

SCHEDULE 4 TO THE MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING
FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS HELD
ON FEBRUARY 16TH, 2004.

5780 Lancing Road,
Richmond, B. C.
V7C 3A1

December 14th, 2001

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

Attn: Mr. Richard McKenna,
City Clerk

Re: File No. E201 - 189889 -- 7731, 7711 7651
7631 No. 2 Road and 5980 Lancing Road

Two posted signs indicate application has been made by Lulu Island Realty to replace the single family homes at the above addresses with 14 Townhouses and a 3 storey apartment complex over 22 parking units.

I have 2 particular concerns in this regard:

- (1) Traffic/Parking
- (2) Devaluation of other properties within the subdivision

- (1) a. The proposed complex is adjacent to the Blundell/No. 2 Road intersection which has already had its share of accidents (even with modifications - lights, etc.)
- b. The West exit from Blundell Shopping Center is just South of this intersection and is a problem in itself even with its secondary light control.
- c. The proposed light signal at the intersection of No. 2 and Lancing Roads (to accommodate this change) is more than likely to create as many problems as it solves due to its proximity to the traffic lights already in existence.
- d. Even now, because of No. 2 Road traffic, much of the subdivision traffic "detours" through Laurelwood to the North (to exit onto Granville) and this creates other problems.
- e. Traffic on No. 2 Road will increase dramatically within the near future due to population and lots being split along No. 2 Road creating "mini" subdivisions.

- (1) f. One major impact will come when the B. C. Packers property is developed because, as it now stands, No. 2 Road will be the most convenient route.
- g. If (as is likely) the 22 parking units cannot accommodate all the vehicles, etc. associated with this complex, where will they park?
- (2) a. The properties within this subdivision will surely decrease in value as has happened before when changes were made.
- b. The 1st change involved Lindsay Gardens, and no further comment need be made in that regard.
- c. The 2nd change came in late 1989 and you will note from your letter of May 2nd, 1989 (File A1005 V3) that 60.2% of the homeowners clearly indicated they did not wish any change in lot sizes, etc.
- d. You subsequently ignored the 60.2% and commenced to slice up the subdivision following a hearing on December 18th, 1989 (held, coincidentally, when most of the homeowners were attending the annual Xmas party at McKay Elementary School.
- e. The next change occurred in 1995/6 (File A1005 V3 REZ-017 Section 13-4-7), and your letter of Nov. 7, 1995 says only 16.5% replied to survey - is it any wonder considering previous experiences? In any event the application passed!
- f. Following this last change, comparison was made between a home sold in this subdivision (7551 Ludgate @ Ludlow) and one in Broadmoor (9591 Herbert @ Afton). The difference was \$105,000.
- g. The two subdivisions are about the same age, and gradually being replaced with the standard stucco/brick structures. There are many similarities such as ditches, size, access to main roads, bridges, etc.
- h. Both homes are on secondary corner lots, and have about the same lot size (7551 Ludgate - 8929 sq. ft.) and (9591 Herbert - 9350 sq. ft.) The Ludgate property sold in March, 1996 for \$325,000 and the following month the Herbert property went for \$430,000. The two homes were torn down shortly thereafter and replaced with stucco and brick structures.

Page 3 of 3 pages
City of Richmond

There can be no doubt that changes in lot sizes, etc. have had an adverse affect on land values as indicated herein. The circumstances under which these changes were made only compounds the wrong.

It would therefore seem reasonable to take an overall view of the Subdivision, with thought to all homeowners, when considering requests from individuals and groups with self-interests. There must be comparable benefit (further re-zoning, house sizes or ??) to remaining properties to compensate for loss in values.

An amount of \$105,000 is quite significant and, sooner or later, is likely to become an issue.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J.C. Hamilton". The signature is fluid and includes a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

James C. Hamilton
for V.E. Hamilton