



**Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings
Monday, October 21, 2019**

Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair
Councillor Chak Au
Councillor Carol Day
Councillor Kelly Greene
Councillor Alexa Loo
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Linda McPhail
Councillor Harold Steves
Councillor Michael Wolfe

Claudia Jesson, Corporate Officer

Call to Order: Mayor Brodie opened the proceedings at 7:00 p.m.

1. **RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 9940 (RZ 18-824565)**
(Location: 12700 and 12800 Rice Mill Road, 12280 and 12300 No. 5 Road; Applicant: SNC Lavalin Inc.)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was available to respond to queries.

Written Submissions:

Brendan Coyle, BC Ferry Services Inc. (Schedule 1)

Submissions from the floor:

None.

PH19/10-1

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9940 be given second and third readings.



**Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings
Monday, October 21, 2019**

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued and concerns were expressed regarding the application and the potential loss of environmentally sensitive areas.

The question on the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllr. Wolfe opposed.

2. **OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW 7100, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10006 AND RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 9999 (RZ 18-807620)**

(Location: 9080, 9086, 9100, 9180 Odlin Road and 4420, 4440 Garden City Road;
Applicant: GBL Architects)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was available to respond to queries.

Written Submissions:

- (a) Shannon Clark, 9199 Tomicki Avenue (Schedule 2)
- (b) Danny Lee, Richmond resident (Schedule 3)

Submissions from the floor:

None.

PH19/10-2

It was moved and seconded

That Official Community Plan Bylaw, 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10006 be given second and third readings.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued regarding the application. In response to queries, staff noted that (i) improvements extending beyond the frontage along Odlin Road, Garden City Road and Dubbert Street include, road widening, additional sidewalks and cycling infrastructure, (ii) there are no current active applications on the southeastern portion of the property; however, it will be developed in the future in accordance with the West Cambie Area Plan, (iii) the retention of 55 trees on the property will be considered, (iv) the parking spaces provided will be shared between the commercial and residential tenants and is consistent with Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, and (v) a cash contribution to the City's Public Art Reserve Fund will be provided.

The question on the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED**.



**Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings
Monday, October 21, 2019**

PH19/10-3

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9999 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED

3. **RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10081 (RZ 18-839945)**

(Location: 4571, 4591, and 4611/4631 Steveston Highway; Applicant: Konic Development Ltd.)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was available to respond to queries.

Written Submissions:

None.

Submissions from the floor:

None.

PH19/10-4

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10081 be given second and third readings.

In reply to questions from Council, staff noted that (i) the tandem parking is consistent with Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 and a covenant on title will ensure that the parking space is not converted into habitable space, and (ii) management of visitor parking spaces is the responsibility of the strata corporation.

The question on the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

4. **RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10082 (RZ 17-763712)**

(Location: 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway & 10831 Southdale Road; Applicant: CLO Ventures K2 Ltd.)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was available to respond to queries.

Written Submissions:

None.



**Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings
Monday, October 21, 2019**

Submissions from the floor:

None.

PH19/10-5

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10082 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllr. Greene

**5. RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10088
(RZ 17-794300)**

(Location: 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road; Applicant: Konic Development Ltd.)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was available to respond to queries.

Written Submissions:

(a) Mark Porter, 10355 Sandiford Drive (Schedule 5)

(b) Karleen Gill, 10340 Sandiford Drive (Schedule 6)

Submissions from the floor:

Mike Charlton, 10320 Sandiford Drive, expressed concerns regarding (i) secondary suites, (ii) traffic flow in and out of the development, and (iii) damage to hedges on his property.

In response to queries, staff noted that (i) the secondary suites are un-stratified rental units associated with one particular unit in the development, (ii) the driveway will have a structural barrier to guide vehicles to enter and exit to the right, and (iii) tree protection fencing will be installed for the duration of the construction process and fines will be imposed if any trees are damaged.

PH19/10-6

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10088 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED



City of Richmond

Minutes

Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings Monday, October 21, 2019

ADJOURNMENT

PH19/10-7

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (7:32 p.m.).

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the Regular meeting for Public Hearings of the City of Richmond held on Monday, October 21, 2019.

Mayor (Malcolm D. Brodie)

Corporate Officer (Claudia Jesson)

CityClerk

From: Coyle, Brendan <Brendan.Coyle@bcferries.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 16 October 2019 13:28
To: CityClerk
Subject: Redevelopment Of the BC Ferries Maintenance Site
Attachments: Redevelopment of the BCFerries Site.pdf

Hello

I would like to submit my letter of support for the redevelopment of the BC Ferries Fleet Maintenance Facility in Richmond. Can you see it gets submitted for a reading at the Oct 21st Council meeting?
Thank you.

Regards,

Brendan Coyle

Estimator

Fleet Maintenance Unit

British Columbia Ferry Services Inc.

12800 Rice Mill Rd. Richmond, BC V6W 1A1

Tel: (604) 204-2318

Cel: (604) 329-6152

brendan.coyle@bcferries.com

This message, including any attachments, is confidential and may contain information that is privileged or exempt from disclosure. It is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed, unless expressly authorized otherwise by the sender. If you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately and permanently destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.



October 16, 2019

Re: Revitalization of British Columbia Ferries Service Deas Maintenance Facility

Hello Mayor Brodie and Council Members

I am an employee of BC Ferries Richmond Maintenance Facility and I support the redevelopment of the British Columbia Ferries Service Deas Maintenance Facility located at 12800 Rice Mill Road.

I have worked in Richmond's marine industry for 35 years in boat building and as a Millwright for BC Packers Imperial Plant. I have seen the loss of good paying maritime jobs with the closure of BC Packers and the loss of marine based industry leaving Richmond.

BC Ferries maintenance yard employs several hundred tradespeople and supporting personnel as well as yearly spin-off work and contracts to local outside service providers. For these people it is environmentally and socially responsible that the employees of the refit yard live and work within the same community.

As the yard has grown over the years since about 1960 there was little thought given to the environment. The company has now endeavored to embrace an environmental conscience through programs such as the annual Great Shoreline Clean-up and Green Marine – a voluntary environmental certification program for the marine industry which sets out set of standards and performance indicators for the marine industry members.

The company is contributing to compensation for environmentally sensitive areas that border the maintenance yard and is aligned with the ideal of natural enhancements to the waterfront s such as planting of marsh grasses.

The construction of new buildings in the redevelopment will also embrace the new energy-saving technologies such as in heating and cooling as well as lighting and introducing natural elements into the new buildings.

In closing I hope the City of Richmond agrees that the BC Ferries Refit Facility is a worthwhile development.

Regards,

Brendan Coyle
3131 Garry Street
Richmond BC
V7E 2S5
bcoyle@telus.net

CityClerk

From: Shannon <Shannon_kl.co@telus.net>
Sent: Friday, 11 October 2019 09:02
To: CityClerk
Subject: RE: Public hearing on (RZ 18-807620) re Odlin and Garden City rezoning

Hi Claudia Jesson,

I'm here in writing to express my concerns and objection to the proposed rezoning on Odlin and Garden City.

I'm one of the owners and currently lived in the block across at 9199 Tomicki Ave. Currently the area in Odlin and Garden City

is already extremely high density after the walmart was built, and created lots of traffic on Garden City Road due to recent developments.

There were also safety concerns as more commercial shops were built.

I hereby object the rezoning as the current rezoning is asking for a mix used with commercial and a high density 5 storey building,

which would further worsen the traffic and erode safety in the area.

Thanks and appreciated

--

Warmest regards,

Shannon Chak



CityClerk

From: Reis,Joshua
Sent: Friday, 18 October 2019 09:51
To: CityClerk
Cc: McMullen, Mark
Subject: FW: Unoccupied lots on Garden City

Importance: High

Please see attached correspondence received related to PH Item #2.

Joshua Reis, RPP, MCIP
Program Coordinator, Development
Planning and Development Division
Tel: 604-204-8653
Email: jreis@richmond.ca
www.richmond.ca

On 17 Oct 2019, at 5:25 PM, Danny Lee <d.lee08@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Tina

I hope you are well. I wrote you some time ago about vacant lots near 4480 Garden City Road which is my parents' property. I have now been made aware that there is a re-zoning application for the area just north of 4460 to Odlin. I believe the file number is RZ-18-807620

I believe the owner of 4460 may be incapacitated so the land may be under public administration, so I wanted to see if the City can make any inquiries into the status of the lot and if possible to see if it, and 4480 may be of interest for the developer to add to their plan?

That would reduce the chances of the lots being orphaned.

Please let me know if you need any further information or if you have any suggestions into how we might find out about the status of 4460 and who we might contact?

Thank you for your attention and assistance with this matter.

Danny Lee

On Fri, May 25, 2018 at 7:18 AM Atva,Tina <TAtva@richmond.ca> wrote:

Hi Danny,



Thank you again for taking the time to send this email.

I do recognize that it can take a lot of effort to reach out to other property owners and try to incorporate additional lots into a development site. In our view, it is very important for an applicant to provide a conceptual plan for orphan lots that are not part of a development. This helps to make sure that a proposed development does not compromise the future potential of adjacent lands. This information also helps us understand if any changes to the development in question need to be considered.

Concept plans for orphan lots are typically not prepared at the pre-application stage. They are usually submitted with, or after an application has been made.

If we can find a time that suits your schedule and location, I think it would be helpful to have a phone conversation.

Thank you,

Tina

Tina Atva, MCIP, RPP

Senior Planning Coordinator

Policy Planning Department

City of Richmond

6911 No. 3 Road

Richmond, BC, V6Y 2C1

Ph: 604-276-4164

Cell: 604-315-5072

tatva@richmond.ca

<image001.gif>

People

<image002.gif>

Excellence

<image003.gif>
Leadership
<image004.gif>
Team
<image005.gif>
Innovation

From: Danny Lee [<mailto:d.lee08@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, 19 May 2018 21:33
To: Atva,Tina
Cc: Carmen Lee; Agnes Lee; Alan Sung; Byron Lee; Konkin,Barry; Craig,Wayne
Subject: Re: Unoccupied lots on Garden City

Hi Tina

Thanks again for the response. Unfortunately I am based overseas so timing wise it'd be hard to have a face to face or call.

Regarding point 2 about the orphan lots, does it make sense that if the developer has made efforts to acquire them, but upon being rebuffed still need to make conceptual plans on how to redevelop them to be consistent with the Area Plan?

Again, I believe that such a position will only perpetuate the non-conformity of those lots as the owners will feel that they cannot be left out of any development plan and basically hold the developer, other owners, and the city hostage.

However, if the city were to provide feedback at the pre-application stage that a development plan were acceptable without those lots provided there is evidence of offers being made to the outstanding owners, then that would likely make them more amenable to entertaining market-rate offers as opposed to excessive demands (I have heard one owner said they would only entertain an offer of 2 x market value). Furthermore, as I understand the city actually owns a couple of the lots, then that can also become a factor in the pre-application discussions and formulation of the development plan.

I understand that there is another attempt at assembly, which will also have pre-planning approval as part of the conditions, so I hope that the points above will be considered if they are able to secure acceptance by some of the owners again, and not be encumbered by the uncooperative owners.

Regards

Danny

On 15 May 2018, at 5:17 AM, Atva,Tina <TAtva@richmond.ca> wrote:

Hi Danny,

Thank you for the response and providing your comments. The purpose of the orphan lot provision included in the West Cambie Area Plan, which is a standard provision in a number of other City documents, is to facilitate development as anticipated in the Council approved Area Plan and not to perpetuate non-conforming uses (e.g. single detached homes).

However, if acquisition of the orphan lots cannot be achieved, an application can still be considered. In this context, the City would generally request the following information (along with the standard application submission requirements):

- Proof an effort was made to acquire the orphan lots; and
- Concept plans for the orphan lots to demonstrate development potential consistent with the Area Plan can still be achieved.

Review of this information, along with a comprehensive review of the development proposal by the various City departments, would occur upon a formal application submission. Staff cannot approve preliminary developments plans, as the outcome of the application is determined by City Council with consideration of public feedback. However, staff do offer pre-application meetings to discuss and review the development proposal with the proponent.

If you would prefer to meet and discuss, please feel free to contact me at 604-276-4164 or tatva@richmond.ca. I am in the office all week.

Yours truly,

Tina

Tina Atva, MCIP, RPP

Senior Planning Coordinator

Policy Planning Department

City of Richmond

6911 No. 3 Road

Richmond, BC, V6Y 2C1

Ph: 604-276-4164

Cell: 604-315-5072

tatva@richmond.ca

<image001.gif> People <image002.gif> Excellence<image003.gif> Leadership
<image004.gif> Team <image005.gif> Innovation

From: Danny Lee [<mailto:d.lee08@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, 10 May 2018 22:05

To: Atva,Tina

Cc: Carmen Lee; Agnes Lee; Alan Sung; Byron Lee; Konkin,Barry; Craig,Wayne

Subject: Re: Unoccupied lots on Garden City

Hi Tina

Thank you for getting back to me and I sincerely appreciate your detailed response. I suppose the outstanding concern is around the 'orphaned lots' as there is no way for the city to compel the owners to sell, yet their reluctance leaves an impact on the owners who do wish to sell to a developer who is willing to redevelop.

I believe that the assembly of 9151 Alexandra, 4480 & 4500 Garden City Road meets the policies outlined above., though there was no plan on how the

orphaned properties might fit into the development plan. However, I do not believe it should be the responsibility of the developer to propose what might be done with the 'orphaned' lots as it is not within their control or plan since they can't secure the properties.

If the city would have approved a preliminary development plan of the 3 properties mentioned above - which all the owners had accepted offers pending subject removal - planning department approval being one of them - then the hold out owners would realize that their lots may be "orphaned" which would make them more cooperative to be included in the redevelopment plan, to the interests of the wider community.

Otherwise they will remain as holdouts, if they feel that their lots must be included in any redevelopment plan, and in effect holding the other owners, developers, and ultimately the city 'hostage' to being able to redevelop the area.

Your thoughts and considerations of the above would be very much appreciated.

Regards,

Danny Lee

On Tue, May 8, 2018 at 6:06 AM, Atva,Tina <TAtva@richmond.ca> wrote:

Hi Danny,

Thank you for your email and for setting out the various concerns you have regarding your parents' property at 4480 Garden City Road.

While I don't have knowledge of all the comments you provided, I can say that when we receive inquiries for development in this part of West Cambie, we let people know that the West Cambie Area Plan includes the following policies:

- minimum lot area of 1.0 hectare; and
- no orphan properties of 0.40 hectare or less in order to facilitate development as anticipated in the Plan and to not perpetuate non -conforming uses (e.g. single detached homes).

A copy of the West Cambie Area Plan is provided here: https://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/westcambie570.pdf.

In order to meet minimum lot area, or to meet the Plan's objectives, we sometimes recommend that proponents try to include additional lots into their development concept. If that cannot be achieved, we may request proof that this was attempted and submission of a development concept for the lots not included. The purpose of the concept would be to show how the lots could work on their own and have development potential according to the (West Cambie) Area Plan. We have also consistently let people know that if they do not meet the minimum lot area, they may still make an application. However, they would be required to show how any orphan properties are able to develop to the full entitlement in the Plan (as noted above). This is our usual practise and we find that it helps to make sure neighbourhoods grow in a well-thought out pattern, in line with Council-adopted plans and policies.

In terms of development in the area, I can confirm that there is an active rezoning application (18- 807620 000 00) by GBL ARCHITECTS to rezone 9080, 9086, 9100, 9180 Odlin Rd and 4420, 4440 Garden City Rd from Single Detached (RS1/F) to a Site Specific Zone to allow a mixed-use development with one retail/office building and three residential buildings with 178 residential units. We also continue to receive inquiries for other properties in the vicinity.

A list of current development applications is available at this link: https://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/2018_Development_Applications_in_Process49423.pdf

I would be happy to speak with you further about this and/or to meet in person if you like. I can be reached at 604-276-4164 or tatva@richmond.ca. Please let me know if there is any other information I can provide.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Tina

Tina Atva, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planning Coordinator
Policy Planning Department
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC, V6Y 2C1
Ph: 604-276-4164
Cell: 604-315-5072
tatva@richmond.ca

People Excellence Leadership Team Innovation

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

From: Danny Lee [mailto:d.lee08@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, 4 May 2018 19:59

To: Atva, Tina

Cc: Carmen Lee; Agnes Lee; Alan Sung; Byron Lee

Subject: Unoccupied lots on Garden City

Dear Tina

I have been passed your details by some realtors with whom we have been liaising to try to sell my parents property at 4480 Garden City Road.

Earlier this year, there was a development group who had agreed to purchase 4480 & 4500 Garden City, and 9151 Alexandra to redevelop the area, subject to conditions.

However, the sale did not go through as the group was apparently advised by the planning department that they required further assembly, of additional lots, including lots which I understand are city-owned, though the gross combined areas of 9151, 4500, and 4480 does meet current requirements to redevelop.

The additional requirements caused the deal to fall through.

The additional conditions to assemble more properties has also dissuaded other potential developers, as the additional conditions adds significant additional costs and risks to redevelop, effectively impacting the owners' ability to sell the properties, resulting in the strip of unoccupied houses, and creating the environment vulnerable to break-ins and other questionable behavior.

Since the collapse of the deal, my parents house at 4480 has been broken into twice. Luckily my elderly parents no longer live there full time, though they do visit in the daytimes, do some gardening and check on the house to ensure it doesn't fall into much disrepair, or worse yet, become a squatting site.

I am sure that you are aware that there are now many unoccupied properties on that strip, creating an environment which attracts the type of behaviour resulting in my parent's home being broken into.

This is also recognised by the RCMP as they had been alerted by calls from the existing neighbors of seeing people move around the yards at night, looking for places to squat, rest or do whatever they do, which is impacting the existing neighbours, and potentially putting them at risk.

The only option would be to secure the house by boarding up the windows or erecting fences - such as at 4440 Garden City - but that is unreasonable considering they still try to use the house, but what else can they do to secure the property?

It certainly puts my parents at risk as they do wish to visit their property to

maintain it until they can sell it - what might happen if they come across unexpected visitors one visit?

I would sincerely appreciate it if you could discuss with the councillors and the rest of the planning team on what might be done to expedite / help facilitate the redevelopment of that area, including easing the extraneous requirements being put upon developers which caused the last deal to collapse.

I certainly believe it would be in the interests of the city, and the public, to see that this area is redeveloped sooner than later and that efforts should be made to facilitate it, ESPECIALLY as the city owns some of the lots in the area and should be able to enact measures to encourage and support redevelopment plans.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your response.

Danny Lee

Jesson, Claudia

From: De Sousa, Steven
Sent: Friday, 18 October 2019 09:08
To: Jesson, Claudia
Subject: FW: Correspondence - 10831 Southdale Rd, 9671, 9611, 9591 & 9571 Steveston Hwy (RZ 17-763712)

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Michael Giligson [<mailto:giligson@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, 16 October 2019 18:22
To: De Sousa, Steven
Cc: Vivienne Giligson
Subject: Re: 9980 Mortfield Court

Steven,

I have received notice of public hearing and will likely attend and would like to meet with you this Friday first thing in the morning if possible to see the plans and documents that correspond to the re zoning if possible.

On initial review of what i have found online I see that part of this development will be miniscule secondary suites; a few of which belong to units that look like they abut my property line. Nowhere in previous communication/ signage or elsewhere was there a discussion of secondary suites.

I have a family of three young daughters all of which are under 7 years of age and I cannot see how this size of secondary suite would be conducive to a safe family oriented neighbourhood as I do not think it is too far fetched to gather that such a size of suites would attract transient type tenants/ or even AirBNB. I am strongly opposed to this allowance for secondary suites in what is originally a Single Family neighbourhood; I cannot see how such a size of suite would be conducive to the official community plan. This is not just densification without justification but also a health and safety concern for my family and others that were hoping to settle in a Single Family area of Richmond.

I would like to make an appointment Friday morning to see the plans and understand exactly where these secondary suites are.

Also, could you explain what convertible units are?

Thank You,



Schedule 5 to the Minutes of the
Public Hearing meeting of
Richmond City Council held on
Monday, October 21, 2019.

10355 Sandiford Drive
Richmond, B.C. V7E 5S6
October 9, 2019

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

Attention: Director, City Clerk's Office

RE: Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10088 (RZ17-794300)

Dear City Council:

I am writing in regards to the proposal to rezone 7 single family dwellings along the 10200 and 10300 section of No. 2 Road to 22 low density townhouse units and 4 secondary suites with vehicle access from No. 2 Road.

My main concern in this matter is the increase to traffic congestion on No. 2 Road. In the past few years we have seen numerous properties along No. 2 Road change from single family to multiple dwelling use. In addition, 132 town homes replaced the old Steveston High School. This has resulted in more and more traffic moving along No. 2 Road in order to access the No. 2 Road Bridge, on route to Vancouver. As well, traffic uses this corridor to access Richmond's business centre by way of Granville Ave and Westminster Hwy.

By approving this rezoning application, Council is continuing to add to this congestion.

Over and over we hear that the citizens in our community, and in neighbouring communities, are majorly concerned with traffic congestion. There are just too many vehicles travelling along major roadways that were never built to handle such traffic. The media reports that our local politicians share this concern and many studies and discussions have taken place with little actually happening to alleviate the problem. However, our local politicians continue to approve such rezoning projects as this one, and the problem only gets worse because we keep adding more people.

One has to ask why are we doing this. Who benefits? I realize there is a housing crisis in our community and we should be trying to add more "housing spaces" to add to the demand. But these are not the type of accommodations that those most affected by the housing crisis can afford. Many of the young people who we count on to be a part of and contribute to our community can't afford these town homes. Most of the buyers of these new developments tend to be buyers coming from out of country. So in essence, we are doing nothing to help "our" housing crisis. The only people who really benefit are the developers pushing these projects in order to make more money.

We, as a community, need to address the problems of traffic congestion in our community before we approve any more rezoning projects that add to the traffic problems we already face. I would ask that City Council decline to approve this application, and others of a similar nature, until such time when we have a good plan in place that addresses our traffic congestion problems here in Richmond.

Sincerely,



Mr. Mark Porter



Schedule 6 to the Minutes of the
Public Hearing meeting of
Richmond City Council held on
Monday, October 21, 2019.

CityClerk

From: Karleen Gill <karleen_gill@shaw.ca>
Sent: Friday, 18 October 2019 13:11
To: CityClerk
Subject: Public Hearing: Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment 10088 (RZ 17-794300)
Attachments: Amend10088RZ17794300.docx

To Whom it May Concern:

Please find attached a letter documenting my comments about the proposed bylaw amendment 10088 (RZ 17-794300), which is scheduled to be discussed at a Public Hearing on Monday, October 21, 2019. I am an affected property owner, and would like these comments to be part of the record of the hearing.

Thank you for your assistance,

Karleen Gill
10340 Sandiford Drive
Richmond BC



Virus-free. www.avast.com



10340 Sandiford Drive
Richmond BC V7E 5M4

City Clerk's Office
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond BC V6Y 2C1

October 18 2019

Re: Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10088 (RZ 17-794300)

To Whom it May Concern:

I am the owner of the property at 10340 Sandiford Drive, and am writing to express my concerns about the proposed development detailed in Amendment Bylaw 10088 RZ 17-794300.

I have read the abovementioned amendment bylaw and associated documents, with particular attention to how the proposed rezoning, demolition, and constructions might impact my property, and my family's enjoyment of it. Overall, I am satisfied with the proposal, and trust that the developer will not make any major changes to their stated plans if and when the amendment is approved. However, I do have a few concerns about the security and protection of my property during the demolition and construction phases of the project.

My first concern is about the two protected trees (#12 and #16) which are on my property. Although they have been tagged as trees that must be preserved, I am concerned that the very minimal fine of \$1,000 is not enough to deter a developer from damaging or destroying these trees. If either of those trees are destroyed, the beauty and value of my property will be diminished, and that \$1,000 fine (which I assume would go to the city, not me) would do nothing to alleviate the situation. What assurance can I, as the landowner, have that the trees will be protected? From what I have observed at other Richmond development sites, nicely asking developers to please respect city by-laws has not been effective.

My second concern is about the security of my property during demolition and construction. My current fence will, I believe, need to be removed, and replaced with a new six-foot wooden fence (see attachment 2). Part of my yard will also be within a Tree Protection Zone (TPZ). What measures will be put in place to ensure that my yard is secure during this period? I have dogs, and need to know that they can roam in our yard without fear of their wandering off. I also need to know that people will not be able to enter our property from the construction site.

Finally, I am concerned about an impending rodent invasion once demolition work begins. When the Steveston Secondary School property was demolished, our neighbourhood was flooded with rodents, who had been displaced from their homes in the abandoned school buildings. I fear a recurrence with the demolition of the homes on No. 2 Road. The homes in question might be tenanted, but they certainly are not all occupied, at least not by humans. I would like to see a pest control plan implemented as part of the demolition project.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,

Karleen (Jordan) Gill