

**MayorandCouncillors**

---

**From:** Frank Suto <fsuto@shaw.ca>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 9 February 2017 18:33  
**To:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Subject:** The Gardens Public Hearing

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

<b>To Public Hearing</b>
Date: <u>Feb. 20, 2017</u>
Item # <u>6</u>
Re: <u>10788 No. 5 Rd.</u>
<u>(DP 16-741981)</u>

Feb 9, 2017

**Development Variances Requested by Townline for “The Gardens” project**

*Feb 8 letter regarding a Public Information Session and Public Hearing from Townline  
Undated Notice of Public Hearing from the City of Richmond*

I received both missives yesterday and offer the following comments:

While both reference the same development permit number (DP 16-741981) there is considerable variation in the information presented which I found to be confusing and suspect most will find confusing.

The notice from the City indicates a request from the developer to increase the height of an approved six story 25.0 m high structure to a ten story 33.6 m high structure and a request to increase the allowable projection of unenclosed balconies from 0.9 m to 1.8 m.

The notice from Townline indicates a request to increase the height of one of two approved eight-storey 24.2 m high structures to a ten-storey 30.2 m structure and moving from one four-storey structure to three three-story structures.

A call to the City provided a fuzzy clarification: While the City’s notice was technically correct; the information within the Townline letter is a more complete description of what is already approved (including variances) and what is being requested.

I’m still scratching my head with regard to the difference between the City’s notice and Townline’s letter. Nevertheless as a resident of the area I am of the opinion that any structure taller than the approved 25.0 m height should not be approved. The approved 25.0 m height is, in my opinion, already too high and out of character for the area and will set a precedent and open the door for additional requests for tall structures in the area.

The new bridge will provide enough visual distraction without the addition of residential towers.

While I am sympathetic to Townline’s issue of proximity to Hwy 99; Hwy 99 is still in the same place it was before the project was proposed. And based on what I’ve learned about the proposed Hwy 99 / Steveston Hwy interchange it won’t be getting all that much closer.

As a result I would suggest that Townline stay with what’s already approved or come up with a new plan that increases separation from Hwy 99 with increased low rise density (no more than four or five storeys) toward the western side of the property. The outcome may be a project with fewer than the presently approved 500 residential units.

Without an understanding of what structures would abut ALR land on the north side (and the setback) it’s difficult to offer an opinion one way or another on balconies.

I’d also like to suggest that the City re-address the geometry of the No 5 Road and Westminster Hwy intersection. Anyone travelling westbound along Steveston Hwy has to make a 110 to 115 degree right turn (should be 90 degrees) into

a narrow right lane to go north on No 5 Road only to run into a standing bus at a bus stop on a regular basis. Not a good situation, especially if eastbound Steveston Hwy traffic is turning left (less than 90 degrees) into the narrow No 5 Road northbound left lane.

Sincerely,  
Frank Suto  
Shellmont resident.

