

To Public Hearing
Date: <u>Sept 20, 2004</u>
Item #: <u>8</u>
Re: <u>7051-7211 Steveston</u>
<u>Bylaw 7793</u>

Mayor and Councillors

From: Allueva, Raul
Sent: September 7, 2004 11:17 AM
To: 'rconklin@interchange.ubc.ca'
Cc: Crowe, Terry; Erceg, Joe; Lee, Janet; 'Patrick Cotter Architect'; McKenna, Richard; Mayor and Councillors; Wei, Victor
Subject: Rezoning Application No. 03-250605 (7051-7211 Steveston Hwy)- Comments from Mr. Conklin
Importance: High

Dear Mr. Conklin:

Thank you for taking the time to provide detailed information on this development application. As requested, your message has been forwarded to Mayor Brodie and Council members.

I have also forwarded this to Mr. Patrick Cotter, Architect, in order that detailed information requested can be prepared and be available for the Public Hearing, as you requested.

I offer the following information for clarification:

1. The 6m (20 foot) setbacks for the proposed townhouses is generally considered a reasonable standard, when combined with a two-storey building height, building design to minimize overlook, and landscaping, given this is the current zoning setback requirement for single-family dwellings from a rear property line. The basic test is that, were the subject site developed with single-family homes instead of townhouses, a similar type of development condition would be generated (2 to 2.5 storeys, 6 m. minimum setback, etc.)
2. I am asking Mr. Cotter to ensure copies of the arborist report, which provides information for the tree noted, are available.
3. In terms of your comments about parking, please note for clarification that only 7 units have tandem parking; the rest (44 units) have double-car garages. On this basis, and given that the proposal exceeds the required parking and also provides the availability of apron parking, we would not expect any overflow parking problems. Nevertheless, as is the case in some developments, the City could ensure registration of a Restrictive Covenant to prohibit the conversion of tandem parking stalls to habitable space. This is often effective in deterring such conversions. A representative from the Transportation Department will be available at the Public Hearing to address any questions regarding possible parking overflow.
4. An outdoor amenity area is provided which meets the size required under the OCP guidelines. As well, a number of raised courtyards for outdoor space are also provided. At the Development Permit stage, the City will ensure children's play area, and equipment, is provided.
5. I believe that a local commercial centre is located at Steveston Hwy and No. 2 Road. The basic premise of locating this type of a project on an Arterial Road is the location on a main transit line, which provides transportation options.
6. Indoor amenity space is not required to be physically provided; Council adopted policy No.5041, which allows cash-in-lieu to be provided instead. The application complies with this policy.
7. I am asking Mr. Cotter to discuss with the developer the market price of these units, and to speak to this issue at the Public Hearing.
8. With respect to the \$25,500 and \$25,500 which the developer is contributing to the Affordable Housing and Childcare Reserve Funds, the City did not ask for these contributions; these were offered by the developer. It is noted that Council has established Statutory Reserve Funds for both of these initiatives.

I trust this information is sufficient for your needs at this time. Again, by copy of this message, the Mayor and Council have been apprised of your concerns. As you are probably aware, the Public Hearing for this project is scheduled for September 20th.

I appreciate your concerns, and would urge you to attend the Public Hearing, if you are available. If you are unable to make it, kindly forward any further information for the meeting to the attention of myself or the City Clerk, Mr. Richard McKenna.

Please contact me at your convenience if you require further information in this regard.

Regards,

Raul Allueva
Director of Development
Development Applications Department
City of Richmond
 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond BC V6Y-2C1
 (604) 276-4138 fax: (604) 276-4052
 <<mailto:rallueva@city.richmond.bc.ca>>

----- Original Message -----

From: Bob Conklin
To: terry Crowe
Cc: Simon Baker ; barb robertson ; jahsunley@shaw.ca
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2004 9:40 PM
Subject: 7051-7211 Steveston Hwy

Please explain why the planning department came to the conclusion that the objections of Mr. Cotter's proposal "have been addressed in the current proposal." There are many issues that many of us feel are still outstanding. The increase in rear setbacks are said to duplicate single family zoning setbacks. Our minimum set backs on the south side of Kimberly Drive average about 30 feet, and Cotter's maximum set backs are 19 feet. It is interesting that he measures our setbacks as the minimum and his as the maximum. His setbacks are not adequate and I believe one of the councillors stated that at the meeting August 24. Cotter states that the significant chestnut is in poor condition. I would like to see the report of an independent arborist to confirm that. Even though there is no city statute protecting significant trees, the voting public would be angry to know that such trees are cut down to line the developer's pocket and that the city councillors support that. Cotter proudly states he has increased the parking spots above the requirement, but he and everyone else knows that storage space is at a premium in such units and tandem parking spots and even side by side parking spots are soon converted to storage rooms, sometimes permanently. Therefore there are not going to be as many parking spots available after a few years, and more will park on Bamberton and Kimberly. Finally, where will children play,.... on Steveston Hwy? Where will the people in the development walk for groceries, etc, ... along Steveston Hwy where cars fly by at 70 to 80 km per hour. Where will they walk? How many miles? They will drive and increase traffic and pollution. Is this compatible with the GVRD's policy of high density near shopping and good transit. There is even no indoor amenity space provided for such as large development. One of the councillors, Mr. Howard, stated in a local paper that this was good since it was low cost housing. Is low cost housing starting at \$400,000 as these units will start as. Will buyers be happy to know that they are buying inferior quality housing as low cost housing implies?

Please explain the \$50,000 dollars the Mr. Cotter is paying to the city, unrelated to the development. Why is it a development requirement. It smells of a bribe. Who offered it or asked for it? I would like answers to these questions before the public hearing.

Please send this to all the councillors.

Bob Conklin.