#### Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the Council Meeting for Public Hearings held on Tuesday, May, 20, 2014.

### MayorandCouncillors

From:	Webgraphics
Sent:	Monday, 12 May 2014 14:40
To:	MayorandCouncillors
Subject:	Send a Submission Online (response #786)

	To Public Hearing
	Date: MAIL 20 2014
	Item #
1922226	Ro: <u>M. 9094</u>
	R212-602748

# Send a Submission Online (response #786)

## Survey Information

Site	City Website	
Page Title	Send a Submission Online	
URL	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx	
Submission Time/Date	5/12/2014 2 39 57 PM	

### Survey Response

Your Name	Katherine Covell
Your Address	302-6233 London Rd, Richmond
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number	13040 No 2 Road, Richmond
Comments	Although Mr Yuen has now addressed the easement issue, he has failed to take into account the serious concerns of area residents as to the height, density, and proximity of the proposed complex. I believe that Richmond City Council has an excellent opportunity here to show leadership in issues of development. Concerns have been raised across the Greater Vancouver Area about unnecessarily large buildings which are changing the nature of the area in their footprint – a footprint that leaves no space for trees, grass, and flowers. The gardens and the tree canopy – what makes the area so pleasing and liveableare rapidly disappearing. In addition, high density areas create many social and health problems for residents. You can make a difference. Richmond can lead the way. There is no need for the complex as proposed. A smaller complex would be much more consistent with the area, more environmentally friendly, less destructive of privacy, and less of a threat to an already over-crowded road. This is not a dense inner city area. It is a semi-rural area in



the process of transition from commercial to residential. The existing condos and townhouses have been built to include green space and appropriate density for the area. The proposed building does neither. Rather it is designed to fill the area among the existing buildings – to be wider, taller, and in very close proximity. The proposed building remains unacceptable to area residents. We again request your leadership in requiring a smaller building; one that does not block the sun and sky and compromise our privacy by being so close and so high; one that is not so large there is still space for trees, grass, and flowers, and one that does not add hundreds more cars to an already inadequate and unsafe #2 Road.