

		INT
	DW	
✓	GJ	
	KY	
	DR	

To Public Hearing	
Date:	June 18, 2012
Item #	2
Re:	Bylaw 8769

June 10, 2012

City of Richmond
 6911 No. 3 Road
 Richmond, BC
 V6Y 2C1

Attn: Director, City Clerk's Office

**Schedule 24 to the Minutes of
 the Council Meeting for
 Public Hearings held on
 Monday, June 18, 2012.**

Dear Mr. Lee,

RE: Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8769 (RZ 10-516267)

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed development at 9160 No. 2 Road. Our concerns are similar to those of other residents of Maple Road, with the primary issues being:

1. The project design and density does not conform to the norm of the neighborhood. Presently, Maple Road consists primarily of single family homes on large lots, introducing a townhouse development to this area will upset the current neighborhood aesthetics in addition to devaluing properties immediately surrounding the proposed development site.
2. The potential for increased traffic from this development has been deemed negligible by Bunt & Associates, however we feel that the analysis does not fully account for the fact that this area of Richmond is not nearly as well served by public transit as central Richmond, thus necessitating each new household in the development will add an additional 2 cars, at minimum. This increased traffic, in addition to the large potential number of visitors to the development is significant when the current intersection services just over 100 households to the East (approximation based on number of households on the eastern side of Maple Road needing to use the No. 2 Rd intersection). This would be an addition of nearly 20%.

One proposed solution to this issue was the installation of a full traffic signal. This would create several other significant issues. We fervently oppose the installation of a full traffic signal at the intersection of Maple Road and No. 2 Road. The portion of Maple Road to the West of No. 2 Road is currently a through street, connecting to both No. 2 Road and Railway Avenue. Implementing a traffic signal at No. 2 Road and Maple Road would encourage traffic to use the Western section of Maple Road as a shortcut between No. 2 Road and Railway Avenue. As a resident of this side of Maple Road I can attest to the current poor design in terms of pedestrian safety on this side of Maple Road. On several occasions in the 4 years we have lived here, we have seen pedestrians nearly struck by traffic speeding down our street. Were a traffic light to be



introduced, it would encourage even more drivers to use this route as a shortcut and endanger countless residents, including the many children that walk along Maple Road to get to school. Furthermore, a full traffic signal would have a negative impact to traffic conditions along No. 2 Road, especially during peak hours, as the signal would be far too close to the intersection of No. 2 Road and Francis Road. If you insist on installing a full traffic signal at Maple Road and No. 2 Road, traffic calming measures must be installed on Maple Road, West of No. 2 Road to prevent drivers from using it as a main thoroughfare.

If by "full traffic signal" the developer were speaking of a pedestrian activated traffic signal, like that at Woodward Road and No. 2 Road, then the aforementioned issues would not arise.

3. The proposed 3 storey structures would impede upon the privacy of the immediate neighbors, especially the seniors residence to the south.
4. The developer has proposed to construct the project below grade to maintain the appearance that the development height is in line with other properties on Maple Road, however there would then be the potential for the proposed development to flood, as water would drain into the new below-grade development. We believe that there should be fewer units constructed on an at-grade site at a height of 2 stories, rather than the current proposal.

In conclusion, we strongly oppose the current redevelopment submission for 9160 Maple Road. Instead, they should either develop single-family homes similar to what has been constructed at Gilbert Road and Blundell Road, or the density and height of the current proposal should be greatly reduced.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ajmer Ghag,
On behalf of the residents of 5260 Maple Road