

## ON TABLE ITEM

Date: May 20, 2025  
Meeting: Public Hearing  
Item: 2

Schedule 4 to the Minutes of the  
Public Hearing meeting of  
Richmond City Council held on  
Tuesday, May 20, 2025.

Chris Jensen  
7-8080 Francis Rd  
Richmond, BC, V6Y1A4  
[JensenCD@gmail.com](mailto:JensenCD@gmail.com)  
778-989-9206

May 20, 2025

**Re: City of Richmond - Public Hearing 9000 No 3 Rd Development**

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed five-storey mixed-use development at 9000 No. 3 Road, which is directly adjacent to my home. As a resident and parent of young children, I am deeply concerned about the significant negative impacts this development will have on our family and our neighbours within the BCS2125 strata at 8080 Francis Road. I have listed our main concerns below:

1. Loss of Greenspace and Common Property

- a. This area of greenspace plays a vital role in our community, providing not only a natural habitat for local wildlife but also a valuable recreational and environmental resource for residents. The removal of this green area could have serious consequences for biodiversity, stormwater management, and air quality, as well as for the physical and mental well-being of those who live nearby.
  - I. The common greenspace at Units 8-11 will be reduced by approximately 10 ft x 10 ft at each unit
  - II. The common greenspace at Unit 7 will be reduced in half, a removal of 10 ft x 57 ft of greenspace
  - III. 8080 Francis has maintained this greenspace since 2006, almost 20 years

2. Encroachment on adjoining land

- a. Has Section 36 of the British Columbia Property Law Act been reviewed?
  - i. If yes, do the residents of 8080 Francis Rd have rights to the property or financial compensation?
  - ii. If no, I would like to formally request that this be reviewed



PHOTOCOPIED

MAY 20 2025

& DISTRIBUTED

## **Section 36 of the British Columbia Property Law Act:**

[https://www.bclaws.gov.bc.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/96377\\_01#section36](https://www.bclaws.gov.bc.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/96377_01#section36)

### **Encroachment on adjoining land**

*36 (1) For the purposes of this section, "owner" includes a person with an interest in, or right to possession of land.*

*(2) If, on the survey of land, it is found that a building on it encroaches on adjoining land, or a fence has been improperly located so as to enclose adjoining land, the Supreme Court may on application*

*(a) declare that the owner of the land has for the period the court determines and on making the compensation to the owner of the adjoining land that the court determines, an easement on the land encroached on or enclosed,*

*(b) vest title to the land encroached on or enclosed in the owner of the land encroaching or enclosing, on making the compensation that the court determines, or*

*(c) order the owner to remove the encroachment or the fence so that it no longer encroaches on or encloses any part of the adjoining land.*

### **3. Removal of Trees**

- a. The mature trees currently on the site provide essential environmental, aesthetic, and social value to our neighborhood. Their removal would represent a significant loss to the local ecosystem and to the character of the area. These trees contribute to air purification, noise reduction, carbon absorption, and stormwater management, while also offering shade, privacy, and beauty
  - i. Trees of more than approximately 50' in height will be cut down.
  - ii. Birds and other animals live and nest in these trees
- b. Removal of trees may cause drainage issues.
  - i. Has a study or hydrological review been completed regarding the drainage once the trees are removed?
- c. Has the Tree Protection Bylaw 8057 been followed?
  - i. Including but not limited to
    1. Tree Removal on Sites Involved in the Rezoning Process (TREE-06)
    2. Replacement Tree Guideline (TREE-10)
- d. The Tree Protection Bylaw 8057 Section 4.3 (d) states that replacement trees do not need to be planted on the site of proposed development and that the developer can pay for the replacement trees

which will be planted at a location to be determined by the City of Richmond.

- i. We are concerned that this is an affordable loophole for a developer to not have to replace trees on a proposed building site.
- ii. Due to the density of this project and according to the plans, it seems clear that the East property line of 9000 No 3 Rd will lose 6 trees with none being put in to replace them.

#### 4. Building Design

- a. There are no existing five-storey buildings in the immediate vicinity, making this development an outlier in terms of scale and density.
- b. The proposed project is inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood and sets a concerning precedent for future developments.

#### 5. Natural Light Impacted

- a. The loss of natural sunlight will directly affect our family's quality of life, increase our heating needs during the colder months, and potentially reduce our property value.
- b. Sunlight is not only essential for the health and well-being of my family but also plays a vital role in the usability and enjoyment of our outdoor space. Reduced access to daylight would significantly alter how we live in and experience our home
- c. Have any sunlight/shadow assessments been completed?

#### 6. SRW 46820

- a. If this development is permitted to proceed as currently proposed, it may violate the terms of the SRW, compromise access for essential services, and potentially expose the city and the developers to legal liabilities or challenges. It also raises significant fairness concerns for surrounding property owners who have respected these legal designations on their own land.
- b. I respectfully urge the planning authority to conduct a thorough legal and technical review of this aspect of the proposal and ensure that no development is permitted on SRW land.

#### 7. Privacy and Security

- a. The increased density and the presence of commercial spaces will lead to more foot traffic and activity near our home, further compromising our family's sense of security and comfort.

- b. I have already raised concerns with the City of Richmond about the initially proposed height of the fence between the development and our complex as it was initially planned at under 4 ft high. That poses significant security concerns for my family. This was addressed by the City in a timely manner, but I am concerned other similar issues may be missed by myself or other residents in the area.

#### 8. Parking on Francis Rd

- a. Currently, there is room to park only five cars along the south side of Francis Road immediately east of the proposed development. According to page 3 of the architectural plans, version 2.0, a total of 77 parking spots are required. However, the developers have only proposed to provide 52 spots—almost one third less than what is mandated. This shortfall will inevitably lead to substantial parking congestion.
- b. Many existing residents on Francis Road already rely on parking along Rideau Gate, and with the proposed development adding further demand, the situation will only worsen. To make matters more complicated, one resident of Rideau Gate is known to regularly call the city to request ticketing of vehicles parked near the front of their property. This is already a source of tension and is likely to increase when more vehicles are forced onto Rideau Gate

#### 9. Traffic

- a. Traffic along No 3 Rd is well known to be a problem. Adding significant traffic to this area is dangerous.
- b. Traffic heading East out of 8988 No 3 Rd is often in danger of being hit by east bound traffic on Francis. Adding an entrance point on the South side of Francis directly across from the entrance on 8988 may cause an increased risk for accidents
- c. Have traffic studies been completed?
- d. Will the traffic or light patterns change?

#### 10. Land Value

- a. The construction of a five-storey building in a predominantly single-family residential area will likely decrease the value of nearby homes. The visual impact of such a large structure, coupled with the associated noise and traffic, will make the neighborhood less desirable for potential buyers.

### 11. Lack of Community Engagement

- a. Residents in our complex and nearby homes were not adequately informed or consulted about the scope and impact of this development.
- b. Such a significant project, especially one that directly affects our shared environments and daily lives, should involve transparent dialogue with affected communities

### 12. Public Process Accountability

- a. Was a formal community consultation or town hall conducted?
  - i. If so, were concerns raised by residents taken into account in the current design?
  - ii. If not, why was a formal consultation process bypassed?

### 13. Overburdened Local Services

- a. The influx of new residents will place additional pressure on local schools, parks, garbage collection, emergency services, and public infrastructure. Our neighborhood schools are already nearing or at capacity, and increased density will exacerbate this issue.
- b. Has the city performed an infrastructure capacity assessment to ensure the area can support this level of increased density without compromising quality of life for existing residents?

When my wife and I purchased our home, one of the main reasons we chose this property was the adjacent greenspace. We saw it as the perfect setting to raise a family, and since moving in, we have been blessed with two children.

Over the years, this space has become an essential part of our lives. It is where our children first crawled, learned to walk, and now spend countless hours playing, exploring, and growing—physically, emotionally, and socially.

The proposed development, which would take away half of this space, is deeply distressing to us as a family. Beyond the obvious loss of greenspace, we are concerned about the profound impact this will have on our mental health and emotional well-being.

Access to greenspace is a well-documented factor in promoting psychological health. It reduces stress, encourages physical activity, and fosters stronger family bonds. For our children, this space is not just a yard—it is a vital outlet for creativity, play, and development.

For us as parents, it offers a sense of peace and stability in an increasingly demanding world. The potential loss of this space introduces not just logistical

challenges but emotional strain—disrupting routines, limiting outdoor activity, and eroding a core source of comfort and connection.

We respectfully urge you to reconsider or seek alternative options to this development. This development proposal, as it stands, disregards the principles of balanced urban planning. It compromises livability, safety, and fairness for those of us who have built our lives here. We ask that the city fulfill its duty to protect community well-being, ensure equitable development practices, and prioritize long-term sustainability over short-term expansion.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris Jensen