

To Public Hearing	
Date:	Nov 15, 2010
Item #:	1
Re:	bylaw 8609

Johnson, Gail

From: Burke, Holger
Sent: October 18, 2010 9:19 AM
To: Johnson, Gail
Subject: RE: setbacks on AG-zoned land---related to the October 12th Council meeting

Holger Burke, MCIP
 Development Coordinator
 City of Richmond
 (E) hburke@richmond.ca
 (P) 604-276-4164
 (F) 604-276-4052

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

From: Gabrielle A. Grun
To: mayorandcouncillors@richmond.ca
Sent: Saturday, October 02, 2010 2:36 PM
Subject: setbacks on AG-zoned land---related to the October 12th Council meeting

October 1, 2010,

Dear Mayor and Councilors of the City of Richmond,

Subsequent to my letter of May 17, 2010 to the Planning Committee, I would like to strongly emphasize that the shape, width and frontage are also very important factors with respect to the issue of setbacks on AG-zoned land. A simple, cursory evaluation by size alone is inadequate e.g. a long, narrow, rectangular shape versus a square-like configuration. Even the amendment presented to the Planning Committee on May 18, 2010 as well as Option 3 of the Public Survey had a special clause for properties with a frontage of 50 m or less (flawed though it was in my view). Setting the standard at the commonly-used "2 acre rule" is not sufficient.

While the Ministry of Agriculture and Land is reviewing this matter, the City will provide input to the process. Furthermore, as I interpret it, the City has the final say in reference to this topic regarding properties in its jurisdiction.

My response to the survey and comments on agriculture are found below.

Many thanks for taking the time to peruse this material. I look forward to a favorable response.

Yours sincerely,

Gabrielle A. Grün
M.Sc.
10551 No. 6 Road
Richmond

http://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/agriculturezonesurveyv326781.pdf

My name and my address are already known-----Gabrielle Assunta Grün
;10551 No. 6 Road, Richmond BC
Yes
2.72 acres ; 1.133 ha
Own
Option 1

If someone is willing to take on the additional costs of building structures further from the road in order to minimize the effects of vehicular-related vibrations as well as noise and air pollution, privacy issues, avoidance of other non-regulated buildings or obstructions and other reasons, there should be no hindrance from the City regarding this.

One should add no increased burden to property owners to prove their case to obtain a variance or allow more autocracy to proliferate.

Some AG-zoned properties have fairly ;large ditches (I am not referring to my property in particular). Right from the start, these land owners have the ditch space subtracted from their usable land under a distance limit , as I understand it.

Comments regarding agriculture:
There is nothing that can prevent or make into law the practice of small-scale food "personal" food production in the "gaps" or interleaving space between the primary dwelling place and secondary residential buildings. Likewise, residential homeowners can grow some of their own food around their yards, patios, etc. This mainly addresses the non-commercially agricultural AG-zoned lands.

As a basic example, the "Edwards Turkey Farm" site has crops growing in front of the primary home location, Food can be produced almost anywhere, not using large farm machinery. but with more intensive or precise techniques.

The focus should be on fostering safe and sustainable agricultural activities for those personally involved in farming, residents of areas surrounding farms and consumers of the food products.

To the best of my knowledge, the cosmetic pesticide ban does not include agricultural uses. Aerial spaying with respect to blueberry "plantations on No. 6 Road have occurred in the past. The wind can spread the chemicals around. The raising of livestock such as cattle should be kept outside a certain radius of crop cultivation. The E. Coli outbreak from spinach in 2006 was traced back to "cattle" origins. The poultry cull in the Fraser Valley in Spring 2004 highlights the need to separate animal-source food production from other land utilization. How many tractors or ploughs do not emit carbon dioxide? Are there controls on the release of agricultural contaminants or byproducts to the environment?

Thanks.

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

img017.pdf

img015.pdf

img016.pdf

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.