

Ying Hang Li
4676 Union Street
Burnaby, BC
V5C 2Y3

September 16, 2024

Mayor and Council of Burnaby,
Burnaby Planning Department, Long Range OCP and Zoning Bylaw Rewrite Team
4949 Canada Way
Burnaby, BC
V5G 1M2

Dear Mayor, Council Members, and Planning Staff,

We are writing to express our deep concerns regarding the proposed land use designation for our neighborhood to "Institutional" and "Park" uses in the new Official Community Plan (OCP). This proposed change creates significant uncertainty for us as homeowners, as well as for our friends and tenants who share our home. The impact this could have on our lives and community is profound.

We have worked hard and invested to create a safe, secure environment for our two families, sharing our home and living together as close friends. Our shared living arrangement allows us to provide affordable housing for our friends at rates well below market value—over \$1,000 less than comparable rentals in the area. This setup helps us cope with the rising cost of living, providing both families with housing security while we contribute to the Burnaby community, working and raising our four young children here.

However, if the proposed land use designation is adopted, we risk losing everything we have built. While the City and planning staff may suggest that the zoning won't necessarily change immediately, the reality is that the Local Government Act allows the City to rezone our homes to public use without a public hearing, as long as it aligns with the OCP land use designation. This creates tremendous uncertainty and fear for us as homeowners and residents.

We have no plans to move, but we want to retain flexibility to accommodate life changes. If our properties are zoned for public uses, their classification could change, negatively impacting their value. Alarmingly, this could create a situation where our mortgage value could exceed the worth of our property. We would lose the ability to sell at fair market value, as no buyer other than the City or the School District (i.e., the Province) would be interested in acquiring public use land. Furthermore, we would be left waiting for the City or School District to act, possibly displacing us at a price that wouldn't be enough to buy suitable housing nearby—or perhaps even anywhere in Burnaby where we work and our young children attend school.

This uncertainty deeply affects our ability to plan for the future. We are committed to Burnaby and have built our lives here, but the risk of losing our homes and financial security due to a land use decision that could be enacted at any time is distressing. We ask that you reconsider the proposed

land use designation for our neighborhood and instead work with the community to find a solution that protects both our homes and Burnaby's growth objectives.

With that in mind, we respectfully urge the City to pursue a win-win scenario that benefits both the community and Burnaby's development goals. Specifically, we propose the following:

1. **Change the land use designation for our properties to allow for 4 or 6-storey apartment buildings and townhomes.**
2. **Adopt density bonus bylaws and policies that further support increased density and height, conditional upon the provision of public use amenities on-site, to be transferred to the City.** This can be achieved through the conditional density provisions in Section 482 of the Local Government Act (LGA), allowing the City to secure necessary public amenities from developers.
3. **Further incentivize the provision of amenities by reducing Amenity Cost Charges and Development Cost Charges.** This approach aligns with current LGA provisions and can lower the cost of housing development while minimizing the effects of the diminishing value of cash-in-lieu contributions as construction costs rise.

This approach would offer much-needed certainty to us and our neighbors, ensuring that we retain control over when we sell our properties and that the value of our homes remains comparable to neighboring residential properties not restricted to public use. At the same time, the City would be able to acquire land and create public amenities without tapping into its amenity reserve fund or other financial resources, potentially reallocating those funds toward other important projects, such as the postponed Confederation Park Centre redevelopment. Developers would bear the costs of adding new parks and school space in exchange for increased density, allowing Burnaby to meet its amenity goals without displacing residents or devaluing their properties.

We believe this solution is a far better alternative to the current approach, which overlooks the uncertainty and hardship it causes for residents, homeowners, and renters in our neighborhood. A collaborative approach that works with the community, rather than against it, would better align with Burnaby's vision of an inclusive and livable city. If our proposal is accepted, I am confident that we and our neighbors will support the final OCP and appreciate Council's efforts to mitigate the impact on current residents while planning for a growing community—one that we very much want to remain a part of.

We ask Mayor and Council, as well as Planning staff, to seriously consider this option as a fair and balanced way to meet both the City's need for public spaces and the residents' need for stability, certainty, and the ability to manage their futures.

Thank you once again for your time and thoughtful consideration. We hope that our voices and concerns will play a key role in shaping a more equitable and sustainable outcome for our neighborhood.

Respectfully submitted,
Ying Hang Li