



## Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003  
Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall  
Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair  
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt, Vice-Chair 4:05 p.m.  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Rob Howard  
Mayor Malcolm Brodie  
Absent: Councillor Harold Steves  
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, October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2003, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, **November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2003**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

### URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **PROVISION FOR SIGNAGE AMENDMENTS IN ZONING & DEVELOPMENT BYLAW 5300**

(Report: Oct. 22/03, File No.: 8060-20-7610) (REDMS No. 1046500, 1046676, 1046439)

The Manager, Zoning, Alan Clark, and David Brownlee, Planner, were present.

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7610, to amend Section 703.01(a) of Zoning & Development Bylaw No. 5300, be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

4. **ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT BYLAW NO. 5300, AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 7613**

(ZT 03-250034 - Report: Oct. 20/03, File No.: 8060-20-7613) (REDMS No. 1080708, 1080971, 1080918)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, and Bruce Murray, Development Review Technician, were present.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7613, which amends Zoning & Development Bylaw No. 5300 as it relates to projections into required side yards, be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

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

(Report: October 20/03, File No.: 8060-20-7611) (REDMS No. 1075709, 1080686, 1080687, 1080684)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, and Suzanne Carter-Huffman, Planner were present. Mr. Crowe indicated that at the conclusion of the several public meeting process an ideal consensus had not been found and that as a result, the two options before Committee were representative of a balanced interest.

Cllr. S. Halsey-Brandt joined the meeting – 4:05 p.m.

Ms. Carter-Huffman then, with a number of graphic displays, reviewed the process to date, the options before Committee, the development potential of the area, and an illustration of what the streetscape might look like should 12m lots be incorporated. During the review, and in response to questions from Committee, the following information was provided:

- it is proposed that the boundaries for multi-family development be limited to approximately 80m from Blundell Road and 100m from Granville Avenue;
- it is anticipated that perceived development/cost inequities facing property owners near the proposed alignments of Sills and Keefer will not require intervention through the planning process as these lots will be highly sought after due to their superior access and timely development opportunities;

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

- it is proposed that the alignment of new roads be allowed to be flexible where any deviation from the "Circulation Concept" contained in the sub-area plan will not result in a net increase in road or significant traffic impacts on residential liveability or character;
- two lot size options were presented, both of which were indicated to be workable. The "recommended" option provides for minimum frontages of 12m (39 ft) throughout the area, while the "alternate" provides for larger frontages, 18 m (59 ft.) minimum, along Bridge and Ash;
- staff noted that, while the "alternate" option most closely reflects the City survey results indicating a preference for large lots along Bridge and Ash, the mix of lot-size designations could encourage speculation, rather than investment in large new homes along Bridge and Ash;
- staff noted that the "recommended" option would result in a mix of lot sizes along Bridge and Ash as redevelopment progresses, but it is anticipated that this process will be gradual and that the proposed design standards for new homes created through subdivision would help to ensure a complementary scale, character, and quality of building and landscape design;

Mayor Brodie joined the meeting during the above presentation – 4:08 p.m.

Ms. Carter-Huffman also provided the context of the application before Committee in Item 6.

Mr. Brad Eshelman, 7731 Bridge Street, indicated that he had been speaking with Ms. Carter-Huffman since February. Mr. Eshelman distributed, and then reviewed, the results of a survey that he had undertaken in the area, a copy of which is attached as Schedule 1 and forms a part of these minutes. Mr. Eshelman then requested that Committee consider a third option that would allow development in those areas that could provide smaller lots, which would avoid the speculation indicated. The concept of greener fronts was favoured, and Mr. Eshelman said that a bylaw or zoning restriction for less paving and more greening would be supported by the neighbourhood. Mr. Eshelman felt that a desire and need existed for 1/4 acre lots in the area, and that an alternate plan would provide consistency within the neighbourhood and for the development community, whose market was for smaller lots.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members, staff and Mr. Eshelman, that included the following:

- based on information provided to date by the development community, the development of the backlands would not generate sufficient money to cover the cost of roads;

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

- the City survey results indicated that large lots should be located along Bridge and Ash;
- should large lots be favoured throughout the entire area a further investigation would be required for putting roads through;
- an agreement that the results of the City survey would be broken into a block by block format, prior to the Public Hearing on the matter;
- the recommended option could be taken forward to Public Hearing along with additional options for review. Should an additional option be preferred, an investigation would then be required on such issues as determining the viability of development in the area should the lot size be set at 18m (59 ft) and road construction impacted;
- the fear felt by some residents that prevented their participation in the survey; and
- the reasons for relocating a portion of Le Chow as opposed to extending General Currie Road in Item 6.

Mayor Brodie left the meeting – 4:55 p.m.

Mr. John Beck, the applicant for Item 6, spoke about the survey that he had conducted as part of his proposed development. A copy of the survey is attached as Schedule 2 and forms a part of these minutes. Noting that the difficulties in achieving consensus for the area was common knowledge, Mr. Beck said that he had spent 1 – 2 hours with each resident included in his survey, and that average sized lots and a heritage character was supported. The owner of the adjacent property to the north of Mr. Beck's proposed development was in support of the project and favoured the removal of some of the dead growth trees in the area. Mr. Beck said that he was tired of the process of public meetings being influenced by several strong presenters, and further, that no decision has been made. Mr. Beck also said that it was important to remember that if developers were unable to "make money" by developing in McLennan South, the roads would not be established and the area's backlands would remain inaccessible.

Correspondence received on the matter is attached as Schedule 3 and forms a part of these minutes.

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 7611, to amend Schedule 2.10D (McLennan South Sub-Area Plan) by introducing a number of text and map amendments aimed at permitting medium-sized "R1/B-type" lots (e.g. 12 m/39 ft. minimum frontage) throughout the area designated for "Residential, Historic Single-Family, 2 ½ storeys max., 0.55 FAR", be introduced and given first reading.*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7611, 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.*
- (3) *That Bylaw No. 7611, having been considered in accordance with the City Policy on Consultation During OCP Development, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation.*

Prior to the question being called Cllr. S. Halsey-Brandt requested, and received, confirmation that both options would be presented at Public Hearing.

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

6. **APPLICATION BY ELLINS ARCHITECT INC. FOR REZONING AT 7320 BRIDGE STREET FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/139) IN ORDER TO PERMIT A SEVEN LOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION WITH A NEW PARTIAL ROAD ALONG THE NORTHERN BOUNDARY.**

(RZ 03-227858 - Report: October 22/03, File No.: 8060-20-7604) (REDMS No. 1068619, 1083591, 1087124, 1072861, 1073056)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, and Eric Fiss, Planner, were present.

Mr. Beck, in response to a question, said that the relocation of Le Chow provided an advantage in that an intersection was eliminated, and further, that the development of 7 smaller lots was financially more viable due to the significant road costs involved.

Further to this, Mr. Erceg indicated that should Le Chow swing to connect to Bridge a section of ring road would not then be required.

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7604, for the rezoning of 7320 Bridge Street from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/139)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

7. **REVISED AMENITY SPACE REQUIREMENTS FOR MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING**

(Report: October 9/03, File No.: 8060-20-7591) (REDMS No. 1030646, 1029998, 1063296, 1029952)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, and Jenny Beran, Planner, were present. Mr. Crowe said that the current policy, which addressed the requirements of the City for multi-family developments for indoor and outdoor developer owned amenity space, was 10 years old and that discussion had been undertaken with the Urban Design Institute and the Greater Vancouver Home Builders Association.

Ms. Beran reviewed and then responded to questions on the information contained in the report, and provided a chart indicating amenity space requirements as at present, and those that would be required under the revised policy.

During the discussion that ensued further information was provided that:

- Strata Council action could be undertaken for altering outdoor amenity space which could include the provision of play equipment;
- the funds placed in the City's Recreation Facility Reserve account would be distributed City wide;
- the Development Permit process provided an opportunity for a review of the location and function of amenity space;
- projects intended for adult market housing groups could provide outdoor amenity space of a more passive nature which could then be retro fitted in the future, should circumstances require;
- the policy revisions would result in the City's requirements being more comparable to other districts;
- those projects currently in process would continue under the existing policy; and
- an evaluation of the revised policy would be undertaken in 2004.

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

Mr. Peter Mitchell, 6271 Anika Crescent, thought the proposal, although excellent, was flawed in that developers on projects of less than 20 units would prefer to contribute to the Cash in Lieu option as opposed to providing space. Mr. Mitchell suggested that the City look at the possibility of reducing the indoor amenity space for small developments, which could then be useful for provision of guest suites, a recreation facility, individual parties, or day-care conversions, etc.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 7591, which amends the Indoor and Outdoor Amenity Space Guidelines in the Development Permit section of the Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100, be introduced and given first reading.*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7591, having been considered in conjunction with:*
  - (a) *the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;*
  - (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.*
- (3) *That Bylaw No. 7591, having been considered in accordance with the City Policy on Consultation During OCP Development, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation.*
- (4) *That the "Cash In Lieu of Indoor Amenity Space Policy" (Attachment 1 to the report dated July 4, 2003 from the Manager, Policy Planning) be adopted upon final reading of Bylaw No. 7591.*

**CARRIED**

### 8. MANAGER'S REPORT

The Acting General Manager, Urban Development, Chuck Gale, requested and then responded to feedback received on the Project "Why Not" Priorities previously distributed to members of Council. During the discussion reference was made to the Customer Information Cards that will be utilized in the process and suggestions were made for revisions to the cards: namely that 'to allow us the opportunity to improve our service to you, now and in the future', be deleted from the second sentence and added to the first sentence; and that a bullet format be used.

Cllr. Barnes requested that secondary suites scoping report be separated out from the Affordable Housing project and brought forth.

Cllr. Howard requested that development of the CP right-of-way lands be placed on a list for future consideration, and that any material on the matter be circulated at that time.

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, reported on the recent 'report card' issued by the National Association of Industrial & Office Properties (NAIOP), which looked at taxes, Development Cost Charges, permit issuing times etc. For the first time NAIOP surveyed its membership to determine which municipality is the most open to business. Of 20 municipalities included in the survey, Richmond ranked as #2. The Committee suggested that staff share this information with the media and consider using it in information for economic development.

### ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (6:25 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, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003.

---

Councillor Bill McNulty  
Chair

---

Deborah MacLennan  
Administrative Assistant



**McLennan South - Bridge and Ash Street Area  
Single-Family Lot Size Surveys**

**Responses**

	<u><b>City Survey</b></u>	<u><b>Preliminary Residents Survey</b></u>
Bridge	38	32
Ash	24	20
General Currie subtotal	<u>3</u> 65	<u>2</u> 54
Granville	6	0
Blundell	2	0
No.4	4	0
Sills	2	0
Jones	3	0
Heather	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	<u>85</u>	<u>54</u>

83%  
of City  
survey  
participants

**Survey Results**

	<u><b>City Survey</b></u>		<u><b>Preliminary Residents Survey</b></u>	
	<u><b>59 ft</b></u>	<u><b>39 ft or 30 ft</b></u>	<u><b>59 ft</b></u>	<u><b>39 ft</b></u>
Bridge Street	87%	13%	98%	2%
Ash Street	87%	13%	96%	4%
North/South Roads				
Between Bridge & Ash	55%	45%	80%	20%
Between Bridge & No.4	55%	45%	76%	24%
New East/West Roads				
Sills	36%	64%	60%	40%
Keefer	36%	64%	63%	38%
General Currie			71%	29%

**Comments on City Survey**

Smaller lots somewhere in the area 64%?

Do not believe this question was asked so I am unsure of its relevance in the City's survey results

# CONFIDENTIAL & IMPORTANT TO RESPOND

## Bridge, Ash and General Currie Residents Survey

### Have a Say in Your Neighbourhoods Development

KEEP THE COUNTRY STYLE CHARACTER OF THE AREA

It is very important that we get residents views on development.  
Any questions call Brad Eshleman at 604-275-6095.

**Last City Survey**

- 87% voted to keep 59 ft minimum lot sizes on Bridge & Ash
- 55% voted to keep 59 ft minimum lot sizes on new North/South Roads
- 43% voted for smaller lots (30ft or 39 ft) on new North/South Roads
- 2% voted for either 59 ft or smaller lots on new North/South roads
- 64 % voted for 39 ft minimum lot sizes on Sills and Keefer

City planners are talking to developers about area and want to recommend smaller lots (39 foot) throughout the area even though the survey above says different.

To see a comparison of current Bridge & Ash area (59 ft lot min.) to 39 ft lot area go see Aspin Drive (zoned R1/B - 39 ft lot width) just south of Bridge St off Blundell.

**Please circle lot size survey choice below for all 7 streets.**

#### North/South Roads

	<b>1 <u>Ash Street</u></b>		<b>2 <u>Bridge Street</u></b>
Circle Lot Width	59 ft      39 ft		59 ft      39 ft
	R1/E      R1/B		R1/E      R1/B
	<b>3 <u>New Road</u></b>		<b>4 <u>New Road</u></b>
	Between		Between
	<u>Ash &amp; Bridge</u>		<u>Bridge &amp; No. 4 Road</u>
Circle Lot Width	59 ft      39 ft		59 ft      39 ft
	R1/E      R1/B		R1/E      R1/B

#### Proposed New East West Roads

	<b>5 <u>North end</u></b>	<b>6 <u>Middlle</u></b>	<b>7 <u>South end</u></b>
	<u>Sills</u>	<u>General Currie</u>	<u>Keefer</u>
Circle Lot Width	59 ft      39 ft	59 ft      39 ft	59 ft      39 ft
	R1/E      R1/B	R1/E      R1/B	R1/E      R1/B

R1/E - 59 ft minimum lot width and 79 ft minimum depth - minimum 5,900 squ. Ft.

R1/B - 39 ft minimum lot width and 79 ft minimum depth - minimum 3,900 squ. Ft.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_

DROP OFF AT 7271 BRIDGE ST

**Attention: Planning Committee Members  
Richmond City Councillors**

**Date: August 19 2003**

**Re: Petition for 7320 Bridge Street Rezoning Proposal**

---

The attached petition includes the signatures of the registered owners on Bridge Street that are "in favour" of the rezoning application submitted by DreamBuilt Estates Inc. (owners of 7320 Bridge Street)

The following findings displayed a considerable amount of time discussing the personal views offered by each owner of the properties. The results will show that presently the majority of owners are "in favour" of the proposed east west road, design of the proposed homes, and the size of lots (RB1).

On the attached map showing all of the properties on Bridge Street, we have coded each property to represent the present status of each owner's vote of the proposal. These codes are as follows:

Yellow	- highlights the properties in favour
Grey	- highlights the properties not in favour
Diagonal lines	- highlights the properties indicating no opinion
Horizontal lines	- highlights the properties not contacted

Along with various amounts of information provided by the owners, the general consensus seems to be that most are not against the east west road included in our proposal. I would be happy to offer more detailed findings if anyone wishes to call @ 604 250 6425.

Yours Sincerely

  
John Paul Beck  
DreamBuilt Estates Inc.



**Petition in favour of the zoning application for 7320 Bridge Street**

---

To: The City of Richmond  
Urban Development Division







Date: June /03

Re: McLennan South Development  
Zoning Application for 7320 Bridge Street  
(RZ 03-227858)




---




**We, the undersigned, are in favour of the development of 7320 Bridge Street as set forth in the current zoning application proposal.**

---

Addresses	Owner's name	Signatures
7320 Bridge Street	DreamBuilt Estates 23/06/03	
7351 Bridge Street	<del>SNYLLA KORUZ</del> George & Judy Chuacosu	
7331 Bridge Street	Margorie J Bueterowe <del>SNYLLA KORUZ</del>	
7511 Bridge Street	Ray & Judith Sebastian	
7571 Bridge Street	Bonnie Greene	YES. SIGNATURE ON LAST PAGE 
7720 Bridge Street	Heini & Irma Bublitz	IN FAVOUR 
7140 Bridge Street	David & Jennifer Price	

Addresses	Owner's name	Signatures
7260 Bridge Street	John & Ulla Larsen 23/06/03	U. Larsen
7280 Bridge Street	Harjit M Sandhu 25/06/03	M. Sandhu
7120 Bridge Street	William & Linda Hawryluk 20/07/03	W. Hawryluk / L. Hawryluk
7171 Bridge Street	Allan & Sandra McBurney	
7540 Bridge Street	Manhoar & Marleny Walia	
7551 Bridge Street	John & Sharon Thomas	
7580 Bridge Street	Shankar & Balvir Dhadwar	
7731 Bridge Street	Jennifer L Eshleman	
7020 Bridge Street	Ravinder & Harkamal Badesha	
7031 Bridge Street	Simon & May Lee	
7038 Bridge Street	Chun C Lam & Yee N Ho	YES AS PER CONVERSATION TO FROM HONG KONG
7051 Bridge Street	Louis & Peggy poon	
7051 Bridge Street	Bright Line Investments Inc.	
7060 Bridge Street	Bridge 7060 Investments Inc.	YES AS PER CONVERSATION TO FROM HONG KONG

Addresses	Owner's Names	Signatures
7071 Bridge Street	Judith Lockett	
✓ 7080 Bridge Street	Cindy Y NG	NO VOTE EITHER WAY.
7091 Bridge Street	Ronald & Tan Keasberry	
7100 Bridge Street	Yiu L Lo & Shirley Lo	IN FAVOUR PHONE CONVERSATION
7111 Bridge Street	Gordon & Angelica Leung	
7131 Bridge Street	664525 B C LTD.	Amar - IN FAVOUR if CITY IS BEHIND IT!
7151 Bridge Street	David & Jennifer Price AND MONICA YU	
7160 Bridge Street	Sydney L Thomson	
7180 Bridge Street	International Buddhist Society	PER:  JULIA WANG TREASURER July 20, 22
7191 Bridge Street	Rudy & Erika Stiegelmar	
7200 Bridge Street	Raymond & Fanny Louey	IN FAVOUR PHONE CONVERSATION
7211 Bridge Street	Victor & Elinna Choy	IN FAVOUR 
7220 Bridge Street	Raymond & Fanny Louey	IN FAVOUR PHONE CONVERSATION
7231 Bridge Street	Calvin & Maryann Radom	

Addresses	Owner's Names	Signatures
7240 Bridge Street	Harmut Bergmann	 YES.
7251 Bridge Street	Simrat K Johal	
7271 Bridge Street	Ranjeet & Jaswinder Sangara	
7291 Bridge Street	Ranjeet & Jaswinder Sangara	
7300 Bridge Street	Kenneth & Doreen Stewart	YES LETTER / SIGNATURE ON FILE
7360 Bridge Street	Todd & Indra Dusanj 23/06/03	 Surinder Dusanj Beena Dail
7380 Bridge Street	Surinder Dusanj 23/06/03	Surinder Dusanj
7411 Bridge Street	Ralph H Schmid	NOT OPPOSED 
7420 Bridge Street	Derek & Jean James	
7426 Bridge Street	Ju-Kun & Joanna tang	
7438 Bridge Street	Lung F Wong & Lai C Kan	
7451 Bridge Street	Anacorita & Benjamin Young	
7468 Bridge Street	Pui W Wong	YES SPOKE WITH MRS. LEE. LOOKING TO SUBSIDIZE IN THE NEAR FUTURE.
7480 Bridge Street	Robert & Margaret Dahl	



Addresses	Owner's Names	Signatures
7491 Bridge Street	Stephen & Marion Daul	
7500 Bridge Street	Stephen & Marion Nordin	
7520 Bridge Street	Barbara Baanders	
7531 Bridge Street	Jeanne N Blackall	<i>J. Nicole Blackall</i>
7560 Bridge Street	Mohan & Nirmal Sandu	
7591 Bridge Street	373838 B C LTD.	
7611 Bridge Street	Caroline & William Nelson	<i>C Nelson</i>
7620 Bridge Street	Hilda Lindenthaler	<i>Hilda Lindenthaler</i>
7631 Bridge Street	Harbans & Bhapinder Sandu	<i>Bhapinder Sandu</i>
7640 Bridge Street	Hilda Lindenthaler	<i>Hilda Lindenthaler</i>
7651 Bridge Street	Glicerio & Consolacion Ganuelas	<i>Glicerio Ganuelas</i>
7660 Bridge Street	Ka D Cheung & Hau Y Chau	YES LETTER OF SIGNATURE ON THE WAY
7671 Bridge Street	Ka H Cheung & Hau Y Lam	YES LETTER OF SIGNATURE ON THE WAY
7680 Bridge Street	Susan & Grace Stromberg	

**Addresses****Owner's Names****Signatures**

---

7691 Bridge Street      Lloyd A Johnson

---

7700 Bridge Street      Ka C Cheung & Siu K Wong

*YES. LETTER WITH  
SIGNATURE  
ON THE WAY.*

---

7711 Bridge Street      Garry & Sandra Hirayama

---

7740 Bridge Street      Edward & Marie Malinoski

*23/06/03 Marie Malinoski*

---

7751 Bridge Street      Kenneth & Paulette Swanston

*P. Swanston (in Swanston)*

---

7760 Bridge Street      David Young

---

7851 Bridge Street      Heidi Y Ng

---

*7720 BRIDGE Lane Bublitz David White 23/06/03  
IRMA AND HEINZ BUBLITZ*

**Total of Properties on Bridge Street** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Owners Contacted** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total of Owners Contacted "in favour"** \_\_\_\_\_

**Percentage of Owners Contacted "in favour"** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total of Owners not Contacted** \_\_\_\_\_

Signatures were acquired by:

John P. Beck  
7320 Bridge Street  
DreamBuilt Estates Inc.

City of Richmond  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond, B.C.  
V6Y 2C1

**SCHEDULE 3 TO THE MINUTES OF  
THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY,  
NOVEMBER 4<sup>TH</sup>, 2003.**

Date 28 Oct 03

Attention: Suzanne Carter-Huffman / Cindy Piper  
Policy Planning Department

Re: Bridge, Ash and General Currie Streets Area Redevelopment

(Your Comments.....)

Yours truly,

*I do not want small lots in  
this area. I am not selling my back lot.*

Name & Address

KJC STEWART

7300 BRIDGE ST V6Y2S7

*KJC Stewart*

*Any questions call Brod Estleman 604-275-2065*

October 28, 2003

Susan and Grace Stromberg  
7680 Bridge Street  
Richmond, B.C.  
V6Y 2S7

City of Richmond  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond, B.C.  
V6Y 2C1

Attention: Suzanne Carter-Huffman / Cindy Piper  
Policy Planning Department

Re: Bridge, Ash and General Currie Streets Area Redevelopment


We strongly oppose any redevelopment plan for the Bridge, Ash and General Currie Streets that will allow for a reduction in lot sizes.

After having read the Official Community Plan four years ago, we purchased our home with the understanding that this neighbourhood would remain large lots in the long term.

We think that our quiet, tree and bird filled neighbourhood is great the way it is; and that it's character will be ruined by a large increase in the number of residents and vehicles that a small lot redevelopment plan would bring. Too many of the well established green spaces and mature trees, (that would take decades to replace) would be sacrificed to make way for roads, driveways and lanes. We are also concerned that the additional roadways and 'ring road' will make our neighbourhood vulnerable to break and enter thefts and other property crime.

Please do not approve a redevelopment plan that allows smaller lot sizes on Bridge, Ash and General Currie Streets.

Yours truly,

  
Grace and Susan Stromberg  
7680 Bridge Street

City of Richmond,  
6911 No. 3 Rd.,  
Richmond B.C.  
V6Y2C1

October 27<sup>th</sup> 2003

Attention : Suzanne Carter-Huffman / Cindy Piper


Re Bridge, Ash and General Currie Streets Area Re-development

At a meeting held for the area residents in July, a vote was requested on changing the lot sizes on Bridge St. The vote showed a massive rejection of a proposal to make changes. This vote notwithstanding, developers in our area have been saying that it is a fait accompli that the lot sizes are going to be changed at the next Council meeting. I am flabbergasted that the city planners are recommending this change against the wish of a large number of the residents. The Official City Plan left Bridge St with large lots for a good reason – the protection of the area and setting – and it was for this reason that people purchased lots on Bridge and built houses to suit the area.

Before the City Council approves these changes they need to hear from the residents and not let developers bulldoze in their demands.

Derek & Jean James  
7420 Bridge St.,  
Richmond,  
V6Y2S7

604-273-9331

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Derek James". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. Below the signature is a long, horizontal, slightly wavy line that spans most of the width of the signature.

Telephone / Fax No. 604-278-6819  
7560 Ash Street, Richmond, B.C. V6Y 2S2  
CANADA

FACSIMILE MACHINE COVER SHEET


DATE: October 20/03 PAGE: 1 OF 1  
TO: City Planner ( The Manager ) FAX: 604-278-5139  
COMPANY: City of Richmond TEL: 604-276-4007  
FROM: Fred. J. Collaco ACKNOWLEDGE: Yes, Please.  
REFERENCE: October. 20/03 City planner Meeting at 8.00 P.M. On ~~xxxx~~ our Ash Stre


Dear Manager of Rmd City Planner,

With much regretted that we are unable to come to your meeting,  
but we would like to voice our vote to have our Lot size remain that same  
as original of 1/2 ( half ) acres Lot .

Thank you for your kind attention.

Yours truly,

  
Fred. J. Collaco



Date: October 21st, 2003

City Planner [The Manager]  
Urban Planning Division  
City of Richmond  
Fax# 604 278 5139

Subject: City Planning Meeting - Item: South Maclellan

Dear Manager,

I am unable to attend your planning meeting but wish to place my vote on record. I strongly vote to keep our area as original with 1/2 acre lots. This I believe is in line with what the majority of area residents have voted for.

Thank you for taking note of the same.

Yours sincerely,



Douglas Nazareth  
Owner: 7480 Ash Street  
Richmond BC  
V6Y 2S1  
Ph: 604 279 5491  
Fax: 604 279 0181



City of Richmond  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond, B.C.  
V6Y 2C1

Via Fax :604-276-4052

October 28, 2003

Attention : Suzanne Carter-Huffman / Cindy Piper  
Policy Planning Department

Re : Bridge, Ash and General Currie Streets Area Re-Development

We hereby register our strong opposition to smaller lots being zoned for the entire area. The Residents Survey of 87% in favor of the 59 foot lot width option for Bridge and Ash Street and 57% in favor of the 59 foot lot option for the new North/South roads does not support smaller lots throughout the area.


We understand that Planning is recommending smaller lot zoning throughout this area which is against the neighborhoods wishes per the survey above. I have been told by two developers that it is already done. We know that Council has not voted on this yet therefore are concerned that developers under the impression that smaller lots will be approved will go ahead with land accumulation. This then puts pressure on City Hall to come through with approved smaller lot zoning. We are concerned that the developer at 7320 Bridge Street purchased his property with the view that the rezoning would be happening and this puts pressure on it being approved for smaller lots.

In my letter dated August 1, 2003 (copy attached) I offered to assist the City in addressing this issue. I also thought residents should see what a 39 foot lot subdivision looked like so they could make an informed decision. Residents should have a say.

There is a notion that residents have changed their minds and want 39 foot lots somewhat based on a meeting held in the middle of the summer. I believe only 30 to 40 residents showed up compared to the area survey which had 85 responses. We know that the developer for 7320 Bridge lobbied residents in the area to support his proposal and attend the meeting. We understand that approximately half of the people in the meeting supported 39 foot lots. I do not believe this indicates that the majority of the 87% of residents in favor of 59 foot lots have changed their minds.

Please, lets not forget that it is the residents that live in the area not the developers.

Respectfully  
Leanne & Brad Eshleman, 7731 Bridge Street

J. L. Eshleman 



City of Richmond  
Urban Development Division  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond, B.C.  
V6Y 2C1

August 1, 2003

Attention: Suzanne Carter-Huffman  
Senior Planner/Urban Design

Dear Suzanne

Re: Development of McLennan South – Single-Family Lot Size

I believe there are two groups present in this area – one that would like to see the area remain with its country character with greenery and large trees with 59 foot lots and another that would like to see it developed to small lots. I think the survey revealed more insight into this than was discussed as follows:

Option 1 – 59 foot lots throughout	36%
Option 2 – 59 foot on all north south roads/39 foot along Sill and Keefer	19%
Option 2 or 3	<u>2%</u>
Total	<u>57%</u>

This indicates that 57% of residents favor 59 foot lots or current lot size on Bridge, Ash and new north/south roads. Also in the survey 87% voted to keep the current lot width (59 ft min.) on Bridge and Ash. This says that the most consistent development for the area is 59 foot lots (current lot size) on Bridge, Ash and new north/south roads and at a minimum with an 87% resident vote Bridge and Ash should be zoned to maintain the current lot width.

Given the 30 foot lot option is out due to lane problems this leaves the City with a likely split in the lot size issue. Also quite a number of residents plan on not subdividing their property and will stay with the large lots further causing problems with the 39 foot lot option.

I can see that this presents quite a problem for the City in terms of consensus throughout. Also there is the equity issue of certain property owners paying for access roads and other property owners capitalizing on it and subdividing into smaller lots.


I believe the best option for the City and all involved is the first option that you presented in the last neighborhood meeting. That is 39 foot lots on Sills and Keefer, flex housing on General Currie and 59 foot lots on Bridge, Ash and the new north/south roads. This is likely to gain the most support overall, be the most consistent for the neighborhood, allow equity to be maintained for development costs and still allow development for those who want to subdivide off their back lots.

In talking to Cindy Piper about the results of the meeting I am a little concerned that the people in the meeting did not fully understanding what going to 39 foot lots would look like. Could you tell me where in Richmond there is a 39 foot lot subdivision as I would like to look at it and it seems appropriate to inform the residents of its location also so they can see what this means. Also I believe the smaller lot option would introduce significant inconsistency throughout the neighborhood as some would develop to 39 foot lots, some would not be able to as you need a neighbor's cooperation and some will just not do it. As you need each lot to go in sequence I can see this creating nothing but problems in the future for the neighborhood and the City.

As I have said before I would be willing to assist the City in this process if you feel this would be appropriate or worthwhile.

There are many people in this neighborhood that would like to see a consistent and country type neighborhood developed. I believe this can be achieved and that it is important that development guidelines and approvals are in place so people know what the area is going to look like and how it will be developed so they make their decisions with more certainty.

Yours truly,



Brad Eshleman  
7731 Bridge Street  
Richmond, B.C.  
V6Y 2S6

**Carter, Suzanne**

---

**From:** Huhtala, Kari  
**Sent:** October 28, 2003 1:08 PM  
**To:** Carter, Suzanne; Fiss, Eric; ChanPiper, Cindy  
**Subject:** McLennan South - Lot Size Zoning

For your information. One of you may want to respond to it as well.

Cheers!

**Kari Huhtala, MCIP**  
**Senior Planner**  
**Policy Planning**  
**(T) 604 276-4188 (F) 604 276-4052**  
**(E) [khuhtala@city.richmond.bc.ca](mailto:khuhtala@city.richmond.bc.ca)**  
**(W) [www.city.richmond.bc.ca](http://www.city.richmond.bc.ca)**

*"Safety...it's everyone's responsibility!"*

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

**From:** Linda Watson [<mailto:twobeagles@shaw.ca>]  
**Sent:** October 25, 2003 10:10 AM  
**To:** Huhtala, Kari  
**Subject:** FW: City Centre

-----  
On review of your website it indicates that comments or questions should be forwarded to you, however please pass this on if it should go to a more appropriate person

There has been a fair bit of discussion lately regarding the lot size zoning for the remaining single family lots in MacLennan South. Most recently the neighbourhood has been "pamphleted" by an irate resident (one presumes an owner but perhaps not) who objects to the possibility of rezoning for 39 foot frontage lots throughout and is campaigning for large lot zoning to "protect the country feel" of the neighbourhood.

I have not responded to this informal survey as I have no belief that contrary opinions will be passed on. In addition, the methodology is so flawed as to make any results meaningless, (not to mention that the survey is on round two as round one was apparently too confusing), were it not for the lingering feeling that this might further delay the Cities deliberations.

I am an owner/occupier in the area, and I love my large "country" lot. If I lived east of number 4 road, and thus had some assurance that the area would not drastically change, I would right now be investing about \$30,000.00 in upgrades/repairs to my home, as I am more than happy with the lifestyle. The problem is that I have no such assurance and thus cannot make those repairs, since it is abundantly clear that under most if not all possible scenarios I am sitting on lot value only.

At every meeting held on this issue there are investor owners who understandably want maximum density, a few vocal critics of any development who don't understand why this isn't still zoned agricultural, and a fair number of owner/occupiers who would be happy to sell off the back half of their lots and get on with it. The vocal critics hold

sway for most of the meeting and seem to be the only voices heard.

I too would be happy to just sell off the back half of my lot, however it is becoming increasingly clear that is not a viable option. The sad fact is that the cost of infrastructure does not support the return on investment that would be required to develop roads and access. There has been a recent flurry of interest in the area by some developers, including one who actually brought me an offer. It appears that my lot may be required as part of a package to provide the access road. While understandably the first offer may not have been the best I can assure you that it did not tempt me in the least. I cannot begin to replace the home I am in for what is being offered, let alone improve our situation, so why should I sell? So I don't sell, the access road doesn't go in, and nothing happens for me or for any of the owners who want access to the "backlands".

If the neighbourhood was in fact a quiet, pastoral, country setting that might be just fine. The reality however is a small, isolated area being surrounded by townhouses. Fewer and fewer owner occupied properties and more absentee landlords even more reluctant than I to invest any money in their properties. Burned out shells and vacant lots gracing the entry to the street. Rusting car hulks in the yards of month to month renters. Hardly a country atmosphere, unless you consider marijuana grow ops to be agriculture.

I would like nothing more than for the uncertainty to go away and for a viable plan to be put in place. This plan however needs to be grounded in the realities of the market and of the neighbourhood. The OCP's stated aim is to encourage density in the City Centre area. Realistically only Bridge and the east side of Ash are involved, as the west side of Ash is either park/school, or at least has the access to the backlot issue solved. Perhaps it is time to realize that the vision of a small community of large lots never was a viable alternative. Certainly 39 foot lots throughout is the only possible chance of retaining single family, however even that will depend on whether the developer/investors "blink" or whether they continue to hold out for multi-family while the neighbourhood continues to deteriorate.

As I noted I would like to submit this in response to the current petition being circulated, and to add my two-bits in to a problem that needs to be solved sooner rather than later.

Regards,

James Watson  
7680 Ash Street