Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of Richmond City Council held on Tuesday, July 8, 2025.

Biason, Evangel

From: Xuan Wu <xuan.wu2@student.kpu.ca>
Sent: July 5, 2025 6:55 PM
To: DevApps; CityClerk; MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Public Input on Rezoning Application No. RZ 25-012598
cc: Josh Reis
Categories: - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Dear Mayor/Councillors,

I am a resident of the neighborhood directly affected by the proposed rezoning of 10471 No. 3 Road (Application No. RZ 25-012598), which would allow for the development of a three-storey, 27-unit market rental apartment building. I live at **7900 Goldstream Place**, just adjacent to the proposed site, and I am writing to express several concerns regarding the potential impact this project may have on our community.

1. Community Safety and Noise Impact

Our neighborhood is currently a peaceful, low-density residential area. A sudden increase of 27 new residential units will bring a large influx of people, increasing noise levels and potentially affecting the sense of safety that we currently enjoy. The change in scale and density may disrupt the character and tranquility of our community.

2. Parking and Traffic Pressures

It is unclear whether the project will provide sufficient parking spaces for residents and their visitors. If parking is not adequately planned, there is a strong likelihood that overflow parking will spill into surrounding residential streets, particularly **Goldstream Place**, which is a small, quiet street with limited capacity.

Although the main access is indicated to be from No. 3 Road, there is currently no information about whether a pedestrian path or secondary access will connect the site to Goldstream Place. If such a connection is created, it may increase foot traffic and could further encourage visitors or even residents to use Goldstream Place as a parking alternative, intensifying congestion and disrupting the calm environment of our street.

Moreover, our neighborhood is near two schools—**Stevenson-London** and **Maple Lane Elementary**—that already experience high traffic volumes during peak hours. The added traffic from 27 more households could worsen congestion and increase risks for students who walk or bike to school.

3. Potential Impact on Property Values

There is concern among many neighbors that a higher-density rental development may negatively impact surrounding property values. Increased noise, traffic, and limited parking all influence the overall appeal of the area and could affect long-term property investment.

I respectfully urge the City to thoroughly assess the long-term effects of this rezoning application, and to ensure that residents' voices are taken into account—particularly with regard to parking, traffic safety, and neighborhood integrity. We hope to see clear plans to mitigate these issues before this project moves forward.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Sincerely,
Wu, Xuan
7900 Goldstream Pl
Richmond, BC
xuanwu2@student.kpu.ca
778-230-1359

FORM LETTER

To: Mayor & Each Councillor
From: City Clerk's Office
Materials Relating to an Agenda Item
Meeting: Planning
Date: July 8, 2025 Item#: 1

Total Received: 7

Biason, Evangel

From: Lisa L <lisalenh@hotmail.com>
Sent: July 6, 2025 11:22 PM
To: DevApps; CityClerk; MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598
cc: Josh Reis
Categories: - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598 (10471 No. 3 Road)

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to state my formal opposition to rezoning application RZ 25-012598. This proposal violates the city's own Official Community Plan (OCP), which does not permit apartment buildings on this "Neighbourhood Residential" site.

This project is not the "gentle density" the City promised. It is a massive overdevelopment, nearly seven times the density legally permitted under the new provincial rules.

[INSERT PERSONALIZED PARAGRAPH HERE]

I respectfully request that Council uphold the OCP and deny this application to protect the stability and safety of our community.

Sincerely,

Lisa Lenh
7791 Malahat Ave.
Richmond BC

Get Outlook for Android

PHOTOCOPIED
JUL 07 2025 PA
& DISTRIBUTED

Biason, Evangel

From: Karen Dy <karenangdy@gmail.com>
Sent: July 4, 2025 7:12 PM
To: DevApps; CityClerk; MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598

Categories: - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598 (10471 No. 3 Road)

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to state my formal and unconditional opposition to rezoning application File No. RZ 25-012598 for 10471 No. 3 Road.

This "spot-zoning" request violates the city's own bylaws, which do not permit apartment buildings on this property. Approving it would set a dangerous precedent, undermining zoning stability across Richmond.

I respectfully request that Council deny this application to uphold the City's planning framework and protect our community.

Sincerely,

Karen Dy
7980 Goldstream Place

Sent from my iPhone

Biason, Evangel

From: andrew so <aso1211@gmail.com>
Sent: July 4, 2025 9:42 PM
To: DevApps; CityClerk; MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ25-012598 (10471 No.3 Road)

Categories: - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to state my formal and unconditional opposition to rezoning application File No. Rz 25-012598 for 10471 No. 3 Road.

This "spot-zoning" request violates the city's own bylaws, which do not permit apartment buildings on this property. Approving it would set a dangerous precedent, undermining zoning stability across Richmond.

I respectfully request that Council deny this application to uphold the City's planning framework and protect our community.

Sincerely,
Andrew So
7771 Goldstream Drive
Richmond BC V7A 1S5

Biason, Evangel

From: humphrey chang <humphreychangster@gmail.com>
Sent: July 5, 2025 12:08 PM
To: DevApps; CityClerk; MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598

Categories: - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598 (10471 No. 3 Road)

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to state my formal and unconditional opposition to rezoning application File No. RZ 25-012598 for 10471 No. 3 Road.

This "spot-zoning" request violates the city's own bylaws, which do not permit apartment buildings on this property. Approving it would set a dangerous precedent, undermining zoning stability across Richmond.

I respectfully request that Council deny this application to uphold the City's planning framework and protect our community.

Sincerely,
Humphrey Chang
7920 goldstream place. Richmond

Cheers and Best regards

Sent from my iPhone

Biason, Evangel

From: Annegret Li <annegretli@gmail.com>
Sent: July 5, 2025 1:44 PM
To: DevApps; CityClerk; MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598

Categories: - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to state my formal and unconditional opposition to rezoning application File No. RZ 25-012598 for 10471 No. 3 Road.

This "spot-zoning" request violates the city's own bylaws, which do not permit apartment buildings on this property. Approving it would set a dangerous precedent, undermining zoning stability across Richmond.

I respectfully request that Council deny this application to uphold the City's planning framework and protect our community.

Sincerely,
Annegret Li
7920 Goldstream place. Richmond

Biason, Evangel

From: Ernest Chang <ernestchang7920@gmail.com>
Sent: July 5, 2025 4:18 PM
To: DevApps; CityClerk; MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598 (10471 No. 3 Road)

Categories: - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to state my formal and unconditional opposition to rezoning application File No. RZ 25-012598 for 10471 No. 3 Road.

This "spot-zoning" request violates the city's own bylaws, which do not permit apartment buildings on this property. Approving it would set a dangerous precedent, undermining zoning stability across Richmond.

I respectfully request that Council deny this application to uphold the City's planning framework and protect our community.

Sincerely,
Ernest Chang
Resident of 7920 Goldstream Place, Richmond BC

Biason, Evangel

From: Gabriel Chow <gabriel.chow4223@gmail.com>
Sent: July 7, 2025 12:22 AM
To: DevApps; CityClerk; MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598

Categories: - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598 (10471 No. 3 Road)

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to state my formal opposition to rezoning application RZ 25-012598. This proposal violates the city's own Official Community Plan (OCP), which does not permit apartment buildings on this "Neighbourhood Residential" site.

This project is not the "gentle density" the City promised. It is a massive overdevelopment, nearly seven times the density legally permitted under the new provincial rules.

I respectfully request that Council uphold the OCP and deny this application to protect the stability and safety of our community.

Sincerely,

Gabriel Chow
7791 Malahat Ave, Richmond, BC V7A 4H3

TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR
FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

ON TABLE ITEM
Date: July 8, 2025
Meeting: Planning
Item: 1

Biason, Evangel

From: Christina Louis <christinalouis888@gmail.com>
Sent: July 7, 2025 10:39 PM
To: DevApps; CityClerk; MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598

Categories: - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598 (10471 No. 3 Road)

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to state my formal opposition to rezoning application RZ 25-012598. This proposal violates the city's own Official Community Plan (OCP), which does not permit apartment buildings on this "Neighbourhood Residential" site.

This project is not the "gentle density" the City promised. It is a massive overdevelopment, nearly seven times the density legally permitted under the new provincial rules.

A development of this unprecedented scale would inevitably introduce a significant increase in vehicle movements, directly impacting the traffic safety around Maple Lane Elementary and Steveston-London Secondary schools, where many children walk and cycle. Furthermore, the sheer density proposed raises substantial concerns regarding public safety and the preservation of our neighbourhood's secure environment. The potential for creating unobserved pathways and areas, if not meticulously designed in adherence to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, risks undermining the established sense of community oversight and livability essential for children to play freely and safely within our residential area.

I respectfully request that Council uphold the OCP and deny this application to protect the stability and safety of our community.

Sincerely,
Sasha He
7771 Malahat ave, Richmond.

CITY OF RICHMOND
DATE
JUL 08 2025
RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

PHOTOCOPIED
JUL 08 2025 PA
& DISTRIBUTED

TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR
FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

ON TABLE ITEM
Date: July 8, 2025
Meeting: Planning
Item: 1

Biason, Evangel

From: LINDA MEADE <ljmeade@shaw.ca>

Sent: July 7, 2025 2:52 PM
To: DevApps; CityClerk; MayorandCouncillors

Categories: - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

CITY OF RICHMOND DATE JUL 08 2025 RECEIVED CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Mayor and Councillors

I object to the rezoning application for 10471 No,3 Road Richmond (RZ.25-012598).

This three story development is a significant intrusion in scale/density for co-existance with the 1 and 2 storey homes of our neighborhood.

It is a violation of our community plan as apartments are not permitted, and a contradiction to our new zoning bylaws.

The spot rezoning, requests an increased density from 40% to 48.9% which is an enlargement of 22.25%

They request the removal of ALL trees on site in addition, some trees on shared boundaries and adjacent properties are identified for removal with owners consent. This is an assault on our neighborhood greenness, and a reduction of privacy. Some of these trees are MASSIVE- further denuding the area by removing a buffer for noise and vehicular pollution from No,3 Road

A gate providing access to Goldstream Place is not currently identified. This should be denied in future. It will increase foot/bicycle traffic on our street, Also of concern will be the availability of our street parking area to supplement their parking area, These things are both a safety and security risk to our street.

PHOTOCOPIED
JUL 08 2025 PA
& DISTRIBUTED

Further, Maple Lane Elementary school is already operating at over capacity.The recent revised zoning in Richmond will increase

the school population, The additional children from 14 families of this development only exasperates the situation at Maple Lane

Elementary and Steveston London Secondary creating further overcrowding.

Thank You,

L Meade

7931 Goldstream Place Richmond

Memorial in Opposition to Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598

Introduction: A Defense of Established Community Character and Sound Planning Principles

This memorial is submitted on behalf of the Concerned Residents of the Maple Grove Neighbourhood, a coalition of homeowners and long-term residents from Goldstream Place, Goldstream Drive, and Malahat Avenue who are directly and adversely affected by the subject proposal.[1] We are formally registering our profound and data-driven opposition to the proposed Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment and rezoning application RZ 25-012598 for the property at 10471 No. 3 Road.[1]

Our opposition is not a rejection of development *per se*, but a principled defense of the existing, legally-codified vision for our neighbourhood as established in the City of Richmond's Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000.[1] The proposal before this Committee, supported by the staff report, represents a radical and unwarranted departure from this plan. It constitutes a clear case of speculative "spot zoning" that threatens to destabilize our community, undermine the integrity of the OCP, and set a dangerous precedent for all residential neighbourhoods in the City of Richmond.

This memorial will demonstrate that this application is fundamentally flawed and must be rejected. The core arguments are that the proposal is:

- **Procedurally Flawed:** It improperly and prematurely relies on a *draft* OCP update to justify a major amendment to the *current* and legally binding OCP, thereby subverting the statutory public process.[1]
- **Fundamentally Incompatible:** The proposed density, form, and scale are grossly out of character with the established low-density "Neighbourhood Residential" context, creating an isolated island of high density.[1]
- **Detrimental to Public Welfare:** It will create unmitigated negative impacts on traffic, public safety, infrastructure, and the local environment, with a particular

and unacceptable risk to children attending the nearby Maple Lane Elementary School.[1]

- **Lacking in Legitimate Public Consent:** The public consultation process has been demonstrably insufficient, with many residents alleging they did not receive proper notification, a claim substantiated by the community petition submitted to the City.[1]

The concerns raised by the community are not born from a simple resistance to change. The public correspondence reveals a sophisticated understanding of urban planning principles. Residents are asking specific, technical questions about infrastructure capacity, the adequacy of sewage and water systems [1], parking ratios and the consequences of a variance [1], the safety implications of pedestrian access routes [1], and the preservation of mature trees under existing city bylaws.[1] This high level of civic engagement positions the community not as an obstacle, but as a vital partner in ensuring sound, sustainable, and responsible planning for Richmond's future.

Critical Deconstruction of the Staff Report (RZ 25-012598)

A thorough analysis of the staff report prepared by the Planning and Development Division reveals a series of critical flaws, contradictions, and procedural errors that render its recommendation untenable. The report fails to provide a sound planning rationale for the proposal, instead relying on a flawed premise that undermines the very foundation of the City's OCP.

The Flawed Premise: An Inappropriate and Prejudicial Spot OCP Amendment

The application's primary requirement is to amend the OCP land use designation from "Neighbourhood Residential" to a higher-density residential designation that permits apartments.[1] This is not a minor adjustment; it is a fundamental and isolated change to the land use map for a single parcel. The Broadmoor Planning Area map and aerial photography clearly show the property is surrounded on three sides by low-density "Neighbourhood Residential" and "Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (RSM/L)" zones.[1]

The proposed three-storey, 27-unit apartment building is an anomaly with no logical transition to the surrounding neighbourhood fabric.

This action constitutes *de facto* "spot zoning"—the singling out of a small parcel of land for a use classification entirely different from that of the surrounding area, for the primary benefit of the property owner and to the detriment of the community. This practice is widely condemned in the planning profession as it subverts the comprehensive, long-range vision of an Official Community Plan, leading to chaotic, unpredictable, and inequitable development patterns.

The Central Procedural Error: Premature and Improper Reliance on a Draft Policy

The staff report's most significant and fatal flaw lies in its justification for the OCP amendment. The report explicitly states:

> "The proposed OCP land use map designates the subject site for apartment or limited mixed-use buildings with up to four-storeys... This application is being considered under existing OCP policies... However, prior to this rezoning application being considered by Council, should there be a change to the applicable policies and the underlying land use designation of the site as a result of the OCP update, staff will reevaluate the need for an OCP amendment at that time." [1]

This reasoning is procedurally improper and legally questionable. The Planning Committee's statutory mandate is to evaluate applications against the *currently adopted* OCP Bylaw 9000. To use a *draft* OCP—a document that has not undergone the full, rigorous process of public hearings and statutory adoption—as a basis for recommending a major amendment to the current OCP is an overreach of authority. It creates a prejudicial environment where a single applicant is allowed to "jump the queue" and benefit from a policy that does not yet legally exist, while all other property owners must abide by the current rules and await the formal conclusion of the OCP update process. This fundamentally compromises the fairness and integrity of the planning system.

This approach appears to be part of a broader departmental strategy to accelerate development. The agenda for this very meeting contains two other items authored or presented by the Director of Development, Joshua Reis, that aim to streamline the

development process.[1] Item 3 proposes a pilot program for On-Demand Surety Bonds, a direct response to lobbying from the Urban Development Institute (UDI) to ease financing for developers.[3] The staff report for that item explicitly seeks to provide developers with "more flexibility and access to working capital".[1] Item 2 proposes new fee structures to facilitate Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH).[1] Viewed in concert, these items suggest an aggressive, department-wide push to facilitate development. The attempt to use a draft OCP to justify this rezoning is not an isolated error, but rather seems to be a component of this larger strategic objective, even if it requires bending established procedures.

Contradiction with Existing Arterial Road Land Use Policy

The staff report itself provides evidence against the proposal. It concedes that under the City's own policies for densification along major corridors, this site was not considered appropriate for intensification. The report notes, "The Arterial Road Land Use Policy designation for the subject property is 'Arterial Road Single Detached,' but the site is not identified for any Arterial Road development (i.e. townhouse, compact lot or coach house)".[1] This is a direct admission that the City's own detailed policy review concluded the site was unsuitable for even modest "missing middle" housing forms. The current proposal to leapfrog past townhouses and coach houses directly to a three-storey apartment building is therefore a stark and unsupported contradiction of existing, adopted policy for this specific corridor.

A Deficient Proposal: Density, Parking, and Design Incompatibility

The application is not only procedurally flawed but also substantively deficient.

- **Parking Variance:** The developer's own site plan indicates a provision of 37 parking stalls for 27 units and explicitly notes "*VARIANCE REQUESTED*".[1] This admission that the proposal fails to meet the City's bylaw requirements for parking is a critical deficiency. The inevitable result of this shortfall will be overflow parking onto the narrow, adjacent residential streets of Goldstream Drive and Goldstream Place, precisely as residents have predicted in their correspondence.[1] This creates issues of congestion, safety, and amenity for the

existing community.

- **Form and Massing:** The conceptual elevations depict a building whose scale, massing, and urban character are utterly alien to the surrounding context of single-family homes and low-rise townhouses.[1] The "internal courtyard" design creates a fortress-like structure that turns inward, failing to integrate with or positively contribute to the public realm along No. 3 Road or the adjacent residential streets.[1]
- **Density Precedent:** Approving a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.80 on this site would set an immediate and powerful precedent.[1] It would signal to the market that the "Neighbourhood Residential" designation is no longer stable, inviting a wave of similar speculative applications throughout the Broadmoor Planning Area and undermining the predictability that is essential for healthy communities.

Unmitigated and Detrimental Impacts on the Maple Grove Community

The concerns articulated by residents are not abstract fears; they are grounded in the lived reality of the neighbourhood and represent material planning considerations that the staff report has failed to adequately address. The following table collates and summarizes the consistent themes of opposition expressed in public correspondence and the community petition.

Concern Category	Key Issues Raised	Cited By
Traffic & Congestion	- Delays turning onto No. 3 Road from Goldstream Dr. are already significant. - Increased traffic will exacerbate congestion, especially during school peak hours. - Left turns from No. 3 Road are unsafe.	Humphrey Chang, Xuan Wu, Michael & Evelyn Mikulin, Petition [1]
Parking	- Insufficient on-site parking (variance requested). - Inevitable overflow parking onto Goldstream Dr. &	Humphrey Chang, Xuan Wu, Michael & Evelyn Mikulin, Petition [1]

	Goldstream Pl. - Narrow streets cannot handle additional on-street parking.	
Public Safety	- Increased risk to children walking/biking to Maple Lane Elementary & Steveston-London Secondary. - Children play on Goldstream Place, creating conflict with new traffic. - Increased population density may affect sense of safety and increase crime vulnerability.	Humphrey Chang, Xuan Wu, Petition [1]
Neighbourhood Character	- Proposal is too tall and dense for the lot and surrounding single-family homes. - Irreversibly alters the character of a quiet, family-oriented neighbourhood. - Sets a concerning precedent for future high-density development.	Xuan Wu, Michael & Evelyn Mikulin, Petition [1]
Environment	- Loss of multiple large, mature trees. - Destruction of natural assets that contribute to quality of life and neighbourhood aesthetic.	Humphrey Chang, Petition [1]
Infrastructure Strain	- Questions about whether water and sewage systems have been upgraded to handle increased density. - Concern that transit and other utilities are not prepared for this growth.	Humphrey Chang, Petition [1]
Procedural Fairness	- Many residents in the immediate vicinity did not receive the City of Richmond notification. - A meaningful community consultation has not occurred.	Petition [1]

Public Safety and Infrastructure Collapse: A Predictable Crisis

The residents' concerns about traffic are specific and acute, focusing on the intersection of Goldstream Drive and No. 3 Road and the safety of children attending Maple Lane Elementary School, located just 250 m away.[1] The staff report offers no traffic impact analysis, stating only that access and parking layouts "will be assessed by staff through a technical review".[1] This is a profound failure of due diligence. For a project of this scale requiring a major OCP amendment, a comprehensive Traffic Impact Study should be a prerequisite for consideration, not an afterthought.

Furthermore, the potential for a pedestrian walkway connecting the development to the Goldstream Place cul-de-sac, a key concern raised by a resident [1], is a critical safety issue. This would funnel a significant volume of pedestrian traffic and encourage parking on a quiet residential street where children play, creating a predictable and avoidable hazard. The conceptual site plan is dangerously ambiguous on this point. Similarly, the legitimate questions raised about water and sewage capacity are met with a vague assurance that a "servicing agreement will be required," with no evidence that the underlying municipal systems can actually support this sudden densification.[1]

Environmental and Aesthetic Degradation

The community petition's reference to Richmond's bylaw protecting trees with a trunk diameter of 20 cm or greater is a specific and valid legal point.[1] The staff report's passive promise to "review" the applicant's arborist report offers no guarantee of preservation.[1] The loss of these mature trees would represent a permanent degradation of the neighbourhood's green canopy and character. The aesthetic incompatibility is not merely a matter of taste; it is a failure to meet the OCP's goal of ensuring development respects and enhances neighbourhood character.

A Failure of Public Consultation

The petition submitted by residents makes a serious allegation that strikes at the heart of procedural fairness: "Many did NOT receive the City Of Richmond notification".[1] This claim, if true, fundamentally undermines the legitimacy of the entire review process to date. The staff report's acknowledgement of one phone call, three emails, and a petition as the sum total of public feedback may be a significant undercount resulting from a flawed notification process.[1] This Committee cannot, in good faith, proceed to a decision when the integrity of the public consultation process is in such serious doubt.

An Appeal to the Mandate and Members of the Planning Committee

This decision rests with the members of the Planning Committee, who are entrusted with the stewardship of the city's future. We appeal to your sworn duties and your publicly stated principles to reject this ill-conceived application. The residents have demonstrated their diligence by researching the issues; we ask that the Committee give due weight to their concerns by considering how this vote aligns with your own records and platforms.

Member	Position	Affiliation/Stances	Key Priorities & Sensitivities	Strategic Appeal
Bill McNulty	Chair	Richmond First (historical). Pro-development, pro-infrastructure, pro-affordable rental housing.[4]	Efficiency, housing supply, infrastructure development.	Argue that "spot zoning" is inefficient planning that creates legal and community instability, which is detrimental to predictable, long-term development.
Alexa Loo	Councillor	ONE Richmond.	Fiscal	Argue that

		Voted against limiting ALR home sizes, suggesting a pro-property rights stance.[7]	conservatism, property rights, accountability.	approving a project based on a draft OCP and a parking variance creates legal uncertainty and financial risk for the city, which is fiscally irresponsible.
Carol Day	Councillor	RITE Richmond. Platform of "gentle density," putting community before developers, protecting neighbourhood character, accountability.[9]	Community consultation, environmental protection, neighbourhood character, fiscal accountability.	This proposal is the antithesis of her platform. Provide her with the procedural and policy arguments to lead the opposition.
Chak Au	Councillor	Conservative (federal). Believes in "honest government, transparent decision making, open consultation and citizen engagement".[11]	Process, transparency, public consultation, fairness.	Focus on the procedural failure (using a draft OCP) and the alleged lack of public notification. This violates his core principles of transparent and honest government.
Andy Hobbs	Councillor	Independent. Retired police superintendent, former School Trustee. Focus on public safety and community service.[13]	Public safety, child safety, community well-being, orderly process.	Emphasize the traffic risks to children near Maple Lane Elementary. His background as a police superintendent and school trustee makes

				him uniquely sensitive to this argument.

The Committee's Primary Duty: Upholding the Adopted OCP

The Committee's authority is derived from the *current* OCP Bylaw 9000. To make a decision based on a future, speculative, and un-ratified draft document would be an overreach of its mandate. It would set a precedent that the City's foundational planning documents can be circumvented on a case-by-case basis, eroding public trust and exposing the City to potential legal challenges.

An Appeal to Stated Principles: Aligning the Vote with Public Commitments

- **To Councillor Day:** This project is a textbook example of what your RITE Richmond platform stands against: a developer-led project that fails to respect neighbourhood character and prioritizes density over community integration.[9] We urge you to champion the cause of responsible, "gentle density" by rejecting this oversized and out-of-place proposal.
- **To Councillor Au:** Your stated commitment to "open consultation and citizen engagement" is being directly tested by this application.[11] Residents claim they were not properly notified, and the staff is asking you to approve a project based on a draft plan the public has not yet had a chance to formally debate in a public hearing. We appeal to your belief in transparent, honest government to reject this procedurally compromised application.
- **To Councillor Hobbs:** As a retired police superintendent and former School Trustee, your career has been dedicated to ensuring public safety.[13] The residents have laid out a clear and convincing case that this project, with its guaranteed traffic and parking overflow, poses a direct and foreseeable threat to the safety of children walking to and from Maple Lane Elementary. We ask you to prioritize the safety of our community's children over the expediency of this single development.

Formal Request for Denial of Application RZ 25-012598

The application before you is procedurally improper, substantively incompatible with its surroundings, and demonstrably harmful to the community's safety, character, and environment. The staff report fails to adequately justify the required OCP amendment, relying on a non-existent policy while dismissing legitimate and specific resident concerns.

The numerous and significant flaws in both the application and the review process leave this Committee with no responsible choice but to reject the proposal in its entirety. Approving this application would validate a flawed process, set a dangerous city-wide precedent for spot zoning, and permanently damage the fabric of the Maple Grove neighbourhood.

We, the Concerned Residents of the Maple Grove Neighbourhood, respectfully and formally request that the Planning Committee **REJECT the Staff Recommendation** and **VOTE TO DENY** the Official Community Plan Amendment and Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598.

Works cited

1. Planning Committee - July 8, 2025 - Agenda - City of Richmond, BC, accessed July 7, 2025, https://citycouncil.richmond.ca/agendas/planning/070825_agenda.htm
2. Joshua Reis Director, Development City of Richmond Re: Supporting Housing Development Through the Adoption of Irrevocable Demand, accessed July 7, 2025, https://udi.org/pdfs/2025-02-21-Draft-UDI-Letter-City-of-Richmond-Irrevocable-Demand-Bonds.pdf
3. Councillor Bill McNulty - City of Richmond, BC, accessed July 7, 2025, https://www.richmond.ca/city-hall/city-council/members/mcnulty.htm
4. Harold Steves - Wikipedia, accessed July 7, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harold_Steves
5. About Bill - Bill McNulty, accessed July 7, 2025, https://billmcnulty.ca/about-bill/
6. Alexa Loo - Wikipedia, accessed July 7, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexa_Loo
7. Richmond council limits ALR homes to 400 square metres - North ..., accessed July 7, 2025, https://www.nsnews.com/real-estate-news/richmond-council-limits-alr-homes-to-400-square-metres-3090116
8. Richmond City Council Candidates - RITE Richmond, accessed July 7, 2025,

https://riterichmond.com/candidates/carol-day/
9. City of Richmond BC - Councillor Carol Day, accessed July 7, 2025, https://www.richmond.ca/city-hall/city-council/members/day.htm
10. Councillor Chak Kwong Au - City of Richmond, BC, accessed July 7, 2025, https://www.richmond.ca/city-hall/city-council/members/ChakKwongAu.htm
11. Chak Au - Wikipedia, accessed July 7, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chak_Au
12. Councillor Andy Hobbs - City of Richmond, BC, accessed July 7, 2025, https://www.richmond.ca/city-hall/city-council/members/ahobbs.htm

From: Wang Qing <yoyomami@gmail.com>
Sent: July 7, 2025 9:07 PM
To: Alabi,Tolu
Subject: Notice of rezoning of application - location 10471 no.3 road

Dear Ms. Tolu Alabi,
I hope this message finds you well.
I am a nearby resident of the proposed redevelopment project located at 10471 No. 3 Road (my address is 7751 Goldstream Drive). I am writing to submit my comments regarding Rezoning Application RZ 25-012598.
The application proposes to rezone the current "Low-Density Multiple Family Residential (RSM/L)" zoning to a Special Development District, allowing for the construction of a three-storey apartment building with 27 market rental units. As a resident adjacent to the proposed site, I have serious concerns about the potential impacts of this development on our community. These concerns include the following:
1. Impact on Community Safety and Tranquillity
Our neighbourhood is currently a quiet and safe low-density residential area. The sudden addition of 27 households will significantly increase population density, potentially resulting in noise disturbances, a diminished sense of safety, and disruption to the existing peaceful atmosphere and close-knit community environment.
2. Insufficient Parking and Increased Traffic Pressure
It is unclear whether the proposed project will provide sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. This may lead to overflow parking spilling onto adjacent streets. It is also worth noting that this area is near Steveston-London Secondary School and Maple Lane Elementary School. The increase in traffic may also pose safety risks for students.
3. Potential Decline in Property Values
Many residents in the neighbourhood are concerned that introducing a high-density rental apartment project could negatively affect existing property values. The anticipated increases in noise, traffic congestion, and parking scarcity may reduce the overall livability and investment stability of the area.
4. Risk to Local Environment and Trees
The proposed site contains three mature trees with historical and ecological value. These valuable natural assets are at risk of being damaged or removed during the development. Mature trees of historical significance are already rare in Richmond and should be preserved and protected as part of our shared natural heritage.
In light of the above, I sincerely urge the City to give full consideration to the legitimate concerns of residents during the approval process. Please ensure that clear and practical measures are in place before moving forward with the project to protect our community environment, the interests of residents, and public safety.
Thank you for your attention and understanding.

Sincerely,
Qing Wang