

McMullen, Mark

From: MacKinnon, Deb
Sent: Monday, 05 January 2015 09:50
To: MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Steveston Property

Categories: 12-8060-20-9155 - RZ 13-649524 - Steveston High School Site - 10440 & 10460 No. 2 Road

I was asked to share this email with council.

Thanks very much

Carol Day

Hello, Carol;

Firstly, I want to say how happy we were to see you on Council! As family, friends, and neighbours, we went through the list and you were on ours! Meeting you at City Hall only confirms that you truly care for the people of Richmond and understand the issues down to the grassroots level.

Thank you for taking the time to respond personally. At Committee, we observed that councillors were led to believe that each of the greenways would be 40ft wide. We were disappointed that staff, nor the developer, clarified that the proposed greenways is actually 30ft wide. We believe support would have been less had this been clarified. 30 feet is not very wide for the length of the corridors, especially when sandwiched between fences. However, the motion that has passed, if it calls for 40ft greenways, then the onus is on the developer.

At heart, we still oppose the loss of this land from the Public Trust to developers, and at a huge discount once rezoning is achieved. If at all possible, this deal ought to be stopped since the sale is conditional to successful rezoning. Perhaps it's too late since the first reading at council yesterday.

At a time when the OCP recognizes a shortage of 330 acres of parkland by 2041, it is a prime opportunity for the City to procure it from the School District through land swap or land swap plus partial payment. The City has influence because it controls the zoning. Retaining Common land is an excellent investment for our future. In the last few years land value have increased approx. 40%. Developers sure recognize the value of land, shouldn't it be time we do too?

The developer underpays for the land. The developer has hoodwinked the public: They agreed to buy the land at a huge discount, as zoned education/institution, with the condition that it be successfully rezoned to a much more valuable designation. In the public record is that the City, School Board, and developer will work together towards its rezoning; and likely not coincidentally, the completion date of Dec. 17, 2014, noted one year earlier, in Oct. 2013, by the Richmond Review, is the SAME DATE passed by Council. -Why? Was it rushed from Committee to Council (next day) for this reason without even the final drawings?

In the final analysis, we have a developer buying land at a cheap rate with a certain understanding that that land would be much more valuable once rezoned. The City Corporation stands to gain as an enterprise. The School District stands to gain as an enterprise. The Public loses. Since rezoning appears inevitable, why isn't it rezoned first then sold for

twice the price? Even the 7.51 acres for townhouses (~80 single family lots) would be worth more than \$52M once rezoned. While the city and school board's interests and public's interest should be same, they conflict when the city and school board act/become enterprises having entity interests of their own.

We feel badly when we analyze the gains and losses in this equation, and thought it would be good to share this with you. Hopefully you can share our thoughts with other Councillors, especially Harold, for whom we don't have an email address.

Thank you!

Jason