

Schedule 3 to the Minutes of the Public Hearing meeting of Richmond City Council held on Monday, December 17, 2018.

ON TABLE ITEM

Date: NOV. 26, 2018
Meeting: MUNICIPAL
Item: #10-APPLICATION BY ORIS
6091 & 6111 DYKE RD.

From: Weber, David
Sent: Monday, 26 November 2018 15:47
To: Berg, Hanieh
Subject: FW: RZ15-702486

From: Roy Oostergo [mailto:roostergo@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, 26 November 2018 13:41
To: Eng, Kevin
Cc: Roy Oostergo
Subject: RZ15-702486



Kevin,

I write with continued questions about the above-noted rezoning on Dyke Rd. and some specific concerns about communications between City Planning and myself.

I was made aware of the Planning Committee meeting on November 20th by a neighbour just a few days before it was to be held, and was unable to attend due to work responsibilities. I understand that the development application was presented, reviewed and ultimately accepted to move forward to Council by the Planning Committee.

I noted with interest in the Planning Committee Agenda and Staff Reports package a response from Oris dated June 8, 2018 in response to my letter to you of April 12, 2018. This was the first time I had seen of such a formal response from the proponent. If you recall, I did meet with you briefly at City Hall on August 15th where you provided me an opportunity to review the latest plans. However nothing was mentioned about a formal response to my letter being received.

Can you please help me understand why this response was not made available to me as the concerned party who wrote to the City in the first place? Is this not a formal policy of the Planning Department? The proponent spent a lot of time in their response, it would have been nice to review it previously in order to understand their positions. There has been no other formal communication on any of these matters to me by anyone.

With respect to some of the key issues I raised back in April, please note the following:

1. West setback to Dyke Rd.

I was pleased to see that the current plans from the proponent have moved the setback for floors 2-4 back from 4.5m to 6m, thank you. However I remain interested to understand why this setback is not recommended by your department to be 7m, as is the case for The Pier across the road. Can you kindly explain to me what specific conditions led to The Pier being required to maintain a 7m setback? Simply put (a) what were those conditions, (b) do those conditions exist on the east side of Dyke Rd., and (c) if those conditions do exist, should not the new building also maintain the same setback?

2. Height of the elevator shafts

I understand that features such as rooftop amenity structures and elevator shafts may extend to a height that is greater than the "Maximum Building Height" that is noted in the Development Application Data Sheet. Can you please answer two questions for me with respect to this issue:

a. What is the process for approving the height of accessory structures over and above the stated Maximum Building Height?

b. Can you confirm what the actual highest height of The Pier buildings is in meters? I ask this as while I have been able to locate and review the Development Permit application and other correspondence with respect to The Pier's rezoning (DP 11-575759), none of the building dimensions are legible from the scanned documents.

Thank you for providing this further information. Unfortunately my business travels have me in Ottawa this week so I am unable to attend this evening's Council meeting.

Regards,

Roy Oostergo
503-6168 London Rd.
Richmond, BC
V7E 0C1