

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