



# Steveston Community Laneway Proposal

Prepared for: Richmond City Council

Prepared by: Residents of Richmond Street and Broadway Street between No. 1 Rd & Second Avenue

January 24, 2018

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Objective

The objective is to work with Richmond City Council to come to an amicable solution for what to do with the city land found in behind our homes.

### Issue

Residents have outlined a number of concerns with the opening of the laneway designation as well as the paving of said laneway, including: the lack of purpose for a laneway; traffic management; safety issues with vehicles speeding through lanes and exiting onto No. 1 Rd and Second Avenue; nuisance issues behind our homes such as noise, vandalism & graffiti, alcohol & drugs, dumping of garbage, theft from our yards, breaking and entering, etc.; the loss of functional green space; and the environmental impact on our community.

### Solution

There are five principles that we, as residents who live here, will hold firm in any proposal brought forward:

1. We do not want a laneway
2. We do not want any vehicle traffic behind our homes, now or in the future
3. We do not want any pavement, concrete, brick, or other impermeable construction material used behind our homes that will impact the environmental sustainability of our community
4. The land must be functional green space that will be used on a regular basis by the adjacent residents
5. We need to ensure the maintenance of a safe and secure community

### Options

The options presented below are listed from most preferred (option 1) to least preferred (option 4). All of these options have costs and benefits associated with them, some of which residents may not have full understanding of, from an operational perspective. As such, we feel a discussion with City Council and City staff to work through these ideas is important, and a necessary next step.

#### **Option 1 - Remove the Laneway from the discussion**

This would entail returning to the status quo understanding that access would be required by the city for any sewer system inspections or repairs. Some factors to consider:

- Fences would be put back equally and amicably among neighbours
- We could agree to hire an approved contractor at our cost to install fences in larger hinged sections
- We would agree to not build any permanent structures or plant large trees on this land

#### **Option 2 - Lease the land from the City**

The City could consider leasing the land to the residents for their private use. This could be set up contractually with a stipulated timeframe attached (i.e., 50 years, 75 years, 99 years). This would allow the City to maintain ownership of the land, as well as justify to other constituents as to why City land is being used privately. Some factors to consider:

- Our understanding is that this already exists in our area of Steveston

- We recommend a minimum 40 year lease, which is on the low end of the new sewer system's lifespan
- Residents would be supportive of a nominal fee, if required to be contractually sound

### **Option 3 - Purchase the land from the City**

The City could consider selling the land to the residents for their private use. Some factors to consider:

- There are homes on Pleasant, Regent, and Hunt Streets between 4th and 7th Avenues who own this 10 foot section of land (Appendix A)
- This approach has been used in Ladner and Tsawwassen, and there is an opportunity to learn from them
- *The financial figures that follow are for discussion purposes only:* Currently, the 10' x 33' plot of land is valued at approximately \$103,000. However, this land is not functional, and as a result, we would offer to purchase the land at 50% of its value - \$51,500.
- Not all residents have the financial ability to pay for this land immediately, therefore we recommend that residents can choose one of three options in this scenario:
  1. Purchase the land outright
  2. Purchase the land over a period of time (i.e., monthly/annual payments to the City)
  3. Place a charge on the property, such that when the property is sold to another owner, the City receives their payment for the land at that time

### **Option 4 - Functional green space for adjacent residents**

Our fourth option is to fence-off the city land at both ends and create a functional green space that adjacent residents can use. We could use this space for things such as a linear parkway for our families, a private community garden, or a picnic area. Some factors to consider:

- The fences at either end would be designed to prevent the public from entering
- Residents would be responsible for maintaining the land, such as cutting the grass, weeding, seeding, etc.

These options will remove all costs to taxpayers, including laneway construction costs, fence construction costs, and ongoing maintenance costs. The purchase option is also a significant revenue generator for the City that could be used for other improvements in Steveston, such as filling in the ditches, installing curb and gutter on Steveston's side streets, or a new Steveston Community Centre.

### **Conclusion**

We would like City Council to revise the consultation process and create an opportunity to reengage with City Council and City staff on an amicable solution. While this is occurring, and after the sewer system is repaired, we ask that our fences be put back up and a moratorium be put on any further laneway development. It is clear that this issue has struck a chord with the community and we will continue to ensure Council, the community and public are aware of our concerns.

# STEVESTON COMMUNITY LANEWAY PROPOSAL

## Objective

The objective is to work with Richmond City Council to come to an amicable solution for what to do with the city land found in behind our homes. For the residents immediately impacted by this decision, an amicable solution includes the following key principles:

- Residents do not want a laneway
- Residents do not want any vehicle traffic behind our homes, nor do we want anything constructed in a way that would allow vehicle traffic in the future
- Residents do not want any pavement, concrete, brick, or other impermeable construction material used behind our homes that will impact the environmental sustainability of our community
- The land must be functional green space that will be used on a regular basis by adjacent residents
- Residents need to ensure the maintenance of a safe and secure community, including minimized nuisance to the community, such as noise, vandalism & graffiti, alcohol & drugs, dumping of garbage, theft from our yards, breaking and entering, etc.

## Scope

The scope of this proposal to use the City land in behind our homes includes the 36 homes directly impacted by the current sewer failure that has occurred between Richmond Street and Broadway Street from No. 1 Rd to Second Avenue. By bringing this proposal forward, the residents in no way suggest that the City of Richmond should apply the same proposal to other areas of the City. Each area of Richmond is different and each situation has its own factors to consider. Therefore, other areas of Steveston and Richmond are considered to be out of scope for the specifics of this proposal.

Throughout this document we refer to “residents immediately impacted” as well as “our area of Steveston”. “Residents immediately impacted” refers to those residents on the south side of Richmond Street and the north side of Broadway Street between No. 1 Rd and Second Avenue. We may also refer to them as “adjacent residents”, meaning they are adjacent to the current sewer system the is being repaired. “Our area of Steveston” refers to those residents contained within the block of homes from the corner of Steveston Hwy and No. 1 Rd south to Chatham Street, west to Seventh Avenue, north to Steveston Hwy, and then east to No. 1 Rd. Please refer to the map in Appendix A to obtain a visual representation of these two references. “Our area of Steveston” is contained within the blue box in the diagram and the “residents immediately impacted” are contained within the red box and are a subset of “our area of Steveston”. (Note, the green boxes found in Appendix A will be explained in subsequent sections of this document)

## Background

The sewer system behind our homes on Richmond Street and Broadway Street between No. 1 Rd and Second Avenue has failed and needs to be replaced. The sewer system runs through an approximate 6m wide piece of

## STEVESTON COMMUNITY LANEWAY PROPOSAL

---

land behind our homes, which is owned by the City. Upon completion of the sewer system repair, the City is planning to install a laneway, which will be a significant change to our community.

Affected residents were informed of this decision via a letter left by City staff at our front door on November 8, 2017. In the letter, the City indicated that there would be “2 Open Houses for residents to discuss this project with staff.” These two open houses were held on November 9 and 10, 2017, which gave residents less than 48 hours notice to prepare. These sessions were designed merely to inform residents of the situation, not discuss alternative options to paved laneways. Collectively, residents were not happy about the process that was taken by the City.

Residents then addressed City Council in a closed meeting on Tuesday November 14, 2017. Recognizing that the land in question is owned by the City, residents outlined a number of concerns with the opening of the laneway designation as well as the paving of said laneway. City Council listened to us at the meeting, but did not engage in any conversation, aside from a few questions from one Council member.

Residents were informed by City staff on November 20, 2017 via a letter left at our front doors that the plans to install a paved laneway after the sewer repairs, would not be changed. Once again, residents were not happy with the outcome, or the process that was being taken by the City or its Council.

Residents took it upon themselves to create greater awareness of these changes amongst the Steveston community, as this decision by City Council has a much greater impact on our community than just the 36 homes immediately impacted by the current sewer failure. From the City of Richmond website, it states: “Consistent with Council Policy 9016, lanes will only be constructed where there is a City-owned lane dedication and access is required for sewer or other infrastructure replacement.” Essentially, this is interpreted to mean that as the sewer systems fail in our area of Steveston (Appendix A), laneways will be opened up.

Through the process of informing our community, we obtained over 275 petitions from Steveston residents within a five day period, stating that they do not want paved laneways throughout our community. This includes printed and signed petition forms as well as online petition forms.

Residents approached City Council again on November 27, 2017 at their open Council meeting. Six residents spoke at the meeting, again outlining a number of concerns that we have with the proposed laneway development and to express our frustration with the process. All six speakers had a consistent request to City Council to provide an opportunity to properly consult with the City on options that are more meaningful for our community. At this meeting, City staff accused residents of using the land “illegally”; however, multiple residents can cite examples of permission given by the City to do so “as long as it is done amicably between neighbours.” Again, there was little to no discussion with City Council at this meeting and no indication as to next steps.

Residents proceeded to follow-up with Council members individually to understand their perspectives on the situation and explore other options. We consistently heard from Council members that they are open to a specific proposal coming forward from the residents that is supported by all of the residents immediately impacted. Council members also consistently suggested that we should meet with City staff to explore options.



## STEVESTON COMMUNITY LANEWAY PROPOSAL

---

As a result of the individual conversations with multiple Council members, we met with John Irving, City Director of Engineering, and Victor Wei, City Director of Transportation on December 5, 2017 to explore options. Residents brought forward a number of ideas, such as functional green space to be used by the community, or purchasing the land. Mr. Wei provided some feedback and things for us to think about as we put together the proposal.

Residents were informed by the City, via letter on December 21, 2017, that they would be holding two public consultation sessions on January 10 & 17, 2017 at the Steveston Community Centre, as well as an online survey at [www.LetsTalkRichmond.ca](http://www.LetsTalkRichmond.ca) between January 10 & 28, 2017. The letter stated “the public consultation will now be expanded to seek public input on a number of lane standard options, including:

- Paved Lane
- Green Swale Lane
- Country Lane
- Bikeway”

Being optimistic, and continuing to hope for some dose of reason from Council, we interpreted this letter literally, and expected the opportunity to also discuss other lane standard options that residents were well prepared to bring forward in the meeting. We very quickly realized in the session that these four options are the only four being considered by City and that there would be no interest from City staff to discuss the merits of other options.

We asked for options that do not involve any vehicle traffic, yet three of the four still have vehicles travelling needlessly behind our homes. The City stated that bollards or other traffic calming measures could be installed, but residents do not feel this is good enough. Bollards can be taken out at any time in the future. We asked for no pavement to be laid, yet three of the four options still involve a significant amount of pavement. Unnecessary pavement will have a significant negative impact on our community. We asked for functional green space options, yet none of the options serve any function to our community. People in our community will not regularly use a driveway, pedestrian pathway or bike lane in this area. We do not have our garages in the rear of our homes, and there are already seven streets going east/west from Steveston Hwy to Chatham.

Virtually none of our questions were answered at the consultation session, there was no opportunity to discuss other, more creative solutions, and City staff continued to dismiss our concerns regarding the impact that these options will have on the future liveability and environmental sustainability of our community.

We have yet to understand the City’s purpose for opening the laneway designations. We also do not understand why the City seems to be pushing for vehicle traffic behind our homes. As a result of what we have seen to date, the residents immediately impacted made the decision to bring this proposal forward to City Council.

### Issue

Recognizing that the land in question is owned by the City, residents outlined a number of concerns with the opening of the laneway designation as well as the paving of said laneway. Concerns include:

*The lack of purpose for a laneway behind our homes*

There are seven streets directed east/west in the 800m stretch between Steveston Hwy and Chatham Street. In comparison, running north on No. 1 from Steveston Hwy to Williams (also an 800m stretch)

there are two streets that exit west, and then from Williams to Francis (also 800m) there are another two streets that exit west. A laneway behind our homes will not serve any purpose for traffic flow.

Residents immediately impacted have indicated on a number of occasions that we do not need or want vehicle access behind our homes. Although this has been a consistent message, the Consultation on Lane Standards document that was provided to residents in preparation for the January 10 and 17 consultation sessions (found in the appendix) listed vehicle access as one of the benefits of a lane behind our homes. Any access to the rear of our homes, let alone vehicle access, is perceived by all residents immediately impacted and many other residents in our area of Steveston, as a significant downgrade to our community. Our garages are not in the backs of our homes (nor do we want our garages in the back), so vehicle access by the residents is not necessary.

The City's engineering department has indicated to us numerous times that the laneway is not required for access to the sewer system. Many other areas of Richmond have an easement with statutory right of way running through the backyards, which allows the City access, as needed. There is no reason why this cannot work in our area of Steveston as well. We have also heard from the City that they cannot put fences back up on City land for private use. We feel the solutions outlined further on in this document will resolve this concern.

Not only have we continued to hear inconsistent messaging from the City in terms of the reasons for this laneway designation being opened up, we have yet to hear a reason that makes any sense and would lead to the betterment of our community.

### Traffic management issues

The City has indicated that they will put traffic calming measures up in the laneway, including speed bumps and bollards. However, the bollards will only be at the No. 1 Rd end, meaning that vehicles still have access to the laneway. As discussed above, we do not agree with this. In addition, bollards can be taken down at any time in the future and residents are not comfortable with the possibility of this occurring, as it will cause significant traffic management issues exiting onto No. 1 Rd, which is a busy arterial roadway.

### Safety issues with vehicles exiting onto No. 1 Rd and onto Second Avenue from the laneway

The likely eventuality of vehicles exiting onto No. 1 Rd will result in safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as other passenger vehicles travelling north/south on No. 1 Rd. On page 6 of the City of Richmond's Lane Policy it states "in terms of safety and supporting traffic flow, cars should not travel directly from a lane to a major road or vice versa, but rather enter a local or collector road first. In this way, the change in speed is accomplished gradually and the number of potential points of conflict are reduced and focused." Although we have heard from the City that this policy is specific to new land developments, the principles are no different in our situation.

Second Avenue is a designated bike lane. Adding additional exit points onto Second Avenue will increase the risk of incidents involving cyclists. This is an unnecessary risk that will result for constructing a laneway behind our homes that serves no purpose.

### Safety issues with vehicles speeding through lanes or using them to take short cuts

The City has indicated that they will install traffic calming measures if a laneway is constructed. We applaud the City's efforts in trying to appease our concerns, but the reality is that any vehicle traffic in the back lane will be a risk to our community. This risk will minimize any possibility of the lane being used for anything other than vehicle movement. Parents will not allow their young children to play in the lane if vehicles begin using a laneway as a way to perceivably take short cuts.

### Nuisance issues behind our homes

There are a number of nuisance issues that will be created by constructing a laneway behind our homes. These may be perceived as insignificant on their own, but combine these together, and it will have a very negative impact on our community. Nuisances include:

- Noise, including vehicle noise and people noise; the latter will be a significant nuisance at night, particularly in the summer months when youth and young adults will be using the lanes as a hangout away from the exposed streets and less likely to be seen by police.
- Garbage thrown into our backyards or left in the laneway for residents to clean up; this may include massive dumping of unwanted refuse
- Vandalism and graffiti on our fences, in our backyards, and generally in the laneway
- Lights coming in through our bedroom windows at night while we try to sleep; the majority of homes in our area have bedrooms situated at the back of the home

### Nuisance issues that are more criminal in nature

Many of the nuisance issues listed above are illegal activities, but for the most part, they do not threaten the safety of the residents. There are other nuisance issues that are more likely to threaten the safety of the residents, including:

- The use and/or distribution of drugs and alcohol
- Groups of people who may threaten the physical safety of the residents or other community members using the laneway
- Unwanted entrants into our backyards
- Attempted break-ins

It is important to understand that many of the issues listed in the last two sections are likely not reported to the police, unless if the activity resulted in a significant crime (i.e., someone injured or threatened, an actual break-in). Analyzing statistics from the RCMP will not provide an accurate representation of the real risk. These issues are a reality and an unnecessary risk for our community, as the laneway is not needed.

### The loss of green space and the environmental impact on our community

Part of the uniqueness of our community is it's walkable outdoor living space and our appreciation for the special eco-system at our door step. The proposed laneway is environmentally problematic due the dramatic reduction in green space.



Green space is of tremendous value for its reduction to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). Healthy lawns neutralize carbon emissions. One average, lawn can neutralize the emissions of a standard car driving a distance of 600 km. Lawns have 10 times the benefit of a tree due to its density and rate of growth. Basically you can grow more, faster, and have a greater impact on carbon emissions.

The current 36 lots directly impacted by the laneway proposal will lose 10% of their total size, all of which is green space. Approximately 12,000 sq. ft. of turf grass and vegetation lost between No. 1 Rd and 2nd Avenue alone. Roughly extrapolating this across our community results in 6 acres of green space, or the equivalent of 5 football fields, lost to pavement. This equates to removing approximately 55,000 pure litres of oxygen from the air each day or what 100 people would consume daily.

Richmond is considered a location that is apt for flooding in the coming decades. Richmond gets 44 inches of rain per year. What happens when the 100 year flood hits? Roads, parking lots, sidewalks, pavements, along with asphalt, concrete, brick, stone, and other building materials, combine to create impervious surfaces that resist the natural absorption of water. Cities flood not because of water accumulation but due to the lack of places for it to go. The Atlantic Magazine, and many more sources, noted that excessive paving and hardscaping were major factors in the recent Hurricane and subsequent flooding in Houston Texas. We need to ensure this can't happen in our community.

Richmond's Official Community Plan indicates our city's understanding that it's not enough to "do less harm", but instead we need to value "Carbon Sequestration - "...protect and enhance Richmond's natural environments to support carbon retention as well as other important ecosystem service." It also includes "Council's endorsement of a 10% energy reduction of 2007 levels by 2020". Will we achieve these objectives by removing green space and replacing it with asphalt?

### *The loss of functional green space*

As we've noted, the loss of green space has a detrimental impact on the environment. It will also have a detrimental impact on the liveability of our community. Many of us are currently using this space for our kids to play, to sit out and read a book or watch the birds, or to grow various plants, including fruits and vegetables. There are many advantages to maintaining this land as functional land. A laneways will not serve any useful function for our community.

In addition, our homes are set far back on our properties. Losing the 10 feet of land, albeit City owned land, results in a 30-50% loss of the functional green space we have been using for four or more decades. Again, we understand that it is City owned land, but nonetheless, we have become accustomed to having the space and this is an important factor for us. We feel the solutions proposed in the next section of this document, will resolve this issue.

In summary, the issues outlined above are important for us and the liveability of our community into the future. When we purchased our homes, we were all likely informed by our real-estate agents that the land back there was owned by the City; however, we were not given any indication that this land would be reclaimed. **We choose to live in a community based on the way it is designed, and all of us chose this community without the**

**existence of laneways. Introducing a significant change such as this severely impacts our desire to live in our current homes.** The factors listed above are significant enough to us, that they may impact our wishes to live here in the future.

### Solution

We believe that there are very few options for this land that will attract people from other areas of Steveston or Richmond. Realistically, whatever the outcome is, this land will likely only be used by the adjacent residents. We are also deeply concerned about the negative impact that any open space will have to our community, regarding nuisance crimes and other disturbances. Therefore, all options presented below focus on how the land can be used by the residents adjacent to the land.

In our view, there are five vitally important principles that we, as residents who must live with the final outcome, will hold firm in any proposal brought forward:

1. We do not want a laneway
2. We do not want any vehicle traffic behind our homes, nor do we want anything constructed in a way that would allow vehicle traffic in the future
3. We do not want any pavement, concrete, brick, or other impermeable construction material used behind our homes that will impact the environmental sustainability of our community
4. The land must be functional green space that will be used on a regular basis by the adjacent residents
5. We need to ensure the maintenance of a safe and secure community, including minimized nuisance to the community, such as noise, vandalism & graffiti, alcohol & drugs, dumping of garbage, theft from our yards, breaking and entering, etc.

### Options

The residents immediately impacted by the current laneway construction as well as many residents in our area of Steveston have come up with creative ideas of what could be done with the City land behind our homes. The options presented below are listed from most preferred (option 1) to least preferred (option 4). All of these options have costs and benefits associated with them, some of which residents may not have full understanding of, from an operational perspective. As such, we feel a discussion with City Council and City staff to work through these ideas is important, and a necessary next step.

#### **Option 1 - Remove the Laneway from the discussion**

This would entail returning to the status quo understanding that access would be required by the city for any sewer system inspections or repairs. Residents still do not have a good understanding of why the fences cannot be put back up after the sewer system is repaired. We have been using the land for over forty years with zero push back from the City. Use of this land has been functional and green. Some factors to consider:

- Fences would be put back equally and amicably among neighbours
- We could agree to hire an approved contractor to install fences in larger hinged sections to allow City to have easier access to the land when sewer system issues arise. We would be happy to do this at our cost.
- We would agree to not build any permanent structures on this land and would agree not to plant any large trees that could impact the integrity of the sewer system.

### Option 2 - Lease the land from the City

One of the concerns we have heard from the City with regards to just putting the fences back up after the sewer repairs, is that they cannot install private structures on city land for private resident use. Conceptually, we understand this concern, even though the residents have been using the land privately for over forty years. To address this issue, the City could consider leasing the land to the residents for their private use. This could be set up contractually with a stipulated timeframe attached (i.e., 50 years, 75 years, 99 years). This would allow the City to maintain ownership of the land, as well as justify to other constituents as to why City land is being used privately. Some factors to consider:

- Our understanding is that this already exists in our area of Steveston, as one resident at the consultation session on January 10 mentioned that her family has been leasing land since the 1970s. The address is 3340 Pleasant Street. Their legal description states “Lane allowance leased from the Corp of Richmond.” *We ask that City staff look into the history of this and consider the practicality of this for our situation.*
- We recommend a minimum of a 40 year lease. This timeframe is on the low end of the new sewer system’s lifespan, which creates an opportunity to revisit the situation as the sewer system’s integrity comes to an end and major construction may again be required.
- Over the term of the lease it also allows the City to reassess the densification needs and determine if community development modifications are required, such as laneway housing. The City could then engage in a multi-year communications plan to gain support from the residents.
- We do not believe that residents should be charged a fee for leasing the land; however, if a nominal fee is required to be contractually sound (e.g., a one time cost of \$1), then residents would be supportive.
- Again, we could agree to hire an approved contractor to install fences in larger hinged sections
- Again, we would agree to not build any permanent structures or large trees on this land

### Option 3 - Purchase the land from the City

The City could consider selling the land to the residents for their private use. Some factors to consider:

- There are other homes in our area of Steveston who own this 10 foot section of land (likely as an easement with a statutory right of way). At some point in the past, the City sold this to the owners, and as such, there is already a precedent for this to occur. Many of these homes are on Pleasant, Regent, and Hunt Streets between 4th and 7th Avenues. Please see the green boxes on the map in Appendix A. *We ask that City staff look into the history of this and consider the practicality of this for our situation.*
- This approach has also been used in Ladner and Tsawwassen, and there is an opportunity to learn from them and adapt City policy accordingly.
- *The financial figures that follow are for discussion purposes only:* We have met with a reputable Steveston real estate agent to discuss this option at length. Currently, the cost of land in Steveston is \$314 per square foot. For most residents, the land size in question is 330 sq ft. (10’ x 33’), which amounts to approximately \$103,000. However, this land is not functional, as nothing permanent can be built on top of it; therefore, we do not believe the land is worth \$314/sq ft. As a result, we would offer to purchase the land at 50% of its value - \$51,500. Of course, this is open to further discussion.
- Recognizing that not all residents have the financial ability to pay for this land immediately, we recommend that residents can choose one of three options in this scenario:
  1. Purchase the land outright
  2. Purchase the land over a period of time (i.e., monthly/annual payments to the City)

3. Place a charge on the property, such that when the property is sold to another owner, the City receives their payment for the land at that time

### **Option 4 - Functional green space for adjacent residents**

As mentioned, residents are deeply concerned about the negative impact that any open public space behind our homes will have to our community. Crowd noise, garbage dumped in the lanes and thrown into our backyards, vandalism, and graffiti are a few of the petty nuisance issues we will have to deal with; as well as issues that threaten the safety of our families, such as the use and distribution of drugs and alcohol, unwanted entrants into our backyards, theft from our backyards, and attempted or actual break-ins. As such, our fourth option is to fence-off the city land at both ends and create a functional green space that adjacent residents can use. We could use this space for things such as a linear parkway for our families, a private community garden, or a picnic area. Some factors to consider:

- The fences at either end would be designed to prevent the public from entering
- Residents would be responsible for maintaining the land, such as cutting the grass, weeding, seeding, etc.

With all four options, there is significant financial gain to the City and taxpayers. These options will remove all costs to taxpayers, including laneway construction costs, fence construction costs, and ongoing maintenance costs. The purchase option is also a significant revenue generator for the City that could be used for other improvements in Steveston, such as filling in the ditches, installing curb and gutter on Steveston's side streets, or a new Steveston Community Centre.

### **Conclusion**

Overall we believe that in the rush to repair the sewer, the City also rushed decisions pertaining to the future of the space. We would like City Council to revise the consultation process and create an opportunity to reengage with City Council and City staff on an amicable solution. While this is occurring, and after the sewer system is repaired, we ask that our fences be put back up and a moratorium be put on any further laneway development. It is clear that this issue has struck a chord with the community and we will continue to ensure Council, the community and public are aware of our concerns.

APPENDIX A: STEVESTON MAP



**Figure 1:** the area contained within the blue box is referred to throughout this document as “our area of Steveston”; the area contained within the red box is referred to as the “residents immediately impacted”; the homes within the green boxes own the 10ft of land in question, resulting in a longer parcel (approximately 39.6m, as opposed to 36.5m for most of the homes with designated laneway in behind)

# APPENDIX B: COMMUNITY SUPPORT

## Residential signatures

To show our support for this proposal, we have obtained signatures from the residents immediately impacted. These residents have read this proposal and are in agreement with all options as a final outcome. More specifically, all residents have agreed to the purchase option (option 3), as it is described.

**Note: this version of the proposal does not contain signatures. A copy of the signatures will be presented to City Council at the Council meeting on January 29th, 2018.**

Resident name	Address	Check box for option agreement				Signature
		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	
	3900 Richmond Street					
	3888 Richmond Street					
	3886 Richmond Street					
	3880 Richmond Street					
	3860 Richmond Street					
	3858 Richmond Street					
	3852 Richmond Street					
	3846 Richmond Street					
	3840 Richmond Street					
	3830 Richmond Street					
	3820 Richmond Street					
	3804 Richmond Street					
	3800 Richmond Street					
	3780 Richmond Street					
	3760 Richmond Street					
	11760 Second Avenue					
	11780 Second Avenue					



Resident name	Address	Check box for option agreement				Signature
		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	
	3731 Broadway Street					
	3751 Broadway Street					
	3755 Broadway Street					
	3771 Broadway Street					
	3775 Broadway Street					
	3791 Broadway Street					
	3811 Broadway Street					
	3815 Broadway Street					
	3831 Broadway Street					
	3835 Broadway Street					
	3839 Broadway Street					
	3851 Broadway Street					
	3871 Broadway Street					
	3879 Broadway Street					
	3891 Broadway Street					
	3895 Broadway Street					