

Lee, Edwin

From: Paul Yu <ipapauyu@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 April 2016 18:17
To: Arterial
Subject: Arterial road housing policy update

- 1 . There should be no stopping and parking on no. 4 road both north and south bound from Westminster hwy to Steveston from 6:00 am to 8:00 pm Monday to Saturday .
2. Any multi- family housing development must have set back to their lot with ample parking space for their occupants .
- 3 arterial roads are for traffic .
4. All housing developments must provide their own parking spaces and must not use the arterial roads for parking day and night !

Paul Yu

Sent from my iPhone

Lee, Edwin

From: Samir Shah [<mailto:samir.shah@shaw.ca>]
Sent: Friday, 29 April 2016 16:39
To: Konkin, Barry
Subject: Arterial Rezoning

hi Barry,

We spoke briefly at the South Arm Open House yesterday. I am that non-practicing Architect who

Thank you for taking the time.

In reaction:

- A. I spent some time online today to view the overall plan.
- B. Then, I drove south from Granville on Garden City to Blundell and round to No. 4, back north to WestMinster Hwy. and then back to Garden City.
- C. Finally, I put some thought into my observations.

First of all, I would say that if we don't plan for increase in density, then we are only fooling ourselves. That need is inevitable.

In that light, and while I endorse the need wholeheartedly, please view my comments as under:

1. There are serious concerns about traffic - I recall your engineers' comments. One thing about engineers (my son is one) is that they provide a well-reasoned calculation if asked about capacity. They don't forward their views proactively about emotional / functional aspects on any subject under discussion. I can provide you some details in discussion, on that aspect.
2. It is not clear whom we would attract as residents in the higher density areas - could be folks from Vancouver or new arrivals. One of the obvious facts is that we will not attract outliers [back] into Richmond. I have some more thoughts on this subject for personal discussion.
3. We would be amiss if we believe naively that this will make affordable housing a possibility and benefit our existing residents. I can try and explain why this is going to be mostly, a failed endeavour, if not totally.
4. There is the aspect of visual monotony. The proposed plans are grossly one-tracked and in truth more thought needs to be put into its execution. We have no undulation of terrain in our flat and reclaimed city like the ups-and-downs of the other municipalities. On top of that flatitude, adding miles of "one-type of housing" will take away any stimulation that one should feel in a vibrant city - and will make for a very dull existence. The townhouses will not go away for 50 years, and only more will replace them. So, we need to find a way to keep them and yet create variety.
5. One aspect that most people do not address / realize / accept is that housing "is expensive" because our incomes have not kept pace. See 3 above - if I can convince the City that affordability is not going to be sufficiently successful, then we will only attract investing buyers, and not social contributors. We well know that such investment will boost City coffers via property taxes but not to society via employment-generation or being employed themselves.
6. Adding density in any city affects schooling - quality of learning - because teachers' salaries will have to rise to afford living locally. The City will not be able to extend large salary increases to teachers despite higher tax collection - due to various HR aspects obvious to us all. Teachers moving out of the city, is one segment of social contributors that don't make for good commuters. Those who will be agreeable to

commute and come to teach in Richmond will be the “needy individuals” who need a job, and not the “great teachers” who will be lost to other municipalities. London UK (not Ontario) is a good place to learn from about this phenomenon.

7. There are solutions to all of the above, if not total, then certainly improvement - and they all relate to the plan for densification. There are things we could do to develop the town homes with even greater density and find ways for the City to access affordability for groups like the teachers aforementioned, etc.

I have not been forthcoming for a while, to offer my time to the City, since my stint on the Board of the Gateway Theatre. Currently, I have some time on my hands and am happy to get involved.

Let me know if I can help do more to make our City, one for a better future.

Samir Shah

samir.shah@shaw.ca

604 961 1716

Lee, Edwin

From: gmwong@telus.net
Sent: Tuesday, 3 May 2016 11:08
To: Lee, Edwin
Subject: Re: Arterial Road Policy Update Survey

Edwin,

Thank you for your reply with regards to our query.

We have been aware that the development in our area has always been towards town house development and there have been a project or two completed in the past few years.

Sale prices in the area have ranged from over \$600,000 to \$1.5M for a townhouse unit.

However, the City should take note and consideration towards the rising value of property in the past year or two as this will directly affect developers who are putting together parcels of land for town house development. We currently have neighbours who have listed their 1/2 duplex for sale from \$1M to over \$1.2M. That means for a 50' frontage, a developer is looking at over \$2M and that would only allow them to build a small townhouse development. Two lots with 50" frontage would hit the developer over \$4M just for the land.

Higher land values contributes towards the building and market sale of townhouses in a very high price range which is totally not affordable to new and young families who wish to move or stay in the neighbourhood.

Not everyone wants to live in a mansion or a large townhouse development. There are lots of people who just want a nice small compact house with a small yard to call their home at an affordable price.

G.M. Wong
P.L.F. Wong

From: "Edwin Lee" <ELee@richmond.ca>
To: "gmwong@telus.net" <gmwong@telus.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2016 9:01:46 AM
Subject: Arterial Road Policy Update Survey

G.M. Wong,

Thank you for completing the survey. I understand that you would like to know if the city would support front access front-back duplex developments on the 9300 block of No. 2 Road. In respond to your inquiry, I would like to advise you that one of the guiding principles on densification along major arterial road, such as No. 2 Road, is to minimize traffic disruption by eliminating driveways along arterial roads. This is why we encourage townhouse developments as only one driveway access will be required for one or more townhouse developments verse one driveway is required for each single family lot. Staff will take your comments into consideration but if you have further questions on the proposed amendments to the policy, please feel free to come to our last open house tonight at the City Hall (5:30pm to 8:30pm), or call me at 604-276-4121.

Regards,
Edwin

Lee, Edwin

From: George Langevin <mglangevin@shaw.ca>
Sent: Saturday, 7 May 2016 20:31
To: Arterial
Subject: Arterial Road Policy Update

Dear Sir:

I realize the open houses started in April in various locations, it was unfortunate that the one at City Hall which was the only convenient date and best location was just before the deadline.

I attended the open house at City Hall on 4 May 16. I would like to have submitted the paper copy, however this project takes considerable time and careful consideration which the city did not allowed for in today's busy lifestyle.

The pictures of Townhouses, Duplexes/Triplexes looked very inviting, not so for for Row Houses.

What I have observed of densification along Williams Road is this:

- a) buildings that have cement pillars and wrought iron fences in front - within four years the gates don't remain closed. (I know this for fact as I pick up litter in a two block area - each side of Williams & Seacote on a weekly basis and have done so for many years).
- b) the smaller the front yard - the less it is maintained, i.e., litter & weeds between the front fence and the sidewalk does not appear to be their responsibility to clean up.
- c) new structures that are built beside an older detached house, sit higher than the older house and have a tall fence - we are told that in time these fences will start to lean outward and towards the detached house.
- d) the type of townhouses? (not sure if this is what they are called) on the north side of Williams Road between Garden City Road and #3 Road, two rows of housing parallel to Williams Road, very confusing when looking for an address when not familiar with the layout. This is poor planning.

There will probably be more things come to mind once this has been sent, however I don't want to miss the deadline.

Mella Langevin
10011 Seacote Road (since 1971)
604 277-7325

Lee, Edwin

From: john terborg [mailto:john_terborg@hotmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, 8 May 2016 20:28

To: Konkin, Barry

Subject: Arterial Road Housing comments

Barry,

Some thoughts.

On the creative side.

Maybe there is something that would work for Richmond.

John

If the vision is to build complete communities, then increased density does not need to mean increased congestion.

Engage the Professional Design Community

The City should engage the professional design community. One such way is to host a design competition as a way to include the input, creativity and professional skills of architects and urban planners. Prizes could be awarded for the top three contributions, and the City could choose to work with the top firms to adapt a functional policy. A recent example is from Edmonton.

<http://edmontoninfilldesign.ca/>

<http://edmontoninfilldesign.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Infill-Design-Competition-Brief-Mar-4.pdf>

New ideas can emerge from a scenario that addresses relevant parameters such as building form, landscaping, green space, subdivisions, consolidations, and buildability. Basic community concerns about setbacks, building heights, and interfaces with single-family housing can be emphasized.

Garages

For a housing type that is supposed to be affordable and transit oriented, why so many garages? Car ownership has changed and is changing rapidly. Alternatives include carpooling, staggered workdays, telecommuting, carsharing, ridesharing, and home based businesses enabled by the internet and the new economy that have allowed people to change their driving behaviours and their dependence on vehicles in ways that were not imaginable in previous decades. For some families it is possible to downsize from owning two cars.

Building Smaller

10', 12', and 20' foot ceilings don't belong in the smaller lot houses, in anything attempting to be affordable, or on properties with secondary residences like coach houses. A culture of aggrandizing that seeks to 'maximize' everything is getting in the way of really creative housing forms. Such as ideas presented by some of the links below.

Livability for a range of users

Richmond's residents are diverse and housing options should be as well. Not everyone is looking for a traditional single family house or even a three storey townhouse. Ground oriented housing forms appeal to people with mobility challenges, people with pets, people who want to garden or appreciate nature. Small families, single parent families, blended families, extended families, individuals, young couples, seniors, downsizers, all have different expectations and needs.

Other jurisdictions have adapted building bylaws to allow developers to build in more creative ways. Some of these unique housing types include:

Pocket neighbourhoods

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k749w3cHSPk>

<https://vimeo.com/21052791>

<http://rosschapin.com/projects/pocket-neighborhoods/>

<http://pocket-neighborhoods.net/patterns/shared.html>

<http://www.pocket-neighborhoods.net/mediatoolbox/PNStoryIdeas.pdf>

Backyard neighbourhoods

<http://www.cottagecompany.com/Communities/Backyard-Neighborhood/Backyard-Neighborhood-Site-Plan.aspx>

<http://www.cottagecompany.com/for-sale/listing-detail.aspx?lid=22>

Row houses

<https://www.arlnow.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Rosslyn-Commons.jpg>

<http://m2jstudio.com/images/MJSKETCHBOOK/2013/UB00100.jpg>

<http://3.bp.blogspot.com/-Ebc3vo2mato/UsDi0TN5IOI/AAAAAAAAHBM/KKF-AiWgzgY/s1600/Toronto+fee+simple+row+houses.jpg>

<http://assets.inhabitat.com/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files/2014/04/Lady-Peel-House-Atelier-RZLBD-1.jpg>

<http://m5.i.pbbase.com/g6/52/479852/2/82935695.KLM3171F.jpg>

Images

http://rosschapin.com/wp/wp-content/gallery/project_pn_gac/project_pn_gac01.jpg

<https://s-media-cache-ak0.pinimg.com/736x/76/d1/0d/76d10db977828b5ff8ab3c9df4886571.jpg>

<https://s-media-cache-ak0.pinimg.com/736x/5b/b4/98/5bb49879aae3dd58747043e24776e353.jpg>

<http://www.liveability.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Berkley-cohousing-US-plan.jpg>

<http://www.fourlightshouses.com/pages/the-napoleon-complex>

A recent affordable housing presentation put on by Michael Geller. A local developer whose eyes have been opened to more creative housing options.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QLkkYaMnqRM>

John ter Borg

Lee, Edwin

From: Angela Burnett <amfb@shaw.ca>
Sent: Thursday, 12 May 2016 11:16
To: Arterial
Subject: Arterial road strategy open house

To the Planning Department

I attended the public open house at City Hall on May 4, 2016. I understand the need for densification in Richmond. My main concerns are not addressed by display as far as I could see:

1. The **wholesale destruction of mature trees that is going on in Richmond**. It is so short-sighted to reduce the canopy of the city in this way. The city of Vancouver is working to plant 150,000 new trees by 2020. Does Richmond have a similar plan? I recommend that you look at:

<http://vancouver.ca/news-calendar/help-vancouver-park-board-grow-our-urban-forest.aspx>

2. The **asphalting or bricking of entire front yards** on lots where very large new houses are being built.

I understand that 25% of a lot must not be covered over when new buildings are put up. Perhaps 25% is left at the back: the houses are so large that it is not possible to see what has been done at the back. But front yards are where people park their cars, and the run-off from several vehicles being parked on asphalt must be considerable. It cannot be good for our water table.

You have only to drive around Richmond to see examples of front yards with no, or miniscule, gardens of any kind. Does the city do anything to ensure that 25% of a lot is in fact being left uncovered?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Angela Burnett