Chair indicated that the order of the agenda would be varied as follows:

The following *referral* motion was introduced:

Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2004

It was moved and seconded

That the current standard of a 50m notification area for new development be examined and a recommendation made as to what increase to the notification area would better serve the public consultation process.

Prior to the question being called Cllr. S. Halsey-Brandt requested that any increased area consider the affected neighbourhood in conjunction with a linear radius.

The question was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

3. **INTERIM STRATEGY FOR MANAGING TOWNHOUSE AND SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL REZONING APPLICATIONS DURING THE REVIEW OF THE LANE ESTABLISHMENT AND ARTERIAL ROAD REDEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

(Report: Aug. 5/04, File No.: 08-4105-00; xr 6360-00) (REDMS No. 1322323, 442122, 439247)

It was moved and seconded

That the following "Interim Strategy for Managing Townhouse and Single-Family Residential Rezoning Applications During the Review of the Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies", (which is attached as Schedule 1 and forms a part of these minutes), take immediate effect:

Except in the following cases, rezoning applications for development along arterial roads that are subject to the Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies will be deferred until the review of these policies is complete and approved by Council:

- *Townhouses (requiring a land assembly of at least 30 m frontage) where shared access for adjacent sites is provided;*
- *Single-family residential proposals, where a municipal lane already exists and is operational; or*
- *Single-family residential proposals in compliance with an existing Lot Size Policy that do not require a rear lane.*

Prior to the question being called Cllr. Howard confirmed that other applications could also be included as special circumstances required.

The question was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

Item 17 was brought forward and heard prior to Item 4.

17. **OCP AIRCRAFT NOISE SENSITIVE DEVELOPMENT POLICY**
(Report: Aug. 16/04, File No.: 12-8060-20-7794; xr 0153-01) (REDMS No. 1319387, 1314818)

It was moved and seconded

That Items 1 through 4 as follows be referred to staff for further examination and consultation with the YVR:

- (1) *That Bylaw No. 7794, which amends the following schedules in Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100:*

Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2004

- *Schedule 1, the main OCP,*
- *Schedule 2.2A (Dover Crossing Sub-Area Plan),*
- *Schedule 2.2B (Terra Nova Sub-Area Plan),*
- *Schedule 2.10 (City Centre Area Plan),*
- *Schedule 2.11A (West Cambie Area Plan),*
- *Schedule 2.11B (East Cambie Area Plan),*
- *Schedule 2.12B (Bridgeport Area Plan), and*
- *Schedule 2.13B (McLennan Sub-Area Plan),*

by introducing a number of text and map amendments to better manage aircraft noise sensitive development, (as presented in the report dated August 16, 2004, from the Manager, Policy Planning), be introduced and given first reading.

- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7794, having been considered in conjunction with:*
- *the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program; and*
 - *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.

- (3) *That Bylaw No. 7794, in accordance with the City Policy on Consultation During OCP Development, be referred for comment to the:*

- *Vancouver International Airport Authority (VIAA),*
- *Agricultural Land Commission,*
- *Richmond School District Board,*
- *Musqueam First Nation,*
- *Transport Canada,*
- *Urban Development Institute, and*
- *Greater Vancouver Home Builders' Association.*

- (4) *That the "Implementation Strategy – Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development Policy" (Attachment 14 to the report dated August 16, 2004, from the Manager, Policy Planning), be approved, effective upon the adoption of Bylaw 7794.*

Prior to the question being called a discussion ensued that identified the need for a careful approach and review of the information due to the long term implications and major impacts that would result for the community at large. It was suggested that staff review aircraft noise management models.

The question was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2004

4. **APPLICATION BY PLATINUM MANAGEMENT INC. TO REZONE 7100 ST. ALBANS ROAD FROM TOWNHOUSE AND APARTMENT DISTRICT (R3) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/127)**

(RZ 04-010244 - Report: Aug. 4/04, File No.: 12-8060-20-7775/7796) (REDMS No. 1305776, 1320981, 1307917, 1307923, 1318737)

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That Bylaw No. 7796, to delete the minimum lot size in "Comprehensive Development District (CD/127), be introduced and given first reading.*

(2) *That Bylaw No. 7775, for the rezoning of 7100 St. Albans Road from "Townhouse and Apartment District (R3)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/127)", be introduced and given first reading.*

CARRIED

5. **APPLICATION BY ELEGANT DEVELOPMENT INC. FOR REZONING AT 6791 AND 6811 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO COACH HOUSE DISTRICT (R9)**

(RZ 04-269537 - Report: July 13/04, File No.: 8060-20-7780) (REDMS No. 1309970, 1311375)

The Director of Development, Raul Allueva, gave advice that Items 5 and 6 would fall under the Interim Strategy for managing townhouse and single-family development during the review of the Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies and therefore these applications should be referred back to staff, and dealt with once the policies are reviewed.

As a result the following referral motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7780, for the rezoning of 6791 and 6811 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Coach House District (R9)", and that Bylaw No. 7781, for the rezoning of 9211 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1 - 0.6)" be referred to staff until such time as the Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies are complete.

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2004

The Director of Development, Raul Allueva, responded to several questions from Committee and the gallery that pertained to the construction of a house on one of the existing vacant lots which form part of Rezoning Application 04-269537. It was noted that the owner of the property could construct a dwelling on the site based on the existing R1/E zoning, provided that a Building Permit had been obtained, which it had. Nevertheless, it was noted that although all development criteria had been met, staff would not consider continued construction prudent given that the rezoning application would be deferred pending review of City policies.

6. **APPLICATION BY ELEGANT DEVELOPMENT INC. FOR REZONING AT 9211 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1 - 0.6)**
(RZ 04-272324 - Report: July 13/04, File No.: 8060-20-7781) (REDMS No. 1309934, 1311334)

Please see Item 5 for action taken on this matter.

7. **APPLICATION BY MOHINDER GILL FOR REZONING AT 9051 DOLPHIN AVENUE FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA K (R1/K)**
(RZ 04-272619 - Report: July 19/04, File No.: 8060-20-7782) (REDMS No. 1309947, 1311444)

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7782, for the rezoning of 9051 Dolphin Avenue from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

8. **APPLICATION BY EMPRESS GARDENS HOLDINGS LTD. FOR REZONING AT 8640 AND 8660 NO. 3 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT (R2-0.6)**
(RZ 04-267350 - Report: Aug. 10/04, File No.: 8060-20-7786) (REDMS No. 1297828, 1317928, 1308110, 1297850)

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7786, for the rezoning of 8640 and 8660 No. 3 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Townhouse District (R2-0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2004

9. **APPLICATION BY PELMAN ARCHITECTURE INC. FOR REZONING AT 7751, 7771 AND 7791 ASH STREET FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/129)**
(RZ 04-267216 - Report: Aug. 10/04, File No.: 8060-20-7787) (REDMS No. 1308069, 1313239, 1313920)

The Director of Development, Raul Allueva, introduced Cecilia Achiam, Planner, to the Committee.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7787, for the rezoning of 7751, 7771 and 7791 Ash Street from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)" to "Comprehensive Development (CD/129), be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

10. **APPLICATION BY RICHBERRY FARMS FOR REZONING AT 20471/20491/20511/20531/20551/20571 AND 20591 WESTMINSTER HIGHWAY FROM BUSINESS PARK INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (I3) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/149)**
(RZ 04-274416 - Report: Aug. 11/04, File No.: 8060-20-7790) (REDMS No. 1316271, 1316277)

The Director of Development, Raul Allueva, introduced Wayne Craig, Program Co-ordinator – Development, to the Committee.

Mr. Allueva, in response to questions from Committee, said that indoor/outdoor amenity space would be addressed during the Development Permit process.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7790, to create a new "Comprehensive Development District (CD/149)", which permits development of an educational institution and to rezone 20471, 20491, 20511, 20531, 20551, 20571 and 20591 Westminster Highway from "Business Park Industrial District (I3)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/149)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2004

11. **APPLICATION BY BIRTHE DREWNOSKI FOR REZONING FOR A PORTION OF 10611 LASSAM ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)**

(RZ 04-264732 - Report: July 30/04, File No.: 8060-20-7791) (REDMS No. 1315043, 280220, 1316618)

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7791, for the rezoning of a portion of 10611 Lassam Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

12. **APPLICATION BY PARM DHINJAL FOR REZONING AT 9271 NO. 1 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1 - 0.6)**

(RZ 04-271961 - Report: July 30/04, File No.: 8060-20-7452/7792) (REDMS No. 1314317, 1314375, 1316320)

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That Bylaw No. 7452, for the rezoning of 9271 No. 1 Road 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. 7792, for the rezoning of 9271 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

13. **APPLICATION BY PATRICK COTTER ARCHITECT INC. FOR REZONING AT 7051, 7071, 7091, 7131, 7171, 7191 & 7211 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT (R2 - 0.6)**

(RZ 03-250605 - Report: Aug. 12/04, File No.: 8060-20-7793) (REDMS No. 1313982, 1319100, 1314109, 1316230, 1220063)

The Director of Development, Raul Allueva, said that: the project was in general compliance with the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy; due to the acquisition of an additional property the number of units had been increased from 38 to 51; 5 public meetings with the community had been held; a number of modifications had been made to the project during the process; and, that although a number of issues were evident within the community the project now merited a review by the Committee.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2004

In addition, the General Manager, Urban Development, Joe Erceg, indicated that in order to better address the concerns of the neighbourhood the notification area for public hearing was proposed to be expanded (50m to 200m).

Mr. Allueva then responded to questions of Committee, including that: a review of alternative development options had been undertaken (single-family, townhouses, etc.) and it had been determined that no substantially greater merit was attained by any one proposal in regard to adjacencies, design, tree preservation etc.; the driveway system would be much narrower for a townhouse development; and, that a 6m setback, similar to the requirement for single-family homes, had been provided on the north property line.

Ms. Judith Hutson, 7160 Kimberley Drive, referred to an email sent to the Director of Development regarding the matter, a copy of which is attached as Schedule 2 and forms a part of these minutes. Ms. Hutson then spoke about her lack of opposition to the consideration of redevelopment; complimented Mr. Cotter for the design concept; and offered her concerns that the proposed density did not fit with the preservation of single family neighbourhoods. Ms. Hutson also felt that the proposal did not address the concerns of the neighbourhood, as contained in Schedule 2.

Ms. Geraldine Harris, 10900 Gilbert Road, expressed her concerns about whether single-family homes mattered anymore, the amount of traffic that would access Gilbert Road and the safety of the bus stop, and then asked that the proposed 3 storey units along the westerly property line be lowered to 2 storey to be consistent with the properties to the north. Ms. Harris also spoke in favour of the horseshoe single-family residential (Bareland Strata) subdivision concept. Ms. Harris referred to a letter submitted on the matter, a copy of which is attached as Schedule 3 and forms a part of these minutes.

Mr. Geoff Norton, 10911 Bamberton Drive, who provided a written submission which is attached as Schedule 4 and forms a part of these minutes, spoke about the devaluation of the properties adjacent to the development; the possibility that a future access would go through his and the adjacent property; the reduction to 2 storey along the north side with 3 storey along the east and west; the setbacks along the east and west property lines; shadowing; tree preservation and parking. Mr. Norton felt that the proposed lane should be permanently removed from the drawings, and that the architect had listened to the residents of Kimberley Drive but not those to the east and west.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2004

Mr. Dana Westermarck, 13333 Princess Street, spoke in support of the project as it presented an excellent example of property that should be developed as townhouses. Mr. Westermarck then addressed a number of points in regard to the project: that although landscaping existed on the property at present it did not mean that it could not be clear cut in the future based on existing City regulations which allow tree cutting on private property. Mr. Westermarck said that landscaping was a benefit for the owner of a property only, and therefore it was unfair to expect that landscape should be provided; that 3 storey should be considered as flood plane issues are alleviated and open and green spaces are increased; and, that the addition of high quality new development improved property values. Further to this Mr. Westermarck said that it was not realistic to expect that all neighbourhood residents would be happy, and that the architect had attempted to address the identified concerns. In concluding his comments, Mr. Westermarck said that the City should not take away the small percentage of property that is suitable for affordable housing as opposed to single-family homes.

Mr. Patrick Cotter, architect, thanked the members of the gallery who had spoken, and recognized that the concerns over protecting neighbourhoods while providing for growth in a reasonable manner were shared. Mr. Cotter said that the larger context for the proposal was the management of growth within the City, where to locate the growth and how to shape the growth, and that many of the policy requirements were based on those issues. Mr. Cotter then, with the aid of display boards, reviewed the project and responded to the concerns raised by the previous speakers.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Bylaw No. 7793, for the rezoning of 7051, 7071, 7091, 7131, 7171, 7191 & 7211 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Townhouse District (R2-0.6)", be introduced and given first reading; and*
- (2) *That the Public Hearing notification area be expanded (as shown in Attachment 10 of the report dated August 12th, 2004, from the Director of Development).*

Prior to the question being called a brief discussion ensued on the Official Community Plan requirements of the buffer along the south property line, during which staff indicated that an effort could be made to further reduce the buffer.

The question was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2004

14. APPLICATION BY J.A.B. ENTERPRISES LTD./SANDHILL DEVELOPMENT LTD. FOR REZONING AT 8291 NO. 2 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) AND 8311 NO. 2 ROAD FROM TWO-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R5) TO TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT (R2 – 0.7)
(RZ 04-270815 - Report: Aug. 3/04, File No.: 8060-20-7795) (REDMS No. 1316938, 1318242)

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7795 for the rezoning of 8291 No. 2 Road from “Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)” and 8311 No. 2 Road from “Two-Family Housing District (R5)” to “Townhouse District (R2 – 0.7)”, be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

15. APPLICATION BY CHEVRON CANADA LIMITED FOR REZONING AT 12011 BRIDGEPORT ROAD FROM SERVICE STATION DISTRICT (G2) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD150)

(RZ 04-263998 - Report: Aug. 4/04, File No.: 8060-20-7797) (REDMS No. 1318630, 1320423, 1319253, 1319055)

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7797, to create a new “Comprehensive Development District (CD/150)”, which permits a gas station with a convenience store and restaurant, and to rezone 12011 Bridgeport Road from “Service Station District (G2)” to “Comprehensive Development District (CD/150)”, be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

16. APPLICATION BY NORMAN ZOTTENBERG ARCHITECTURE TO REZONE 7820 ASH STREET FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/28)

(RZ 04-263553 - Report: Aug. 10/04, File No.: 8060-20-7799) (REDMS No. 1319386, 1304225, 1319691)

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7799, for the rezoning of 7820 Ash Street from “Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)” to Comprehensive Development District (CD/28)”, be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

18. MANAGER’S REPORT

There were no reports.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2004

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (6:20 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, August 24th, 2004.

Councillor Bill McNulty
Chair

Deborah MacLennan
Administrative Assistant

**Interim Strategy for Managing Townhouse and Single-Family Residential
Rezoning Applications During the Review of the Lane Establishment and Arterial
Road Redevelopment Policies**

OBJECTIVES:

- To address Council, Planning Committee, and public concerns regarding the Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies; and
- To assist staff and Council to manage townhouse and single-family residential Rezoning applications along arterial roads in the interim until a review of the Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies is completed.

INTERIM STRATEGY:

Except in the following cases, rezoning applications for development along arterial roads that are subject to the Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies will be deferred until the review of these policies is complete and approved by Council:

- Townhouses (requiring a land assembly of at least 30 m frontage) where shared access for adjacent sites is provided;
- Single-family residential proposals, where a municipal lane already exists and is operational; or
- Single-family residential proposals in compliance with an existing Lot Size Policy that do not require a rear lane.

City of Richmond, Aug. 2004

Allueva, Raul

From: Judith Hutson [jhutson@shaw.ca]
Sent: August 24, 2004 12:33 PM
To: Allueva, Raul
Cc: McKenna, Richard; Erceg, Joe; Duncan, George
Subject: Rezoning 7051-7211 Steveston Highw
Importance: High

Dear Raul,

As the Director of Development for the City of Richmond, I believe it is important for you to understand my significant concerns about both the process and the rezoning recommendation that will be presented at today's planning meeting.

In terms of the rezoning process and the Planning Department's report that will be presented today, I continue to have major concerns. In the report, it reads that the majority of the concerns identified by the residents have been addressed by the developer. This is patently untrue. Anyone who has attended any of the public meetings and/or read any of the correspondence from the residents would know that these concerns have not been addressed. I feel that all of our involvement in this process has been a complete waste of time. Our concerns have not been included in the Planning Department's report and recommendation. It is interesting that the City Planning Department feels comfortable writing a report about these concerns when, to the best of my knowledge, the City has only attended one of these public meetings and the summary of the meetings that the City is relying has been written by the agent of the developer. These meeting summaries should have been prepared by someone who does not have a vested interest in the project.

I also have significant concerns about the fact that the new plan for 51 units has never been presented to our neighbourhood. Again, how can this happen? It is so unfair that both the developer and the City have engaged in discussions about this new proposal and the citizens, who will be directly impacted, have not. It is galling to see that the City has gone so far as to engage and finalize negotiations with the developer about payments, prior to receiving approval from our elected officials for the rezoning.

I am a loss to understand how our rights as taxpayers and property owners are being represented at this hearing. My neighbours and I have participated in a one sided discussion. Based on the city report that will be presented at the meeting today, the rezoning and the proposed redevelopment is slated to go ahead as planned. All of our concerns about density, the trees, the traffic, the impact this will have on our property from both a financial and lifestyle, and the overall impact this type of development will have on our single family neighbourhood appear irrelevant to the City Planning Department.

I can not begin to adequately capture my deep frustration with this process and the impending outcome of the rezoning application. My home, neighbourhood and the value of my largest asset are about to be significantly impacted. I feel powerless and fearful.

I feel that my concerns have not been addressed and that, in the end, my concerns and the concerns of my neighbours are not relevant to the City Planning Department. Since the onset of this rezoning/ redevelopment project, the most significant change in this project has been that the number of units have increased from 38 to 51. No one in my neighbourhood considers this a positive change.

I have actively participated in the process and have had little or no impact on the final outcome. Like my next door neighbours who, after much sole searching, made a very difficult decision to sell their home, I feel that I am being forced to make the same decision. This is a terribly difficult position to be put in. I love my home, my neighbourhood and my community. In the end, it is the citizens in this neighbourhood who will bear the brunt of this redevelopment. The City planners will continue to work in their departments, the City will collect the property taxes and the developers will move onto new projects. My neighbours and I will live with the impact of this redevelopment. And in the end, many of us will leave our neighbourhood with a huge sense of loss and lack of

representation. This is a terrible position to be in.

I am stunned that in a democracy in 2004, that as property owners and taxpayers, our concerns are whitewashed by a City Planning Department and a process that treats us as second class citizens.

I would like the members of the Planning Committee to fully understand my concerns about this rezoning process and would appreciate it if this correspondence could be included in their briefing package for today's meeting.

I look forward to your response to my email and my request to share this email with all the members of the Planning Committee.

Sincerely,

Judith Hutson
7160 Kimberley Drive
Richmond, British Columbia

SCHEDULE 3 TO THE MINUTES OF
THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY,
AUGUST 24TH, 2004.

RZ 03-250605
7051-7211 Steveston

To: Planning Committee
Attention: Janet Lee

Re: 51 Unit Development
7051-7211 Steveston Hwy

HEIGHT CHANGE REQUEST - The expansion of this property (from 39 Units to 51 Units) now includes the property directly behind my home.
I ask that the 3 level town homes slated to be built along the west side of the proposed town house development be lowered to two levels. This would allow my home and others on the west side to be afforded the same consideration and privacy as those to the north.

Thank You

G.HARRIS / L. HERZOG
Home Owner
10900 Gilbert Road
(604-537-5402)

SCHEDULE 4 TO THE MINUTES OF
THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY,
AUGUST 24TH, 2004.

August 6, 2004

R2 03-250605

Janet Lee
Policy Planning Development
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Patrick Cotter
Principal
Patrick Cotter Architect Inc.
1338 - 56th Street
Delta, BC V4L 2A4

Dear Mr. Cotter:

Re: Re-Zoning Application for 7051-7211 Steveston Highway

As residents of 10911 Bamberton Drive, we have a few concerns regarding this development.

1. As shown on the proposed 51 unit development, future access to the east goes through our property and property 7231. My neighbour, who owns both properties 7231 and 1093, wanted to sell but, to my knowledge, was turned down by the developer. We were never approached regarding the sale of our property. We may be receptive to the sale.

Future access required would be a 6 metres wide lane going through both properties. The access lane going west onto Gilbert Road (designated as an arterial road) has "no new accesses to the arterial are permitted" (quoted from "Residential Redevelopment Along Richmond's Arterial Roads" prepared by the City of Richmond).

2. When the area has been developed and "future access" has not been provided, whose responsibility does it now become?

- (a) the developer at a future date if he is still in business;
- (b) the strata owners; and/or
- (c) the City of Richmond.

3. From a safety perspective, one entrance serving both entrance and exit would not be adequate in an emergency situation. For example: in a major fire or earthquake, the occupants of the 51 units would be trying to out of the complex, probably in vehicles, while emergency vehicles would be trying to access it.

4. As an alternative to "future access" being to the east and west, why not one direct road from Steveston Highway through to Kimberly Drive? This would only require the purchase of one property on Kimberly Drive as opposed four.

5. The above would eliminate any responsibilities on the developer or the strata holders and give a completed development, as to the "future accesses" which could be postponed indefinitely.

6. My primary concern with the development is, if it is left as currently proposed, the affect it will have on my property value. Negatively we're sure and as this is our investment for the future; my concerns are warranted. If we choose to sell in the future, will someone want to make this investment knowing about "future accesses"? Would a developer purchase these common properties knowing that "future accesses" need to be provided?

I would appreciate your comments on these six items and, hopefully, they can be resolved to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned parties.

Sincerely,

Dg Nester

Please NOTE additional concerns on next page.

Additional concerns.

1. PROPERTIES TO EAST AND WEST.

To the North the developer appears to have addressed the concerns of the residents of Kimberly Drive by lowering the buildings to two stories high, but have not considered the privacy that the properties to the East and West now enjoy. I would like to see the proposed buildings to be lowered to two stories also so as to accommodate us too

2. FUTURE ACCESS--lane access/exit.

If the project goes through as shown on the latest proposal from the architect, the future access lane goes through my property. I have read and re-read your Policy Manual (policy 50380) and am confused as it appears to say this can be done if certain conditions are met, namely #2 a, ' a mid-block vehicular access is approved by the city' , etc. but, then b states that 'land is dedicated and funding provided for future construction etc'.

How can this happen when my wife and I own this property and it is single family zoned.

But, I also realise that section 4 'exceptions to the policy' give you the Planning Committee the power to make whatever recommendations you think fit for final approval

Please take into consideration that if the development goes ahead as planned, all the values of the adjacent properties will be adversely affected especially the ones having to allow for 'Future Access'

3. PARKING.

My property is the one that is and will be the most seriously affected by the development. 10911 Bamberton Drive is the closest on-street parking available and , over the last few years, this is where the existing properties have parked when necessary. It now looks very bad for the future.

The original development was for 38 units, but this has now grown to 51 units with an increase of only 10 more visitor parking spaces. Someones math is not so good, not more but less per unit.

I can see that in the future all the properties at the entrance to Bamberton Drive will have vehicles parked along their property lines and what can we do about it? The increase in traffic went up when Bamberton Drive became a through road 10 years ago and it is only going to get worse with the additional expected parking problem and getting into Steveston Hwy will not improve with the new entrance/exit from a new 51 unit development