

The Corporation of the
CITY OF WHITE ROCK



Public Meeting
AGENDA

Monday, April 19, 2021, 5:00 p.m.

City Hall Council Chambers

15322 Buena Vista Avenue, White Rock, BC, V4B 1Y6

***Live Streaming/Telecast:** Please note that all Committees, Task Forces, Council Meetings, and Public Hearings held in the Council Chamber are being recorded and broadcasted as well included on the City's website at: www.whiterockcity.ca

The City of White Rock is committed to the health and safety of our community. In keeping with Ministerial Order No. M192 from the Province of British Columbia, City Council meetings will take place without the public in attendance at this time until further notice.

T. Arthur, Director of Corporate Administration

	Pages
1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER	
2. MEETING DETAILS	5
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT 436	
CIVIC ADDRESS: 1273 Fir Street, White Rock	
PURPOSE: Development Variance Permit (DVP) 436 proposes to allow relief from the maximum height standard of the P-1 Zone (i.e., 10.7 metres) to allow a maximum height of 12.4 metres sought in support of an eight (8)-classroom expansion to White Rock Elementary School, located at 1273 Fir Street.	
3. DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION READS A STATEMENT REGARDING THE PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED FOR THE PUBLIC MEETING	9

4. **DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION ADVISES HOW THIS PUBLIC MEETING HAS BEEN PUBLICIZED**

- Notice was published in the April 8 and 15 editions of the Peace Arch News
- 281 notices were mailed to owners and occupants within 100 metres of the subject property.
- A copy of the notice was placed on the public notice posting board on March 30, 2021

5. **THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO PRESENT THE PROPOSED APPLICATION**

11

Note: Corporate report dated March 8, 2021 and minutes extract provided for information purposes.

6. THE CHAIRPERSON WILL REQUEST THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION TO ADVISE OF ANY CORRESPONDENCE OR SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

70

As of 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 14, 2021 there have been 27 submissions.

Note: Submissions received between 8:30 a.m., April 14, 2021 and 12:00 p.m., April 19, 2021 will be presented "On Table" at the Public Meeting.

Author	Date Received	Civic Address	Status	Item #
J. Corenblum	April 7, 2021	301-1221 Johnston Road, White Rock	Support	C-1
J. Pallet	April 12, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-2
Miranda	April 12, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-3
C. Pasco	April 12, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-4
H. Kowalski	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-5
L. King	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-6
K. Saddington	April 13, 2021a	Undisclosed	Support	C-7
A. Da Costa	April 13, 2021	White Rock	Support	C-8
M. Tatto	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-9
L. Tatto	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-9
K. Li Chen	April 13, 2021	White Rock	Support	C-10
S. Oh	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-11
C. Barclay	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-12
D. Manhas	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-13
D. Braun	April 13, 2021	15557 Thrift Avenue, White Rock	Support	C-14
J. Braun	April 13, 2021	15557 Thrift Avenue, White Rock	Support	C-14
C. Wilke	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-15
C. Denter	April 13, 2021	White Rock	Support	C-16
B. Ferguson	April 13, 2021	White Rock Resident	Support	C-17
S. Walters	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-18
D. Schinkel	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-19
E. Santos	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-19
M. Coulas	April 14, 2021	15500 Oxenham Avenue, White Rock	Support	C-20
P. Strauss	April 13, 2021	White Rock resident	Support	C-21
D. Blake	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-22
L. Lempriere	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-23
D. Blake	April 13, 2021	White Rock Resident	Support	C-24
C. Adamson	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-25
M. Bray-Russell	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-26
M. Beedle	April 13, 2021	15295 Roper Avenue, White Rock	Support	C-27

7. THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THOSE IN ATTENDANCE TO PRESENT THEIR COMMENTS
8. IF REQUIRED, THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THE DIRECTOR OR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO SUMMARIZE THE PROPOSED APPLICATION
9. CONCLUSION OF THE APRIL 19, 2021 PUBLIC MEETING

THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK

15322 BUENA VISTA AVENUE, WHITE ROCK, B.C. V4B 1Y6

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2021**

NOTICE is hereby given that the Council of the City of White Rock will hold an opportunity for public participation for a Public Meeting on **MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2021** at **5:00 P.M.** in accordance with the *Local Government Act* & Planning Procedures Bylaw. All persons who deem their interest in property is affected by the proposed application shall be afforded an opportunity to be heard **via a telephone-in process** or by forwarding written submissions reflecting matters contained in the proposed application that is the subject of the Public Meeting. At the Public Meeting, Council will hear and receive submissions from the interested persons in regard to the application listed below:

1) DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT 436

CIVIC ADDRESS: 1273 Fir Street, White Rock Elementary (See Site Map Attached)

PURPOSE: Development Variance Permit (DVP) 436 proposes to allow relief from the maximum height standard of the P-1 Zone (i.e., 10.7 metres) to allow a maximum height of 12.4 metres sought in support of an eight (8)-classroom expansion to White Rock Elementary School, located at 1273 Fir Street.

Further details regarding the subject of the Public Meeting may be obtained from the City's Planning and Development Services Department at City Hall by contacting 604-541-2136 | planning@whiterockcity.ca.

Electronic Meeting: The Provincial Health Officer has issued orders related to gatherings and events in the province of BC. As such, Public Meetings will be held virtually and will also be live streamed on the City website. To participate in a Public Meeting, please review the options below.

WHITE ROCK
My City by the Sea!

www.whiterockcity.ca

1. Submit written comments to Council:

You can provide your submission (comments or concerns) by email to clerksoffice@whiterockcity.ca or by mail to Mayor and Council, 15322 Buena Vista Avenue, White Rock, BC, V4B 1Y6. The deadline to receive submissions is by **12:00 p.m. on the date of the Public Meeting, April 19, 2021.**

You may forward your submissions by:

- Mailing to White Rock City Hall, 15322 Buena Vista Avenue, White Rock, BC V4B 1Y6, or hand delivery by leaving it in the “City Hall Drop Box” to the left outside the front door; or
- Emailing the Mayor and Council at clerksoffice@whiterockcity.ca with the applicable subject line:
 - **PM: DVP 436, 1273 Fir Street, White Rock Elementary School**

2. If you do not wish to speak or write in but would still like to convey that you are in support or that you are not in support of the Public Meeting item:

You may phone 604-541-2127 to register your support / or that you are not in support of the Public Meeting item. If the call is not answered please leave a voicemail with the call-in information noted below (all four (4) bullet points must be noted).

When you call-in, please be prepared to provide the following information:

- The public hearing item
- Your first and last name
- Civic address
- Whether you are in support of or not in support of the item

3. You may register to speak to the Public Meeting item via telephone:

Register to speak by emailing clerksoffice@whiterockcity.ca or calling 604-541-2127

Registration will take place up until **4:00 p.m. on the meeting date – April 19, 2021**. Once you register, you will be sent an email with further instructions.

Please note the following instructions when you call in:


- You will be put on hold in a queue for the respective item, and you will be connected when it is your turn to speak. **If you hang up during this time, you will lose your place in the queue.** You may watch the meeting through the City's Live Stream while you are on hold.
- Your comments must be relevant to the application (permit) being considered at the Public Meeting
- You will have 5 minutes to speak
- **While speaking turn off all audio of the meeting. Note:** There is a **1-minute delay** in the live stream so please listen to the cues given over the phone
- **Do not put your phone on speaker phone**
- Once you make your comments to Council, the call will end quickly so that the next speaker can join the meeting

If you miss the noted registration period, please watch the live meeting at the following link: whiterockcity.ca/Agendas as there will be an opportunity for you to call in for a limited period of time.

Please Note: Correspondence that is the subject of a Public Hearing, Public Meeting, or other public processes will be included, in its entirety, in the public information package and will form part of the public record. Council shall not receive further submissions from the public or interested persons concerning the bylaws/applications after the Public Hearing has been concluded.

The meeting will be streamed live and archived through the City's web-streaming service.

Site Map – 1273 Fir Street



The proposed application and associated reports can be viewed online on the agenda and minutes page of the City website, www.whiterockcity.ca, under Council Agendas from March 30, 2021, until April 19, 2021. **If you are unable to access the information online, please contact the Corporate Administration department at 604-541-2212, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., or leave a voicemail and staff will ensure you have the information made available to you.**

March 30, 2021

Tracey Arthur
Director of Corporate Administration

WHITE ROCK
My City by the Sea!

OPENING STATEMENT OF PUBLIC MEETING PURPOSE AND CONDUCT

The purpose of this evenings public meeting shall be to give a reasonable opportunity to be heard or to present written submissions respecting the proposal. Registration for the hearings took place between the publication of the meeting notice and 4:00 p.m. this afternoon.

Those wishing to speak to the proposal called into Corporate Administration providing their contact information and an email was provided with instructions on how to participate this evening.

Members of the public who did not register to speak will still be given an opportunity to call in at the end of registration list. Individuals will be called in the order that their name appears on the registration list. The speaker will begin by clearly stating their name and address and then providing their comments concerning the proposal. The address of the speaker is permitted to be collected through Section 26c of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. If the speaker has any questions regarding the collection of their personal information, please contact Corporate Administration.

If you have a petition with you, please read out the information at the top of the petition and it may be submitted to staff via email directly following the meeting.

Anyone wishing to speak at this meeting must be acknowledged by the Chairperson. Anyone speaking is requested to follow instructions provided by staff:

- You will be put on hold in a queue for the respective item, and you will be connected when it is your turn to speak. **If you hang up during this time, you will lose your place in the queue.** You may watch the Council meeting through the City's Live Stream while you are on hold.
- Your comments must be relevant to the application (bylaw and permit) being considered at the Public Meeting.
- Each speaker will be given a maximum of **five (5) minutes to speak**
- **Turn off all audio of the meeting. Note:** There is a **1-minute delay** in the live stream so please listen to the cues given over the phone
- **Do not put your phone on speaker phone**
- Once you make your comments to Council, the call will end quickly so that the next speaker can join the meeting

Once all individuals on the registration list have had the opportunity to speak the Chairperson will ask for anyone wishing to speak to call into the meeting and contact information will be provided.

A person speaking an additional time is requested to add additional information from what they said previously.

Members of Council may, if they wish, ask questions of you following your presentation. However, the main function of Council members this evening is to listen to the views of the public. It is not the function of Council at this time to debate the merits of the proposal with individual citizens. It is also not the time for the speaker to be asking questions of staff regarding the application.

Any person who wishes to present a written submission to Council may do so. The submissions will be retained by staff and copies of submissions will be available upon request. Everyone shall be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard at this Public Hearing/meeting. No one will be or should feel discouraged or prevented from making their views heard.

Note: *The meeting will be streamed live and archived through the City's web-streaming service.*

THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK
CORPORATE REPORT



DATE: March 8, 2021

TO: Land Use and Planning Committee

FROM: Carl Isaak, Director, Planning and Development Services

SUBJECT: 1273 Fir Street, White Rock Elementary School Expansion – Development Variance Permit (DVP 20-023)

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee:

1. Recommend that Council direct staff to schedule the required Public Meeting for Development Variance Permit No. 436; and
 2. Recommend that Council consider approval of Development Variance Permit No. 436.
-

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An application for a Development Variance Permit (DVP) has been received in support of a proposed eight (8) classroom expansion to White Rock Elementary School, located at 1273 Fir Street. The expansion extends the existing building toward the east (Fir Street) property line and has been designed to continue the established “top of ridge” of the School which requires relief from the maximum height standard set out in City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000. At the time the original building was constructed, the previous Zoning Bylaw did not have a maximum height for buildings in this zone. Staff have considered the feedback received from the public and the Applicant’s response to this feedback, in addition to applicable policies of the Official Community Plan and good planning principles. Staff recommend that the project proceed to a public meeting.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DIRECTION

Not applicable.

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The City of White Rock has received a Development Variance Permit (DVP) application from the Board of Education of School District 36 (Surrey) (‘Applicant’) to add classrooms to White Rock Elementary at 1273 Fir Street. The property is designated Institutional in the Official Community Plan (‘OCP’) and is zoned Civic / Institutional Use (P-1) Zone in City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000 (‘Bylaw’). The Institutional designation in the OCP recognizes public or semi-public uses which serve the needs of the community. The Plan notes that the height and density of buildings will be based on their compatibility with surrounding development.

The application seeks relief from the maximum height permissions of the P-1 Zone to enable the construction of a 1,046 square metre (11,255 square foot) expansion to the east wall of the school. The Applicant has clarified that the immediate need for the expansion is to enable the relocation of students who are currently occupying portables on the west side of the school; there would be a minimal net increase to the level of student enrolment forecasted over the next 10 years. The portables would be removed concurrent with the construction of the addition. The variance, if approved, would permit a maximum building height of 12.4 metres to the “top of ridge” whereas the maximum height permitted in the P-1 Zone is 10.7 metres (i.e., relief of 1.7 metres or approx. 5.6 feet). The proposed “top of ridge” would continue the ridge line established by the existing school building.

The design of the school expansion includes a cupola (the “dome” type feature present in the existing building) which would have a maximum height of 15.7 metres (see Figure 1). Section 4.13.4 of the Bylaw allows exceedances from a maximum height standard for: “elevator shafts and stair towers that do not provide direct access to the roof; for antennas; for church spires, belfries and domes; for chimneys; for flag poles; and, for monuments; but no such structure shall cover more than 20 percent of the lot or, if located on a building, no more than 10 percent of the roof area of the building.” At the time of advertising the Public Information Meeting (PIM) the height of the cupola was recognized as being a component of the variance. However, on further review, staff have confirmed that the cupola is consistent in form and function with structures that are explicitly exempted from the maximum height provision (i.e., a church spire, belfry or dome) and therefore the cupola too is exempt from the maximum height limit. The Applicant has confirmed that the existing cupolas and the proposed cupola, together, would cover 3.4 percent of the roof area of the building and would therefore fall below the ten percent limit outlined in the Bylaw.




Figure 1: North Elevation – Illustration of Cupola and Top of Ridge relative to Existing School

Site Context

The subject property is surrounded by a mix of commercial and residential uses (see Figure 2). Lands immediately northeast of the property, being those most likely to be impacted by the requested height variance, are comprised of three and four-storey residential apartment and townhome buildings (see Appendix A – Site Photos). To the northwest, lands are comprised of public parkland / utility uses as well as commercial (restaurant) uses, the latter of which front

onto Johnston Road. The property at 1310 Johnston Road (being at the northeast corner of Johnston Road and Roper Avenue) is zoned Comprehensive Development Zone 61 (CD-61). The CD-61 Zone allows for a maximum building height of six storeys.




Figure 2: Aerial image of the subject property and abutting lands.

Consultation with the Public

On February 3, 2021 a Public Information Meeting (PIM) was held to raise awareness of the proposal. Approximately 12 people attended the meeting. Digital feedback forms were advertised during the PIM and made available until February 19, 2021. A total of six forms were received with all respondents expressing concern with the proposal (see Appendix B - Feedback Forms). Issues raised include:

1. Opposition to the inclusion of a “cupola” with opportunity for alternate design (e.g., skylights) to enable solar gain within the addition;
2. Negative impacts to property value and related declining impacts to tax revenue;
3. Loss of view to the water and resultant decline in the use and enjoyment of the property;
4. Opportunity to utilize other portions of the site (i.e., parking lot, sports fields, and west side of site in location of existing portables);
5. Opportunity to accommodate a flat roof to reduce view-related impacts.

The Applicant has provided a PIM Summary which offers a response to the issues outlined above (see Appendix C). Since the hosting of the PIM, residents, parents, teachers, and others have provided email correspondence to staff expressing support for the proposal. At the time of

preparing this report, approximately 80 such emails had been received. In some instances, commenters voiced concern about the City's decision to deny the application and/or delay the advancement of the proposal. In such instances, staff clarified that the project was currently under review and that interested stakeholders would have an opportunity to express their concerns / support directly to Council during a public meeting.

Analysis

The properties northeast of the proposed addition, opposite Fir Street (east), and immediately south of the subject property are comprised of three-storey residential buildings, including both townhomes and apartment (strata) buildings. Considering the context, the height of the proposed school addition would be in keeping with the height of existing buildings in the immediate vicinity of the property. It is acknowledged that the addition will have an impact on the southward (water) views of residents living immediately north of the property. In evaluating this matter, staff have considered several factors given greater merit below.

The subject property was redeveloped with a new school between 2005 and 2007. Prior to this, the property was occupied by several school buildings (constructed circa 1962) including a three storey building which was located on the same site as where the eight classroom addition is proposed; these buildings collectively covered a larger area than that of the existing school with the proposed addition (see Figure 3). This is offered as acknowledgement of the historic use of the property and how prior buildings would have also affected views in the area. While the two properties immediately northeast of the property were built prior to the demolition of the former school, one new townhome has since been built at 1321 Fir Street. Residents of these homes have expressed concern about the variance and the impact of additional height on their southward views. Design alternatives, discussed in the Applicant's PIM Summary and further outlined in their Design Rationale (see Appendix D), provide a basis for the design, as proposed.




Figure 3: Aerial Image of Former Peace Arch Elementary School (April, 2004)

During the PIM, concerns were similarly expressed about the pitched roof design and the necessity of the cupola. The Applicant confirmed that the cupola not only brought light into the building but that the feature helped to ventilate the space, replacing the need for rooftop mechanical units. If the building was designed with a flat roof, the Applicant has provided that rooftop mechanical units would be required to support ventilation, heating and cooling. These mechanical units are considered a building feature similar to a “chimney” and are exempt from the maximum height provisions of the Bylaw (per Section 4.13.4). Taking this into account, while a flat roof design may reduce the height of the roof (i.e., from 12.4 metres as proposed to 10.7 metres as required), portions of this roof space would then be occupied by mechanical units which would have an impact on views and the overall aesthetic of the building.

Figure 4 below, prepared by the Thinkspace Architecture Planning Interior Design (‘Project Architect’) illustrates the differences between a flat-roofed building, with rooftop mechanical units, and the proposed pitched roof building with cupola. The illustration demonstrates the limited impact of the building, as proposed, on nearby views to the water. The drawing also highlights the aesthetic value to be gained from a design that continues the architectural aesthetic of the existing building into the addition. The Design Rationale provided by the Applicant notes that when the new school was being proposed, the City “requested/encouraged SD36 to create a design that maintained the form and character of the original 1914 school, respectful of the seaside community aspect of White Rock while paying homage to the history of the site as the long-term home of White Rock school”. Staff are supportive of the design in this regard.




Figure 4: View Analysis Illustrating permitted building height (flat roof on top) against proposed, pitched, roof design

One final factor considered by staff pertains to the planned programming of the property. When the school site was redeveloped with the current building the lands immediately east of the building were intentionally set aside to accommodate future expansion. Servicing connections, positioned to the west of the site, and the overall layout of facilities such as parking, pedestrian walkways and vehicle lanes, are designed to enable the addition without disruption to the overall function of the school. Had the entire building been constructed at the time of the current building, no height variance would have been required under the height provisions in the Zoning Bylaw at the time. Further, the current zoning bylaw establishes a 6 metre (approx. 20 foot) minimum yard setback, applicable to all the property’s boundaries. The design respects these

setbacks and enhanced landscaping has been proposed along the eastern limit of the property to buffer the new construction from nearby residential uses while enhancing the aesthetic of the site along the City's boulevard. A draft version of Development Variance Permit No. 436 has been included in this report as Appendix E. The Permit requires that future development be in substantial compliance with the designs submitted with the application.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

COMMUNICATION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

As noted, feedback received during and after the Public Information Meeting, has been considered in preparing this report and a draft Development Variance Permit for consideration by the City's Land Use Planning Committee and ultimately Council.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL INVOLVEMENT/IMPLICATIONS

The application was circulated to City Departments for review and comment. As noted, the intentional layout of the property, designed to enable an expansion of the building, has negated the need for any alteration to the proposal. There are no outstanding issues to be resolved as they relate to the DVP; it is noted that the City is in receipt of a building permit for the work.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

The ability to support a mix of uses and more intensive use of urban land lessens the need for outward sprawl which can bring increased reliance on the private automobile and other impacts (e.g., loss of farmland, destruction of wooded areas, etc.). Lower reliance on the auto can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, recognized as a leading contributor to climate change. Further, more intensive use of land, serviced by roads, sewers, and other community facilities, helps to preserve undeveloped (green) lands which can be used as a resource to support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

There is no specific project or Council Strategic Priority that this proposal aligns with.

Allowing for the construction of a permanent expansion to the elementary school as an alternative to portables is understood to offer a better learning environment for students and responds to growing enrollment in the White Rock and South Surrey area. The expansion to White Rock Elementary School will support the long term needs of White Rock families. The variance from maximum building height, if approved, would accommodate the continuation of the architectural design and character of the School with limited impacts to existing residents.

OPTIONS / RISKS / ALTERNATIVES

The following options are available for Council's consideration:

1. Deny Development Variance Permit No. 436 and provide alternative suggestions to the Applicant on how the design could be revised to comply with City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No, 2000; or

2. Defer consideration of Development Variance Permit No. 436 and refer the application back to staff to address any issues identified by Council.

Either of the above alternatives would necessitate redesign of the building and ultimately delay its construction.

CONCLUSION

The Board of Education of School District 36 (Surrey) has made an application for a development variance permit to support the expansion of White Rock Elementary School. The variance from maximum height, if approved, would allow for the continuation of the existing roof ridge thereby complementing the existing architectural aesthetic of the building. An evaluation of an alternative (flat-roofed) building designs demonstrates the limited impact of the proposal on views and the aesthetic benefits that may be realized with approval of the variance. Staff recommend that the proposal proceed to Public Meeting and that Council consider the issuance of the Development Variance Permit.


Respectfully submitted,



Carl Isaak, MCIP, RPP
Director, Planning and Development Services

Comments from the Chief Administrative Officer

I concur with the recommendations of this corporate report.



Guillermo Ferrero
Chief Administrative Officer

- Appendix A: Site Photos
- Appendix B: Feedback Forms
- Appendix C: PIM Summary
- Appendix D: Design Rationale
- Appendix E: Draft Development Variance Permit 436

WHITE ROCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – SITE PHOTOS (taken Feb 22, 2021)



Photo 1: East Elevation of School



Photo 2: North Elevation – looking south (location of addition at end of School – left side of image)



Photo 3: Looking North along Fir Street



Photo 4: West side of White Rock Elementary – Existing Portables on right



1273 Fir Street FEEDBACK FORM Public Information Meeting

6

Responses

07:06

Average time to complete

Active

Status

1. Please provide your name:

6

Responses

Latest Responses

"Bradley Tims"

"Shelley Torma"

"Kathleen Butler"

2. Please provide your address:

6

Responses

Latest Responses

"211-15233 Pacific Ave. Whiterock BC"

"#303 15233 Pacific Ave, White Rock BC V4B 1P8"

"205 - 15233 Pacific Avenue"

3. Do you support the proposed development application?



Yes

0



No

6



Undecided

0




4. Please provide your comments on the application:

5
Responses

Latest Responses

"Like the property to stay the way it is."

"The field is one of the very few green spaces available to the commun..."



Respondent



1

Anonymous




23:45

Time to complete



1273 Fir Street White Rock Elementary School Addition



The City of White Rock has received a Development Variance Permit (DVP) application which, if approved, would permit a 1,046 square metre (11,255 square foot) addition to the east side of White Rock Elementary. The variance sought would enable the addition to have heights of 12.4 metres to the “top of ridge” and 15.7 metres to the “top of cupola”, which would match the height of the existing ridge and cupola, whereas the existing Civic / Institutional Use (P-1) Zone establishes a maximum height of 10.7 metres; all other applicable standards of the P-1 Zone would be upheld in addition to the general standards of City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000 (e.g., parking).

The information on this electronic form is collected under the authority of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, RSBC 1996, c. 165, s. 26(e). The information will be used for evaluating the DVP application. By submitting this electronic form, you are consenting to its collection and use. If you have any questions about the collection and use of this information, contact the Director of Corporate Administration, White Rock City Hall, 15322 Buena Vista Avenue, White Rock, BC, V4B 1Y6, Tel. 604-541-2100

1

Please provide your name: *

Andrew Sader

2

Please provide your address:

2-1321 Fir St White Rock

3

Do you support the proposed development application?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Undecided

4

Please provide your comments on the application:

Thank you for allowing residents to be part of this process and for providing us with the ability to voice comments and concerns. We understand the need to expand the school and get away from portables, With a toddler at home who will be attending this school in 2 years, we want her to have the best experience possible. Having said that, we only disagree with the current design proposal. Not the project in general. There is no functional reason to exceed the current height restrictions other than looks. The copula is completely unnecessary. One question we have is, why can't skylights be used for natural light instead? The only reason for the copula seems to be matching the one that is already there. We don't believe the city is in the business of driving down property values, as that means less tax revenue. But with the current design proposal, that is what would happen. Our unit (and our 3 neighbors) have large rooftop decks with panoramic views of the entire bay. This would adversely affect our view and the inherent value. We realize we don't own the view. and that views are subjective but it is a major part of our living enjoyment and a factor in property value. Please consider using other portions of the school's large property, or an alternate design, to add the much needed space but respect the requests of those most affected by these choices. Thank you again for your time and consideration. Andrew, Rachel and Ellie Sader 604.367.5423 andrewsader@gmail.com

Respondent



2

Anonymous




02:27

Time to complete



1273 Fir Street White Rock Elementary School Addition



The City of White Rock has received a Development Variance Permit (DVP) application which, if approved, would permit a 1,046 square metre (11,255 square foot) addition to the east side of White Rock Elementary. The variance sought would enable the addition to have heights of 12.4 metres to the “top of ridge” and 15.7 metres to the “top of cupola”, which would match the height of the existing ridge and cupola, whereas the existing Civic / Institutional Use (P-1) Zone establishes a maximum height of 10.7 metres; all other applicable standards of the P-1 Zone would be upheld in addition to the general standards of City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000 (e.g., parking).

The information on this electronic form is collected under the authority of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, RSBC 1996, c. 165, s. 26(e). The information will be used for evaluating the DVP application. By submitting this electronic form, you are consenting to its collection and use. If you have any questions about the collection and use of this information, contact the Director of Corporate Administration, White Rock City Hall, 15322 Buena Vista Avenue, White Rock, BC, V4B 1Y6, Tel. 604-541-2100

1

Please provide your name: *

Karen McNulty

2

Please provide your address:

4-1321 Fir Street

3

Do you support the proposed development application?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Undecided

4

Please provide your comments on the application:

To be clear, I am definitely in favour of getting students out of portables. That being said, I am not in favour of the current proposed expansion in location or design. As said by the architects, the proposal was designed from thoughts and by-laws in 2007 – plans can change in 14 years. We propose that the addition be built on the west side of the building attached to the classrooms, not the gym. There is plenty of room to build a one story addition with the proposed eight classrooms. There are no hydro obstructions on that side and to densify on that side makes more sense than the east side. As for the sports field – this is a very large piece of property with other options for either improving the existing sports areas or even using them. I have never seen the existing sports fields crowded with students. Building on the west side of the school has no negative impacts on the neighbourhood as a whole. As much as we are totally against the building of the addition on the east side, I feel the proposal in its present form should be addressed. As presented, if the variance is permitted, the views from our homes at 1321 Fir Street would be greatly impacted. The drawings submitted by the architect, although said to have been done through surveying, do not depict the enormity of the change; they only show the sliver of a view that would be left. At the very least we would implore the Council to uphold the current By-law and not allow for the variance which in turn would do away with the cupola. Peaked roofs at the 10.7 maximum could be a possibility; a flat roof would suffice. To say that the roof line MUST be the same as the main building for aesthetic purposes is misleading. There are several different roof lines on this building. To say grills on the side of the building would not suffice is untrue as there are other segments of the building serviced in this way. Redesigning takes time and money, however taking the easy road is not always the best road forward. I ask the Council to consider the impact the expansion of White Rock Elementary

has on the entire neighbourhood and proceed with an option that works for all concerned – school community and those living around it.

Respondent



3

Anonymous




01:50

Time to complete



1273 Fir Street White Rock Elementary School Addition



The City of White Rock has received a Development Variance Permit (DVP) application which, if approved, would permit a 1,046 square metre (11,255 square foot) addition to the east side of White Rock Elementary. The variance sought would enable the addition to have heights of 12.4 metres to the “top of ridge” and 15.7 metres to the “top of cupola”, which would match the height of the existing ridge and cupola, whereas the existing Civic / Institutional Use (P-1) Zone establishes a maximum height of 10.7 metres; all other applicable standards of the P-1 Zone would be upheld in addition to the general standards of City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000 (e.g., parking).

The information on this electronic form is collected under the authority of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, RSBC 1996, c. 165, s. 26(e). The information will be used for evaluating the DVP application. By submitting this electronic form, you are consenting to its collection and use. If you have any questions about the collection and use of this information, contact the Director of Corporate Administration, White Rock City Hall, 15322 Buena Vista Avenue, White Rock, BC, V4B 1Y6, Tel. 604-541-2100

1

Please provide your name: *

Don McNulty

2

Please provide your address:

4 - 1321 Fir Street

3

Do you support the proposed development application?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Undecided

4

Please provide your comments on the application:

Regarding the variance requested by the Surrey School Board for the addition to Whiterock elementary school. As a resident of the area, I would like to voice my concern about the building of the addition on the east side of the school. It directly affects our property and view if built to the current specification. There is plenty of room for the new addition on the west side of the school attached to the classrooms there. If built there would be no effect to the community or the residential neighbours. The current plan directly affects the enjoyment of the residential neighbourhood properties. While I understand the need for the addition it is not necessary to build it where it affects the neighbours. Not only are they asking build on the east side, but they are requesting a variance to increase the height of the building beyond the current by laws. When we purchased our property, we looked at the possible future obstructions to our view to determine if the investment was sound. Knowing that the limit was 10.7M gave us some security that our property would only be affected by future construction to that height. To allow a higher building at this location would be detrimental to both our enjoyment of the property as well as the value of the investment. The proponent talks about what was there before, but this is of no relevance to this situation as decisions are made based on the information in place at the time. Our decision was based on the by-laws in effect when we purchased and are currently in place. In closing I would request that the addition be built on the west side of the school and that it be built to the existing by laws. Don McNulty 604 649 8152 4-1321 Fir Street White Rock BC V4B 4B3

Respondent



4

Anonymous




02:16

Time to complete



1273 Fir Street White Rock Elementary School Addition



The City of White Rock has received a Development Variance Permit (DVP) application which, if approved, would permit a 1,046 square metre (11,255 square foot) addition to the east side of White Rock Elementary. The variance sought would enable the addition to have heights of 12.4 metres to the “top of ridge” and 15.7 metres to the “top of cupola”, which would match the height of the existing ridge and cupola, whereas the existing Civic / Institutional Use (P-1) Zone establishes a maximum height of 10.7 metres; all other applicable standards of the P-1 Zone would be upheld in addition to the general standards of City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000 (e.g., parking).

The information on this electronic form is collected under the authority of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, RSBC 1996, c. 165, s. 26(e). The information will be used for evaluating the DVP application. By submitting this electronic form, you are consenting to its collection and use. If you have any questions about the collection and use of this information, contact the Director of Corporate Administration, White Rock City Hall, 15322 Buena Vista Avenue, White Rock, BC, V4B 1Y6, Tel. 604-541-2100

1

Please provide your name: *

Kathleen Butler

2

Please provide your address:

205 - 15233 Pacific Avenue

3

Do you support the proposed development application?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Undecided

4

Please provide your comments on the application:

The field is one of the very few green spaces available to the community. People use it for sports and in some cases just picnics. It is also wonderful for the school children to have green space during recess and lunch, and before school to practice sports. There has to be another solution - where the mobiles are? Where the parking lot is? Even the west side where it's mostly gravel and not used. Thank you.

Respondent



5

Anonymous




01:44

Time to complete



1273 Fir Street White Rock Elementary School Addition



The City of White Rock has received a Development Variance Permit (DVP) application which, if approved, would permit a 1,046 square metre (11,255 square foot) addition to the east side of White Rock Elementary. The variance sought would enable the addition to have heights of 12.4 metres to the “top of ridge” and 15.7 metres to the “top of cupola”, which would match the height of the existing ridge and cupola, whereas the existing Civic / Institutional Use (P-1) Zone establishes a maximum height of 10.7 metres; all other applicable standards of the P-1 Zone would be upheld in addition to the general standards of City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000 (e.g., parking).

The information on this electronic form is collected under the authority of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, RSBC 1996, c. 165, s. 26(e). The information will be used for evaluating the DVP application. By submitting this electronic form, you are consenting to its collection and use. If you have any questions about the collection and use of this information, contact the Director of Corporate Administration, White Rock City Hall, 15322 Buena Vista Avenue, White Rock, BC, V4B 1Y6, Tel. 604-541-2100

1

Please provide your name: *

Shelley Torma

2

Please provide your address:

#303 15233 Pacific Ave, White Rock BC V4B 1P8

3

Do you support the proposed development application?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Undecided

4

Please provide your comments on the application:

Respondent



6

Anonymous




10:35

Time to complete



1273 Fir Street White Rock Elementary School Addition



The City of White Rock has received a Development Variance Permit (DVP) application which, if approved, would permit a 1,046 square metre (11,255 square foot) addition to the east side of White Rock Elementary. The variance sought would enable the addition to have heights of 12.4 metres to the “top of ridge” and 15.7 metres to the “top of cupola”, which would match the height of the existing ridge and cupola, whereas the existing Civic / Institutional Use (P-1) Zone establishes a maximum height of 10.7 metres; all other applicable standards of the P-1 Zone would be upheld in addition to the general standards of City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000 (e.g., parking).

The information on this electronic form is collected under the authority of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, RSBC 1996, c. 165, s. 26(e). The information will be used for evaluating the DVP application. By submitting this electronic form, you are consenting to its collection and use. If you have any questions about the collection and use of this information, contact the Director of Corporate Administration, White Rock City Hall, 15322 Buena Vista Avenue, White Rock, BC, V4B 1Y6, Tel. 604-541-2100

1

Please provide your name: *

Bradley Tims

2

Please provide your address:

211-15233 Pacific Ave. Whiterock BC

3

Do you support the proposed development application?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Undecided

4

Please provide your comments on the application:

Like the property to stay the way it is.

February 19, 2021

City of White Rock
15322 Buena Vista Avenue,
White Rock, BC
V4B 1Y6

Attn: Greg Newman, Manager of Planning

Re: SD36 White Rock Elementary Addition – DVP00014 1273 Fir Street

Dear Greg,

Thank you for hosting the Public Information Meeting (PIM), February 3rd from 5:30 pm to 6:30 pm (PST). Included in this letter is a summary of the questions asked at the meeting along with SD36 response. Out of the feedback we received directly at the PIM, we would note that there were 3 in opposition of the proposed variance, 3 neutral and 2 in support. In total 3 out of 8 were against the variance proposal.

Since the PIM, we have been notified that to date there has been over 60 positive submittals in favor of approval of the proposed variance. The summary below does not include this additional positive feedback as the District has only been provided the content from the PIM and any additional negative feedback from the PIM feedback forms. We have received 3 additional negative feedback forms from new participants, and 2 negative feedback forms from attendees of the PIM. We would also like to clarify that any questions in duplicate have only been responded to once below.

To recap, the project is an 8 classroom addition to the existing White Rock Elementary School to relocate students from 3 portables currently on the site. This addition is located on the eastern area of the site that was prepared during the 2007 reconstruction of the school. At the time of the 2007 reconstruction, the design of the building was specifically conceptualized to respond to the design of and pay homage to the existing 1914 building that was initially on this site. In addition, the east end of the building incorporated physical work in 2007 that prepared it for the future addition.

School buildings are long term elements in the urban fabric. Unlike commercial buildings, they tend to be in existence for 50 years or more. As a result, the character of these facilities should be respectful of the character and scale of the community. The current design of the school respects the character of the neighbourhood and White Rock by incorporating a residential design language, typical in seaside communities. This design was requested/encouraged by the City of White Rock and the community during the 2007 reconstruction.

The intent of the addition is to respect and compliment the strong identity and character created by the current school design by providing a seamless transition between the existing building and addition. In 2007 when the school was built, the zoning for this site did not limit the height of buildings, while the current bylaw does have a 10.7m height limit measured to the top of the ridge. The existing building is 12.4m to the ridge therefore, if we are to match that height we require a variance of 1.7m.

Enclosed is the updated view analysis completed for the proposed addition versus the impact of a 10.7m high flat, compliant roof structure (shown in red) that would have rooftop mechanical units (shown in yellow). This analysis identifies a rather minimal loss of view between the proposed option and the bylaw compliant option. Currently, the comments received from the City of White Rock are primarily focused on the small loss of view not the aesthetic considerations of respecting the existing school design. We also received comments based on the location of the proposed addition which we would like to reiterate is not a factor within the bylaw height variance.

Participant 1 (Andrew Sader):
Question + Answer from PIM:

Q1: Was an attempt made to comply with the current bylaw or has this always been the plan to go straight to the variance application? Also, why not build on the west side of the lot, where the current high density corridor is?

A: When the original building from 1914-1967 was identified for demolition and reconstruction, the City of White Rock originally asked SD36 to save the 1914 building. As this was not possible, the City then requested/encouraged SD36 to create a design that maintained the form and character of the original 1914 school, respectful of the seaside community aspect of White Rock while paying homage to the history of the site as the long-time home of the White Rock School. In undertaking the design of the addition and understanding that schools are in place for 50 years or more, we focused on achieving a seamless addition, respecting the original design and wishes of the community. The variance of 1.7m for height is relatively small verses leaving a 50 year mark on the community with a design not in keeping with the residential/seaside aesthetic of the area.

Refer question from Participant 6, Q1 with respect to the question about the west side of the site.

Response to Additional Feedback Form:

With respect to the feedback form, the comment on the aesthetic is addressed above, the comment on the cupola is addressed in question from Participant 5, Q2, the comment on the views is addressed in question from Participant 5, Q1.

Relative to the comment on the building location. This DVP is based solely on this addition in this location. Other locations on the site cannot be considered for reasons primarily focused on functionality of educational space. Other reasons include preparatory work already completed in 2007, BC Ministry of Education approval limits and topography of the site.

Participant 2 (Anne):

Q1: Is this plan for existing registered numbers, or planning for the future growth? What happens 5 years down the line when there are more students? Bring back the portables?

A: The long range facilities plan proposes a 6 classroom addition to Peace Arch Elementary to support future growth within the direct White Rock elementary community.

The current 8 classroom addition at White Rock Elementary will remove the 3 portables currently onsite and address projected future growth.

Participant 3 (Anonymous):

Q1: Will there be improvements to traffic flow?

A: The existing parking lot and drop off area was originally sized to support this addition and meets the current by-law. The existing entry to the school and parking will not be impacted.

Q2: Why not build to the south, where ample space is available?

A: We have funding approval from the Ministry of Education to proceed only with the addition located to the east of the existing building, as preparation for tie-in and design planning was established in 2007 when the current existing building was demolished and rebuilt. Our business case also found other factors that contributed to this decision:

- Locating the students to the south will require a larger addition and renovation to the existing building would be significant resulting in displacement of students during the project.
- The existing grade differential between the ground just outside the school and the lower back south of the school is greater than 2m.
- The current configuration of the building requires a relatively straight forward realignment to the Hydro and TELUS services. A new building would require a much larger relocation/extension around the perimeter of the building.
- This would also significantly disrupt the planting and existing trees along the south edge of the school, which we are currently retaining.
- The students need to remain in the existing portables established in the west until the addition is complete.

Q3: Will there be noise abatement to shield neighbours from the new east side plaza?

A: Currently this area is a play field used by many students during the school day. The new addition will provide landscaping and new trees between the streetscape and the addition/ plaza.

The plaza will provide access to the classrooms within the addition.

Q4: Will there be accommodations for construction equipment and materials that will not interfere with Fir Street residences?

A: All construction onsite will meet current City of White Rock construction and noise bylaws.

Q5: What are the school district's projections for enrollment at WR Elementary over the next 5-10 years?

A: Listed in the 2020-21 Long Range Facilities Plan the 10 year student enrolment projection for South Surrey/ White Rock area is to increase from 4,613 to 4,840 by 2029. The future 6 classroom addition planned at Peace Arch Elementary in White Rock, as well as an 8 classroom addition planned at South Meridian Elementary will assist in creating additional space for the South Surrey and White Rock elementary community.

The current 8 classroom addition at White Rock Elementary will remove the 3 portables currently onsite and address projected future growth.

Q6: Is there any other school in Surrey that is positioned this close to a residential street (Fir)?

A: This building is within the established setbacks for this site. It is common at all school sites throughout the district (Surrey and White Rock) to construct the facility close to the existing building setback lines established by the municipality.

Participant 4 (Anonymous):

Q1: I think what most of the neighbours need to understand is that the addition is going to happen to move the students out of the portables. Would you prefer to look at an addition that matches the existing, or something that doesn't match and then mechanical equipment on the roof?

A: Please see updated view analysis completed for the proposed addition versus the impact of a 10.7m high compliant roof structure (shown in red) that would have rooftop mechanical units (shown in yellow).

The district believes that the most responsible approach for the community is to continue the existing design aesthetic that was completed with input from the City of White Rock and the community in 2007. A seamless addition will fit best into the community and continue to be an identifiable landmark for the next 50 years.

Participant 5 – (Don + Karen McNulty):

Question + Answers from PIM:

Q1: Not an insignificant difference on the height. When we purchased we checked the by laws and the limit of 10.7 was provided. This addition effectively reduces the view for our property significantly especially if allowed to be increased in height from the current by laws.

A: Please see updated view analysis completed for the proposed addition versus the impact of a 10.7m high compliant roof structure (shown in red) that would have rooftop mechanical units (shown in yellow). The current proposal versus the complaint roof design with the mechanical

units are similar in height. This analysis identifies a rather minimal loss of view between the proposed option and the bylaw compliant option.

Q2: Can we use skylights instead of the cupola?

A: The purpose of the cupola is primarily as a mechanical element to facilitate natural ventilation. Its secondary use is to allow natural light into the interior spaces of the school. The cupola is classified as a dome/ chimney under the bylaw and is not included in the total building height calculation. For natural ventilation, the cupola has louvers to relieve excess air out of the building to prevent over-pressurization, a mechanical function that matches all of the existing cupolas, and existing systems in the rest of the school. Removing the cupola would require mechanical ventilation units to be installed on the roof.

Q3: How tall are the current ceilings in each classroom on the second floor?

A: The second floor ceiling is a sloped from a scissor-truss and starts at 11'-0" to approximately 14'-0" in total.

Response to Additional Feedback Form:

There are a number of comments in two feedback forms from both members of this household, most of which are already addressed in this response.

The district confirms that in order to provide an accurate view analysis, the balconies of the noted properties as well as the streets and existing buildings were surveyed. Further, a significant amount of time and energy has been expended to confirm the information on the view analysis and it accurately represents the view impacts of this development.

The comment about moving the west side of the school has been addressed in in the questions from Participant 6, Q1 and comment form response from Participant 1. The comment on the view has been addressed above in response to Q1 as well as in response to Participant 4, Q1. The building aesthetic comments have been addressed in responses to Participant 1, Q1 and Participant 4, Q1.

Further to these responses, we provide the following: SD36 proposes to respect the original direction of the City of White Rock and the community in 2007 and provide an addition that seamlessly extends the original building. We believe that this is the right thing to do for the community, as this building can be expected to be hear for at least 50 years. The location of this addition was selected in 2007 and the existing floor plan and servicing was structured to support this future addition. BC Ministry of Education would not support an addition to this building in another location on the site as they have already supported the "rough-in" work to prepare for this addition that was completed in 2007. Further, the current approved funding for this addition does not include any renovations of the existing building as the work to support this addition was completed in 2007.

Participant 6 – (Steve Swenson):

Q1: Why not build on the west side where there is a great deal of space for building and construction equipment/supplies, with no obstruction of residential properties?

A: Notwithstanding the number of comments seeing to move the addition to another location on

the site, this DVP submission is specific to this addition at this location and height remains the only consideration of the variance request.

The location of the proposed addition at the eastern side of the existing building has very important features to the students and teaching staff. From a teaching perspective it is very important for the Kindergarten classrooms and Grade 1-7 classrooms to have close adjacencies to one another for teaching support and student safety. From a student perspective creating community and mentorship between grades is critical for development of care for self and others. Other locations on the site cannot be considered as teaching adjacencies will be lost, as will functionality of the educational space.

The location of this addition was selected in 2007 and the existing floor plan and servicing was structured to support this future addition. BC Ministry of Education would not support an addition to this building in another location on the site as they have already supported the “rough-in” work to prepare for this addition that was completed in 2007. Further, the current approved funding for this addition does not include any renovations of the existing building as the work to support this addition was completed in 2007.

Lastly, the topography of the site presents limits to where an addition can be located as we cannot provide internal ramps and stairs in corridors in an elementary setting as this presents hazards to the youngest students. In addition, the 3 existing portables need to remain and host student's onsite until the addition is completed.

Participant 7 – (Tim):

Q1: Have sightline analysis from the roof top patios of 1321 Fir Street?

A: Yes, this was included in the original presentation and is included in our updated view analysis attached.

Participant 8 – (Wendy):

Q1: When will work begin?

A: Assuming that the DVP application is approved, construction will begin in the summer of 2021. Should this variance not be accepted, the project will be forced into redesign which means that the critical summer construction season will be lost. We estimate that the project delay could be as much as a year which would have substantial impacts on costs due to escalation in the market. The redesign and escalation costs are not included within the current budget approval and may result in a need to go back to the Ministry of Education for additional funding. If additional funding is not granted, there is a real threat that the project could be cancelled entirely resulting in the addition of more portables to the site, to address the projected growth in the community.

Statement: I like the proposed Addition. Adds more character to the school, than a box.

To summarize, this project is to be built in an area of the site that was designated for this purpose in 2007. The design respects the intent of the City of White Rock and the community from 2007 and provides a seamless transition between the existing school and the addition, maintaining the current strong visual identity. In order to maintain the seamlessness of the addition a 1.7m variance to the new height bylaw is required which will allow us to match the heights of the existing building.

This addition is also a very important benefit to the community to provide quality spaces for our learners and future growth by removing them from portables, and also respecting the community fabric by ensuring that important architectural elements are maintained.

We look forward to continuing to work with the City of White Rock to build the future eight classroom addition at the White Rock elementary school.

Sincerely,

Alana Kuroyama, BID PMP



Project Manager
Capital Project Office

Context

View Analysis – View from neighboring residences

BYLAW COMPLIANT
OPTION



PROPOSED OPTION



15265 Roper Street South East Balcony View



15265 Roper Street South Balcony View

15289 Roper Street Balcony View


Context

View Analysis – View from neighboring residences

BYLAW COMPLIANT
OPTION



PROPOSED OPTION





15299 Roper Street Balcony View

15311 Roper Street Balcony View

15303 Roper Street Balcony View

Context

View Analysis – View from neighboring residences



1321 Fir Street Front Building Rooftop View

1321 Fir Street Back Building Rooftop View

White Rock Elementary School Addition

Development Variance Application Design Rationale

On behalf of School District 36 (SD36), Thinkspace Architecture is pleased to submit the application for a Development Variance Permit for a height variance for the addition to the White Rock Elementary School located at 1273 Fir Street.

The proposed development meets the objectives and aspirations of SD36 currently and as established in 2007 when the current building was constructed. It also complies with the OCP requirements for the Lower Town Centre area in that new developments are to be compatible with adjacent buildings.

School buildings are long term elements in the urban fabric. Unlike commercial buildings, they tend to be in existence for 60 years or more. As a result, the character of these facilities should be respectful of the character and scale of the community. When the original building from 1914-1967 was identified for demolition and reconstruction, the City of White Rock originally asked SD36 to save the 1914 building and display it somewhere on the existing site. As this was not possible, the City then requested/encouraged



1914 Original Building



3 storey addition 1920's



SD36 to create a design that maintained the form and character of the original 1914 school, respectful of the seaside community aspect of White Rock while paying homage to the history of the site as the long-time home of the White Rock School.

The current design of school respects the character of the neighbourhood and the City of White Rock by incorporating a residential design language and aesthetic typical in seaside communities. Further, the design of the building was specifically conceptualized to respond to the design of the original 1914 building.


The intent of the addition design is to respect the original wishes of the City of White Rock in 2007 and the strong identity created by the current school design for not only the school community, but the Lower Town Centre community. This



Existing Building (2007)

school design is in keeping with the seaside village aesthetic that embodied the original 1914 school building and we propose maintaining that aesthetic in the design, form and character of the new addition. This is best achieved with a seamless addition to the existing building, matching the existing ridge line.

Notwithstanding that the bylaw in 2007 did not limit building height on this site, the current 2 storey building was constructed to be substantially lower (12.4m to ridge) than the original 3 storey buildings (approx. 16m to the ridge). Unfortunately, today's new bylaw established an even lower maximum height of 10.7m. This means that the existing building is non-conforming with respect to height. As a result, to create a design that seamlessly connects and respects the original design, a variance of 1.7m to the existing zoning bylaw height is required.



Proposed Development

As established above, SD36 proposes to respect the original direction of the City of White Rock in 2007 and provide an addition that seamlessly extends the original building. The location of this addition was selected in 2007 and the existing floor plan and servicing was structured to support this future addition. BC Ministry of Education would not support an addition to this building in another location on the site as they have already supported the “rough-in” work to prepare for this addition that was completed in 2007. Further, the current approved funding for this addition does not include any renovations of the existing building as the work to support this addition was completed in 2007.

The new addition is a wood frame, eight classroom, 1,046 m² addition to the original school. The design intent of the new addition is to mimic the design of the existing building such that the addition appears as if it was part of the original construction. To that end, the design uses the existing building heights – extending the existing building ridge, matching the existing window configuration and using the same exterior materials as the existing building.



Natural Ventilation System

Similar to the existing building, the proposed addition includes a cupola to provide natural ventilation. The cupolas are deemed a “dome” under the definition of the bylaw, and therefore not included in the overall height calculation. The louvers at the high level of cupola relieve excess air out of the building, this prevents the building from being over-pressurized. Because this is a 2-storey school, the cupola works very well by taking advantage of thermal buoyancy (stack effect), which is a strategy also typically used

for naturally ventilating buildings. The high level of the cupola is a good location for the large louvers, away from building occupants.

Alternative Compliant Designs

Height Compliance

In order to construct an addition within the height limits of the bylaw, the building may have to be a flat roof building at 10.7m plus roof top mechanical units to replace the natural ventilation of the cupolas. These roof top mechanical units are deemed “chimneys” under the bylaw, and therefore not included in the overall height calculation. These units could not be screened as the screens would exceed the height bylaw. The images below generally show the shape of this potential addition (red) as well as the roof top mechanical units that may be required (yellow).



We acknowledge that an addition located on the east side will impact properties that currently have a view through this empty space, however, as demonstrated above, the view impact of the flat roof version with mechanical units is very similar to the proposed version that matches the existing form and character of the school. Currently, the approval from the Ministry of Education requires that the addition be located on the east end.

Educational Spaces

We do not deny that the building could be built to comply with the height limits of the bylaw, however, we do not believe that is in the best interests of the White Rock community for this addition on this site. We refer you to the history of the design process for the current school. It was the City of White Rock and the Community that originally requested the direction of the current design. While we have not done the design work for the alternative solutions, if the building does become a flat roof structure, the form and

character of the existing building would not be maintained, as the pitched roof is a significant architectural element in the design of the existing building and a primary characteristic in creating the seaside village motif.

In addition to form and character, the existing building has the pitched roofs that create large, vaulted ceilings in the upper floor classrooms, thus increasing their openness and achieving better acoustics. These classrooms are character defining features for the White Rock School, sought after by students and teachers alike. We anticipate that a flat roof design that meets the bylaw height will have flat ceilings for the 2nd floor spaces. While not an insurmountable deficit, it will likely make the addition, the poor cousin to the original building.

Accessibility

The current layout of the school is based on inclusivity and accessibility requirements for elementary schools. It is impractical and dangerous to provide ramps and stairs within the floor plate of an elementary school. The design reflects a need to not only provide access within the school but also from the exterior to the main floor classrooms at several locations. The access to these locations is provided with sloped surfaces for ease of access for all students and parents. Should we consider adding stairs and ramps inside the building, our issues on the site would only be aggravated as the north part of the floorplate needs to go up to the street from the existing main floor, but the south part of the floorplate would need to do down to Fir Street.

Project Timeline

Should this variance not be accepted, the project will be forced into redesign which means that the critical summer construction season will be lost. We estimate that the project delay could be as much as a year which would have substantial impacts on costs due to escalation in the market. The redesign and escalation costs are not included within the current budget approval and may result in a need to go back to the Ministry of Education for additional funding. If additional funding is not granted, there is a real threat that the project could be cancelled entirely resulting in the addition of more portables to the site, to address the projected growth in the community.

Conclusion

We strongly believe that the design as proposed represents the best option for the community as it respects the original request of the City of White Rock for a form and character that acknowledges this as the site for the past century as White Rock School. The White Rock School is a long term asset for the City of White Rock and SD36, therefore, we believe that respect to form and character of the building should be paramount.

We acknowledge that the addition will impact properties that currently have a view, however, whether the addition is bylaw compliant or not, the difference in view impact is insignificant and should be offset by the continuity of form and character of this long term asset of the community.

In order to maintain the form and character of the addition relative to the existing building, we request a Development Variance Permit to allow for the increased height of the new addition to match the existing ridge height of the existing building. The variance requested is 1.7m.

**THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK**



DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT NO. 436

1. This Development Variance Permit No. 436 is issued to **BOARD OF EDUCATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 36 (SURREY)** as the owner and shall apply only to ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the City of White Rock, in the Province of British Columbia, and more particularly known and described as:

Legal Description: Lot 1, Plan BCP15882, Section 11, Township 1, New Westminster Land District, White Rock Elem & Semiahmoo Sr Sec

PID: 026-188-899

As indicated on Schedule A

2. This Development Variance Permit No. 436 is issued pursuant to the authority of Section 498 of the *Local Government Act, R.S.B.C. 2015, Chapter 1* as amended, and in conformity with the procedures prescribed by "White Rock Planning Procedures Bylaw, 2017, No. 2234," as amended.
3. The provisions of the "City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000," as amended, is varied as follows:
 - (a) Section 6.22.4 is varied to permit a *principal building* having a maximum height 12.4 metres, being measured to the "top of ridge" of the roof.
 - (b) Pursuant to Section 4.13.4 of the Zoning Bylaw, the "cupolas", having a maximum height of 15.7 metres, are deemed to be exempt from the maximum height of buildings subject to any specified limit on roof coverage.
4. Said lands shall be developed in accordance with all terms, conditions, and provisions of this permit and any plans and specifications attached to this permit which shall form a part hereof.
5. Terms and Conditions:
 - (a) The development shall generally conform to the drawings attached hereto as Schedule B.
6. Where the holder of this Development Variance Permit does not receive final approval of a building permit for the proposed development within two (2) years after the date this Permit was issued, the Permit shall lapse, unless the Council, prior to the date the Permit is scheduled to lapse, has authorized the extension of the Permit.
7. This permit does not constitute a Sign Permit, a Tree Management Permit or a Building Permit.

Authorizing Resolution passed by the Council on the _____ day of _____ 2021.


This development variance permit has been executed at White Rock, British Columbia, the _____ day of _____ 2021.

The Corporate Seal of THE CORPORATION
OF THE CITY OF WHITE ROCK was hereunto
affixed in the presence of:

Mayor – Darryl Walker

Director of Corporate Administration – Tracey Arthur

Schedule A Location Map



Schedule B
Architectural Drawings
[cover page]

DRAFT

PROJECT STATISTICS


STREET ADDRESS:
1273 FIR STREET, WHITE ROCK, BC

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
LOT 1, SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 1, NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT PLAN BCP 15882

SITE AREA = 32,404 sq.m.

FLOOR AREA (sq.m.):	EXISTING	NEW	TOTAL
MAIN FLOOR	2,840	533	3,373
2ND FLOOR	1,276	513	1,789
TOTAL GROSS AREA	4,116	1,046	5,162

ZONING		P-1 - CIVIC/INSTITUTIONAL ZONE	
ZONING		REQUIRED	PROVIDED
MINIMUM SETBACKS, ALL LOT LINES		6M	MINIMUM 6M
LOT COVERAGE		MAX 50%	SITE AREA = 32,404 SQ. M. BLDG. FOOT PRINT = 3,379 SQ. M. COVERAGE = 10.43%
EXISTING BUILDING HEIGHT		CURRENT BYLAW = 10.7M 1999 BYLAW = NO REQUIREMENT	TOP OF RIDGE = 12.4M TOP OF CUPOLA = 15.7M
EXISTING OFF STREET PARKING AS PER 4.14		1 SPACE PER 92 SQ. M. OF INSTITUTIONAL FLOOR AREA = 57 SPACES	65 REGULAR, 2 ACCESSIBLE = 67 SPACES
EXISTING OFF STREET LOADING AS PER 4.15.2 & 4.15.3		CURRENT BYLAW = 4 REQUIRED 1999 BYLAW = 1 REQUIRED	9 DROP OFF SPACES
BIKE PARKING AS PER 4.16.3 (NOT REFERENCED IN P-1)		CLASS 1 = 0.25 SPACES PER 200 SQ.M. = 7 SPACES CLASS 2 = 0.75 SPACES PER 200 SQ.M. = 20 SPACES	CLASS 1 = 8 SPACES IN SECURE COMPOUND CLASS 2 = 32 SPACES ON SOUTH SIDE OF BUILDING




SITE PLAN
1 1/200

ISSUED FOR DVP
DATE: 2020.11.02
DRAWN: K. BROWN/1587

Copyright Reserved


thinkspace
architecture planning interior design
300-10190 152A Street Surrey, BC V4R 1J7
(604) 581 8128 / (604) 581 8148 www.thinkspace.ca

200810
Project Number
WHITE ROCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
CLASSROOM ADDITION
OVERALL SITE PLAN
D1.0
Sheet Number



HISTORICAL SITE INFORMATION

SITE SECTION 1:750



HISTORICAL SITE INFORMATION

SITE SECTION 1:750



HISTORICAL SITE INFORMATION



HISTORICAL SITE INFORMATION

AERIAL PHOTO OF DEMOLISHED BUILDING (2004)




HISTORICAL SITE INFORMATION
PHOTO 1




HISTORICAL SITE INFORMATION
PHOTO 2



HISTORICAL SITE INFORMATION
PHOTO 3



[illegible]



ELEVATION KEYNOTES & MATERIALS

- EM-1 PREFINISHED ALUMINUM ROOFING - GREY TO MATCH EXISTING
- EM-2 PREFINISHED ALUMINUM FACIAL WHITE
- EM-3 PLANK SIDING - GREY TO MATCH EXISTING
- EM-4 SHINGLE BOARD SIDING - GREY TO MATCH EXISTING
- EM-5 MASSIVE BRICK - COLOUR TO MATCH EXISTING
- EM-6 CLAMMITTUS T-100 - WHITE TO MATCH EXISTING
- EM-7 PRECAST CONCRETE WINDOW SILL - COLOUR TO MATCH EXISTING
- EM-8 PREFINISHED ALUMINUM WINDOW
- EM-9 SECURITY DOOR
- EM-10 ALUMINUM SHUTTER - DARK GREY
- EM-11 PREFINISHED ALUMINUM CLADDING - COLOUR TO MATCH ADJACENT SURFACE
- EM-12 MECHANICAL GRILLE - PAINTED GREY TO MATCH SIDING


Copyright Reserved

ISSUED FOR DVP
2020-11-02

thinkspace architecture planning interior design
300-10190 152A Street | Surrey, BC | V4R 1J7
(604) 581 8128 | (604) 581 8148
www.thinkspace.ca

thinkspace
architecture planning interior design
300-10190 152A Street | Surrey, BC | V4R 1J7
(604) 581 8128 | (604) 581 8148
www.thinkspace.ca

200810	Project Number
WHITE ROCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Project
CLASSROOM ADDITION	Project
DETAILED ELEVATIONS	Project
D4.2	Sheet Number





10 AM 12 PM 2 PM 4 PM

MARCH/SEPTEMBER 21ST

N.T.S.



10 AM

12 PM

2 PM

4 PM

JUNE 21ST

N.T.S.



10 AM

12 PM

2 PM

4 PM

DECEMBER 21ST

N.T.S.

4 PM - SUNSET TYPICAL AT 4:16 PM. NOTE THESE SHADOWS REPRESENT SHADOWS FROM THIS SITE ONLY. MOST OF THIS AREA WILL BE IN SHADOW FROM OTHER BUILDINGS AT THIS TIME.

ISSUED FOR DVP 2
DATE: 2005.11.09
DRAWN: 2005.11.09
NO. DATE DISPOSITION
1 2005.11.09 2005.11.09 DVP 2
1 2005.11.09 2005.11.09 DVP 2
This plan and design are the exclusive property of
White Rock Elementary School
All other content of this plan, including but not limited
to, shall remain the property of the City of White Rock.
This plan and design are the exclusive property of
White Rock Elementary School
All other content of this plan, including but not limited
to, shall remain the property of the City of White Rock.
This plan and design are the exclusive property of
White Rock Elementary School
All other content of this plan, including but not limited
to, shall remain the property of the City of White Rock.

Copyright Reserved



thinkspace
architecture planning interior design
100-10190 152A Street | Surrey, BC | V4R 1J7
(604) 581 8128 / (604) 581 8148 www.thinkspace.ca

2008010	Project Number
WHITE ROCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Project
CLASSROOM ADDITION	Project
SHADOW STUDY	Project
D6.0	Sheet Number


1
 ELEVATION FROM ROPER AVENUE
 1:200




2
 SITE PLAN
 1:200




15303/15311 ROPER AVENUE SECTION



15265 ROPER AVENUE SITE SECTION



15289/15299 ROPER AVENUE, 1321 FIR STREET SITE SECTION



**MINUTE EXTRACTS REGARDING DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT 436 – 1273 FIR STREET
WHITE ROCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EXPANSION**

Land Use and Planning Committee
March 8, 2021

**5. 1273 FIR STREET, WHITE ROCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EXPANSION -
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT (DVP 20-023)**

Corporate report dated March 8, 2021 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled "1273 Fir Street, White Rock Elementary School Expansion - Development Variance Permit (DVP 20-023)".

The Manager of Planning gave a PowerPoint outlining the project.

Motion Number: LU/P-032 It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee:

1. Recommend that Council direct staff to schedule the required Public Meeting for Development Variance Permit No. 436; and
2. Recommend that Council consider approval of Development Variance Permit No. 436.

Motion CARRIED

From: [Jenny Corenblum](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: PM: DVP 436, 1273 Fir Street, White Rock Elementary School
Date: April 7, 2021 6:13:51 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am in support of the eight classroom expansion to be built at 1273 Fir Street.
Jenny Corenblum
301-1221 Johnston Road
White Rock, BC , V4B 3Y8

From: [Joey Pallot](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock Elementary addition
Date: April 12, 2021 12:45:30 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Mr. Newman,

I am writing to you to show my support for the original design for the White Rock Elementary School addition. It makes no sense to not match the existing school design.

Thank you,
Joey

From: [Miranda](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock Elementary addition
Date: April 12, 2021 12:42:36 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Mr. Newman,

I am writing to you today to show my support for the original design for the White Rock Elementary School addition.

Thank you,
Miranda

From: [Chantelle Pasco](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: Support White Rock Elementary expansion
Date: April 13, 2021 2:53:00 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Mr. Newman,

I am writing to you as I support the original design of the addition to White Rock Elementary.

Thank you,

Chantelle Pasco

From: [Heidi Kowalski](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: Support for Original Design of White Rock Elementary Addition
Date: April 13, 2021 6:37:01 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Newman,

The White Rock Elementary community has been made aware that there is strong opposition to the proposed addition of our school. The project managers have informed us that those in opposition are fighting over essentially 5 feet and that if an adjustment needs to be made on the original design, the view will still be obstructed. However, with an incongruent design as well as an unsightly "box" just to meet the height requirement. If the view will be blocked somewhat, it might as well have something nice to look at rather than an odd-looking box.

Further, the original design has peaks that allow for natural ventilation. If a redesign is necessary, it will require forced air, thus less energy efficient.

Please consider how a school with a seamless design is much more aesthetically pleasing for the community rather than an eyesore.

Respectfully Yours,

Heidi Kowalski (parent of two students at White Rock Elementary)

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [Leslie King](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock School
Date: April 13, 2021 8:17:10 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi,

I am writing in favour of the White Rock Elementary addition with the height allowance to match the existing building.

Thanks,
Leslie King

From: [Kathleen Saddington](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock Elementary Variance Application
Date: April 13, 2021 7:08:37 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Norman,

Please accept this email as an expression of support for the Surrey School District's application for a variance in the height limit for the planned addition. As a White Rock resident I support a cohesive look to the building and as a White Rock Elementary parent I believe this is a much needed addition for the community and the height is needed to meet those needs.

Thank you,
Kathleen Saddington

From: [Amy Da Costa](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: development proposal for White Rock Elementary
Date: April 13, 2021 1:10:15 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Greg,

I am in favor of adopting the height variance and allowing the addition to White Rock Elementary to match the existing building.

The goal of the addition to the school is to reduce the need for portables, which are an eyesore and do not contribute to a sense of belonging for those kids that spend their entire year in that space. It then seems the wrong decision, to build an addition of a different style and height to the existing building- again, an eyesore that does not contribute to a sense of belonging for those children in that wing of the school.

Thanks,

Amy Da Costa.

Parent, and homeowner within the neighborhood of White Rock Elementary.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Linda Tatto](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: Development Variance - WhiteRock elementary school
Date: April 13, 2021 1:40:44 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Greg Newman,
Manager of Planning, City of White Rock

We as a family with long time connections to White Rock elementary school, strongly believe that the design as proposed by the school represents the best option for the community as it respects the original request of the City of White Rock for a form and character that acknowledges this as the site for the past century as White Rock School. The White Rock School is a long term asset for the City of White Rock and SD36, therefore, we believe that respect to form and character of the building should be paramount.

In order to maintain the form and character of the addition relative to the existing building, we request a Development Variance Permit to allow for the increased height of the new addition to match the existing ridge height of the existing building. The variance requested is 1.7m.

Sincerely,
Michael & Linda Tatto

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [Kelly Chen](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Cc: [Maddisen Stegavik](#)
Subject: For supporting application for a variance in the height limit for our school planned addition.
Date: April 13, 2021 1:56:48 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi , Mr. Greg,

Good afternoon, As one of the parents of White Rock Elementary school, today I send this email to you just for supporting application for a variance in the height limit for our school planned addition.

In fact I send this email to you not only as one of the parent , but also as one of the guardians residing in White Rock. We love our city, also support our city's government. The Education always is the most important thing to our City. Because the kids are our future. For this situation, we need to do more things for supporting our education and the safety of all the students and the teachers!

All of us look forward approval!
Best wishes and regards

Kai Li Chen

From: [S.J.](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: Support of the addition of White Rock Elementary School
Date: April 13, 2021 1:43:44 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

This email is to confirm my support of the proposed addition for White Rock Elementary School, which now requires Council to approve a variance of 1.7 metres to the building height by-law to move forward with construction.

Yours sincerely,
Soya Oh

From: [Chelan Barclay](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: Variance for White Rock Elementary
Date: April 13, 2021 1:19:42 PM
Attachments: [image001\[43\].png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi There,

I am writing as a White Rock Elementary parent to express my support in having City Council review an application for a variance to the height limit to the planned addition to the school.

I understand that denial of this application will delay the addition. As well, the proposed addition should the variance be denied is ugly, and does not keep within the original spirit of the White Rock Elementary design.

I have two children who attend WRE, one who is currently in a portable, and one who has been. I'm sure they both will again. As a person who works in the school system, I know how inconvenient portables are for students, especially younger ones. As a teacher, the portable cuts you off from the wider school community, and you must operate on your own "island." I have taught in portables and I hate it. For this reason alone, the application for variance should be passed so as to allow construction to take place as soon as possible.

Further, White Rock Elementary is a beautiful school, and a flagship building in the Surrey School District. There is no other school building designed quite like it, and clearly it was constructed to carry the spirit of the original WRE and Semiahmoo Secondary buildings forward—it keeps that heritage in its design. The addition should continue the theme.

Please do the right thing and review and support this application for variance. My kid shouldn't have to walk through rain and snow to go to the bathroom any longer than they already have.

Chelan C. Barclay

Counsellor, last names: McKinley - S
Semiahmoo Secondary School



1785 148th Street, Surrey, BC
604-536-2131

barclay_c@surreyschools.ca

For Appointment Bookings visit: https://calendly.com/barclay_c

For Mental Health Resources visit: <https://sway.office.com/oc5cLpfX4MZozTjT?ref=Link&loc=play>

To view our counsellor's page

visit: <https://www.surreyschools.ca/schools/semi/Departments/Counselling/Pages/default.aspx>

We would like to acknowledge that the lands on which we work, play and learn, are on the shared traditional territory of the Semiahmoo, Katzie, Kwantlen, and other Coast Salish Peoples.

Notice - This transmission may contain confidential and privileged information. The information contained in this transmission is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the addressee of this message, please do not review, disclose, copy or distribute it. If you have received this communication by mistake, please reply to the author immediately. Thank you

From: [Diane Manhas](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock Elementary
Date: April 13, 2021 10:07:50 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Mr Newman,

I want the design plans for White Rock Elementary to remain unchanged and I support a variance to the zoning by law. Consideration should be made to match the established architecture.

Thank you for your time.

Diane Manhas

Diane Manhas
dianemanhas@gmail.com
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Dave Braun](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock Elementary Addition - In support of application for variance
Date: April 13, 2021 3:33:48 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Mr Newman,

We are writing this letter in support of the application for variance by the school district.

We believe that the design as proposed represents the best option for the community as it respects the original request of the City of White Rock for a form and character that acknowledges this as the site for the past century as White Rock School. The White Rock School is a long term asset for the City of White Rock and SD36, therefore, we believe that respect to form and character of the building should be paramount.

In order to maintain the form and character of the addition relative to the existing building, we request a Development Variance Permit to allow for the increased height of the new addition to match the existing ridge height of the existing building.

Thank you for your consideration.

David & Joanna (Kennedy & Paxton) Braun
15557 Thrift Ave, White Rock

From: [Carrie Wilke](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock Elementary Addition - Variance to Height Limit
Date: April 13, 2021 1:42:51 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

I write at this time to express my support in having City Council review an application for a variance to the height limit to the planned addition to White Rock Elementary.

Thank you,
Carrie Wilke

From: [Christian Denter](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock Elementary School - Request for Development Variance
Date: April 13, 2021 3:14:52 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Newman,

As a resident of White Rock and as a parent of two students attending White Rock Elementary School, I wanted to reach out to convey my approval of the application submitted for a development variance permit for a height variance for the addition to the White Rock Elementary School located at 1273 Fir Street.

I understand that the proposed development meets the objectives and aspirations of SD36 currently and as established in 2007 when the current building was constructed, and that it also complies with the OCP requirements for the Lower Town Centre area in that new developments are to be compatible with adjacent buildings.

Further to meeting these requirements, I strongly believe that an additional to the school supports the best interests of the community and that having a visually appealing addition would be more beneficial to the city of White Rock and the neighbourhood itself.

The city has approved the building of 20+ story high-rises that have completely changed the skyline of the seaside town that I grew up in, and which have primarily benefited developers, who don't always reside in the neighbourhood. This is a project that would directly benefit the residents of White Rock, and by approving this minor variance would add to the building's visual appeal and allow it to continue fitting into the town it services.

I would be happy to discuss this with you further at your convenience, and hope you take my input (and those of other parents and White Rock residents) into consideration when deciding to approve the requested variance.

Sincerely,
Christian Denter

From: [Brandon Ferguson](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White rock Elementary school variance
Date: April 13, 2021 2:16:21 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello

I'm writing this email to send my support for the White Rock Elementary school height variance allowance the community is growing just look at the number of high rises going up there is going to be a need for more classroom space

Thank you

Brandon Ferguson

White Rock resident

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Shaila Walters](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock Elementary
Date: April 13, 2021 2:58:46 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I support the development variance for White Rock Elementary.

Thankyou,
Shaila Walters

Sent from my Galaxy

From: [Diana Schinkel](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock ELEMntry - Classroom addition
Date: April 13, 2021 11:44:38 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Newman,

We are writing to support the Surrey School Districts application for a variance in the height limit for the planned and much needed classroom addition at White Rock Elementary School. We think the original planned design is the best way for this community.

Thank you.

Kind regards,

Diana Schinkel & Eddy Santos

From: [Marla Coulas](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Cc: [thom \(my love\) prior](#)
Subject: WRE original design
Date: April 14, 2021 7:46:19 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Mr. Newman,

I would like to express my strong support for the original design with the development permit variance for White Rock Elementary. The cohesive design supports the aesthetic of the school and community as a whole. To do otherwise is impractical and would be a long-standing eyesore in our community. Our kids deserve a well-designed, cohesive school.

As a thirty year resident of this community, former WRE student, and current parent of two WRE students, I hope you will consider my thoughts on this matter.

Warmly,
-Marla Coulas,
15500 Oxenham Avenue
White Rock, BC
V4B2J3

Sent from my iPhone

From: straussbc@hotmail.com
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White rock school
Date: April 13, 2021 7:51:38 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Greg

I am a white rock resident and support the development variance for the white rock school

Thx

Perry Strauss

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Doreen Blake](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock Elementary Expansion
Date: April 13, 2021 7:29:44 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I totally support the expansion of the White Rock Elementary school.

Doreen Blake

Sent from my iPad

From: [Lehla Moran](#)
To: [Greg Newman](#)
Subject: White Rock Elementary 1273 Fir Street-Height Variance
Date: April 13, 2021 6:55:16 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello, I am a parent of two children that go to WRE and I am writing to indicate my support of the Height variance issue that is going to council this week.

The school needs updating to keep up with the additional children in the area due to all the new development and to keep in line with the existing structure, we need this variance approved or the alternative is a design that will not fit with the existing school design.

Please consider allowing the height variance.

Thank you!

Lehla Lempriere
Children (Colton and Sienna).

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Greg Newman](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: FW: Support for the Addition
Date: April 14, 2021 8:21:15 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Doreen Blake <blakedoreen@yahoo.com>
Sent: April 13, 2021 6:47 PM
To: Greg Newman <GNewman@whiterockcity.ca>
Subject: Support for the Addition

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you I would like to voice my approval of the continuance of the addition as planned.

Sincerely,
Doreen Blake
Grandmother of student
Residence of White Rock

Sent from my iPad

From: [Greg Newman](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: FW: Proposed construction vs bylaw
Date: April 14, 2021 9:23:30 AM

T

From: C A <chrisadamson8@gmail.com>
Sent: April 13, 2021 6:05 PM
To: Greg Newman <GNewman@whiterockcity.ca>
Subject: Proposed construction vs bylaw

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello, the proposed construction is clearly much more visually appealing and fitting with the neighbourhood and area. The by law compliant version looks like a huge box stuck in a strange place, where walkway to classes is now. Where I walk my kid to school. Doesnt match rest of building. 1.7 metres is not much. Especially considering the height of other buildings going up nearby. White Rock Elem is one of the main schools for the community with the highest rating and should have a school that parents are proud to send their kid to, and where kids want to go to learn. Not that looks like a warehouse. For this reason I support the well planned proposed wrap around option making use of the NW corner.

Chris Adamson

From: [Greg Newman](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: FW: White Rock Elementary - variance
Date: April 14, 2021 9:24:53 AM

T

From: Michelle Bray-Russell <braydesign@telus.net>
Sent: April 13, 2021 5:54 PM
To: Greg Newman <GNewman@whiterockcity.ca>
Subject: White Rock Elementary - variance

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am sending my support **to White Rock City Council in support of the District's application** for a Development Variance.

My daughter is currently attending WRE, my oldest daughter attended for 7 years.
My father attended in 1952 when the school was Semi. My husband attended in the 1980s.
Keep White Rock beautiful!

Sincerely,
Michelle Bray-Russell

From: [Greg Newman](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: FW: Support for WRE construction
Date: April 14, 2021 9:25:08 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Savannah Watts <melissa.beedle@icloud.com>
Sent: April 13, 2021 5:30 PM
To: Greg Newman <GNewman@whiterockcity.ca>
Subject: Support for WRE construction

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I'm writing in support of White Rock Elementary building variance.

Melissa Beedle
15295 Roper Ave
White Rock, BC
V4B 2E9

Sent from my iPhone