

The Corporation of the
CITY OF WHITE ROCK



Public Hearing
AGENDA

Monday, April 19, 2021, 6:00 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 HEARING TO ORDER
2. BYLAW NO: 2376 - White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000, Amendment (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions), Bylaw, 2021, No. 2376

PURPOSE: Bylaw 2376 would amend Schedule A – Text of the Zoning Bylaw by deleting the existing Section 6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial/ Residential Zone in its entirety and replacing it with a new Section 6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial / Residential Zone.

Changes in this zoning amendment, if approved, will include:

- Reducing maximum density
- Encouraging more affordable housing choices and employment uses
- Requiring more green spaces as part of development
- Lowering overall building heights (current maximum height is 80.7 metres, approx. 25-26 storeys). Proposed heights are indicated in yellow circles on map in number of storeys.
- Reinforcing the lower-scale, pedestrian-focused experience on Johnston Road
- Requiring adaptable, accessible-ready housing

3. **DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION READS A STATMENT REGARDING THE PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING** 5

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

- Notice was published in the April 8 and 15 editions of the Peace Arch News
- 10,974 postcards were mailed out to all residents in White Rock
- A copy of the notice was placed on the public notice posting board on March 31, 2021

5. **THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO PRESENT THE PROPOSED BYLAW** 7

Note: Information package for this item provided for reference purposes.

6. **THE CHAIRPERSON WILL REQUEST THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION TO ADVISE OF ANY CORRESPONDENCE OR SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED** 470

As of 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 14, 2021 there have been 36 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	Resident Address	Status	Item #
L. Gom	April 8, 2021	Undisclosed	Opposed	C-1
A. Shah	April 9, 2021	1558 Victoria Avenue White Rock, BC	Opposed	C-2
D. Evoy	April 9, 2021	White Rock	Opposed	C-3
I. Campbell	April 9, 2021	White Rock	Opposed	C-4
M. Mallot	April 10, 2021	White Rock	Opposed	C-5
L. Swanson	April 10, 2021	White Rock	Opposed	C-6
J. Vye	April 10, 2021	White Rock	Opposed	C-7
G. A.	April 10, 2021	Undisclosed	Opposed	C-8
C. Fast	April 10, 2021	1130 Finlay Street White Rock, BC	Opposed	C-9
L. Nielsen	April 10, 2021	1480 Foster Street 14716 Thrift Avenue	Opposed	C-10
T. Scott	April 10, 2021	White Rock, BC V4B 2J5	Opposed	C-11
G. Boutilier	April 10, 2021	208 - 1280 Merklin St. White Rock, BC	Opposed	C-12
S. Butterfly	April 10, 2021	Suite 300 15176 Buena Vista	Opposed	C-13

		Ave.		
		White Rock, B.C		
		602 - 15015 Victoria		
S. Bergen	April 10, 2021	Ave	Opposed	C-14
		White Rock, BC		
J. Hampson	April 10, 2021	15858 Roper Avenue	Opposed	C-15
		White Rock, BC		
P. Glabush	April 10, 2021	1130 Finlay Street	Opposed	C-16
		White Rock, BC		
A. Currie	April 11, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-17
S. Willis	April 11, 2021	Undisclosed	Opposed	C-18
P. Chang	April 11, 2021	Undisclosed	Opposed	C-19
D. Lewis	April 11, 2021	Undisclosed	Opposed	C-20
R. Green	April 11, 2021	White Rock	Opposed	C-21
S. Green	April 11, 2021	White Rock	Opposed	C-21
S. Mare	April 12, 2021	Undisclosed	Opposed	C-22
		15586 Goggs Avenue		
A. McCorkell	April 12, 2021	White Rock,	Opposed	C-23
		215 - 1280 Fir Street		
T. Bishop	April 12, 2021	White Rock, BC	Support	C-24
		305 - 1369 George		
V. Mair	April 12, 2021	St. White Rock, BC	Opposed	C-25
		204 - 1020 Parker		
T. Moore	April 12, 2021	Street	Undetermined	C-26
		White Rock, BC		
D. Darts	April 12, 2021	14855 Thrift Avenue	Opposed	C-27
		White Rock, BC		
V. Darts	April 12, 2021	14855 Thrift Avenue	Opposed	C-27
		White Rock, BC		
D. Taylor	April 12, 2021	Undisclosed	Opposed	C-28
G. Dawson	April 10, 2021	309-1280 Merklin	Opposed	C-29
		Street		
F. Old	April 12, 2021	White Rock	Opposed	C-30
		306 1437 Foster		
J. Babb	April 12, 2021	Street	Opposed	C-31
		White Rock		
B. Johnston	April 12, 2021	#504 White Rock	Opposed	C-32
		Square		
C. Blacklaws	April 13, 2021	Undisclosed	Opposed	C-33
		301-1351 Martin		
A. MacDonald	April 13, 2021	Street, White Rock	Opposed	C-34
D. Manuel	April 14, 2021	Undisclosed	Opposed	C-35
D. Dakstader	April 12, 2021	White Rock	Opposed	C-36

7. THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THOSE IN ATTENDANCE (VIA TELEPHONE) TO PRESENT THEIR COMMENTS

8. IF REQUIRED, THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THE DIRECTOR OR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO SUMMARIZE THE PROPOSED BYLAW
9. CONCLUSION OF THE APRIL 19, 2021 PUBLIC HEARING

OPENING STATEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PURPOSE AND CONDUCT

The purpose of this evening's public hearings shall be to give a reasonable opportunity to be heard or to present written submissions respecting the proposal. Meeting information with a telephone number to call for tonight's Public Hearing was provided on the City Website, on the public meeting notice board and in the Peace Arch News. Members of the public may call in using that information anytime. The information will also be provided throughout the course of the meeting. 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 Hearing
- 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

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.*

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING – APRIL 19, 2021

BYLAW 2376: **White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000, Amendment (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions) Bylaw, 2021, No. 2376**

PURPOSE: Bylaw 2376 would amend Schedule A – Text of the Zoning Bylaw by deleting the existing Section 6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial/ Residential Zone in its entirety and replacing it with a new Section 6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial / Residential Zone.

Changes in this zoning amendment, if approved, will include:

- Reducing maximum density
- Encouraging more affordable housing choices and employment uses
- Requiring more green spaces as part of development
- Lowering overall building heights (current maximum height is 80.7 metres, approx. 25-26 storeys). Proposed heights are indicated in yellow circles on map in number of storeys.
- Reinforcing the lower-scale, pedestrian-focused experience on Johnston Road
- Requiring adaptable, accessible-ready housing

WHITE ROCK
My City by the Sea!

Documents:

Author	Document	Item #
Excerpt from Zoning Bylaw 2000	Current CR-1 Zone	R-1
N/A	Town Centre Urban Design Plan – August 2011	R-2
Council Policy 511	Density Bonus/ Amenity Contribution	R-3
Director of Planning and Development Services	Corporate report dated February 11, 2019	R-4
Director of Planning and Development Services	Land Use and Planning Committee corporate report dated November 4, 2019	R-5
Director of Planning and Development Services	Corporate report dated March 9, 2020	R-6
Director of Planning and Development Services	Land Use and Planning Committee corporate report dated July 27, 2020	R-7
Director of Planning and Development Services	Land Use and Planning Committee corporate report dated February 8, 2021	R-8
Corporate Administration Department	Minutes – Various Extracts	R-9

Written Submissions:

Author	Date Received	Civic Address	Status	Item #

THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK

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

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
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 Hearing on **MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2021** at **6:00 P.M.** in accordance with the *Local Government Act*. All persons who deem their interest in property is affected by the proposed bylaw/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 bylaw/application that is the subject of the Public Hearing. At the Public Hearing, Council will hear and receive submissions from the interested persons in regard to the bylaw/application listed below:

**1) BYLAW 2376: WHITE ROCK ZONING BYLAW, 2012,
NO. 2000, AMENDMENT (CR-1 TOWN CENTRE REVISIONS)
BYLAW, 2021, NO. 2376**

PURPOSE: Bylaw 2376 would amend Schedule A – Text of the Zoning Bylaw by deleting the existing Section 6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial/ Residential Zone in its entirety and replacing it with a new Section 6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial / Residential Zone.

Changes in this zoning amendment, if approved, will include:

- Reducing maximum density
- Encouraging more affordable housing choices and employment uses
- Requiring more green spaces as part of development
- Lowering overall building heights (current maximum height is 80.7 metres, approx. 25-26 storeys). Proposed heights are indicated in yellow circles on map in number of storeys.
- Reinforcing the lower-scale, pedestrian-focused experience on Johnston Road
- Requiring adaptable, accessible-ready housing

Further details regarding the subject of the Public Hearings/Public Meetings may be obtained from the City's Planning and Development Services Department at City Hall by contacting 604-541-2136 | planning@whiterockcity.ca. Related reports and the draft bylaw may be viewed on the City website at www.whiterockcity.ca/CR1

Electronic Meeting: The Provincial Health Officer has issued orders related to gatherings and events in the province of BC. As such, Public Hearings will be held virtually and will also be live streamed on the City website. To participate in a Public Hearing, 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 Hearing/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 subject line: **Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)**

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 Hearing/ Meeting item:

You may phone 604-541-2127 to register your support / or that you are not in support of the Public Hearing/ 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 call into the Public Hearing/ Meeting item via telephone:

Registration for this Public Hearing is **not** required. Should you wish to participate you may do so following the instructions below:

Phone-In Instructions:

- **Call: 778-736-1164**
- Enter Conference ID # when prompted: **624916385#**
 - A prompt will ask if you are the meeting organizer. Please disregard this message and remain on the line.
 - When prompted, state your first and last name, then press #

- You will then be notified that you have entered the waiting room, where you will remain until it is your turn to speak. During this time, please feel free to continue to watch the Public Meeting/ Hearing on the website livestream - <https://www.whiterockcity.ca/894/Agendas-Minutes>

(Note: there is approximately a one (1) minute delay between the live version of the meeting and the website livestream. You may be called upon by phone before you hear this on the livestream meeting.)


- When it is your turn to speak you will be advised that you are now joining the meeting. *At this time please ensure that you turn OFF the live stream for the meeting* Staff will ask for you to confirm your first and last name and civic address, after which you will have an opportunity to provide your comments to Council
- You will have 5 minutes to speak
- Once you make your comments to Council, the call will end quickly so that the next speaker can join the meeting.

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.

The proposed bylaws / applications 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 31, 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.**

MAP FOR BYLAW 2376, CR-1 TOWN CENTRE REVISIONS



Arthur

Tracey Arthur
Director of Corporate Administration

WHITE ROCK
My City by the Sea!

The Corporation of the CITY OF WHITE ROCK BYLAW 2376



A Bylaw to amend the
"White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000" as amended

The CITY COUNCIL of the Corporation of the City of White Rock in open meeting assembled ENACTS as follows:

1. Schedule A - Text of the *White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000* as amended is further amended by deleting the existing Section 6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial/Residential Zone in its entirety and replacing it with a new Section 6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial/Residential Zone as follows:

6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial / Residential Zone

The intent of this zone is to accommodate a mix of uses and activities, including residential and commercial development along with cultural and civic facilities, to support the ability of residents to walk to meet their daily needs. Containing the greatest concentration and variety of employment-generating uses, this zone establishes this area as the City's pedestrian and transit-focused growth area, consistent with the objectives and policies of the Official Community Plan.

6.16.1 Permitted Uses:

The following uses are permitted in one (1) or more principal buildings:

- 1) *retail service group 1 uses*;
- 2) *subject to section 9 b), licensed establishments, including liquor primary, food primary, liquor store, agent store, u-brew, u-vin, and licensed manufacturer*;
- 3) *hotel*;
- 4) *civic use*;
- 5) *medical or dental clinic*;
- 6) *multi-unit residential use*;
- 7) *accessory home occupation* in conjunction with a *multi-unit residential use* and in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.3, and that does not involve clients of the home occupation accessing the building in person;
- 8) *one-unit residential use* accessory to a *retail service group 1 use* and limited to a storey above the portion of a building used for the *retail service group 1 use*.
- 9) *adult entertainment use* in accordance with the following provisions:
 - a) the *adult entertainment use* has a valid business license;
 - b) the *adult entertainment use* shall not operate in conjunction with a liquor licence in the same establishment;
 - c) the *adult entertainment use* shall not be located within 500 metres of a school;

- d) despite Section 6.16.2 Lot Size, the minimum *lot* width of a *lot* accommodating an *adult entertainment use* shall not be less than 45 metres;
- e) a *lot* accommodating an *adult entertainment use* must have a *lot line* common with North Bluff Road;
- f) a *building* accommodating an *adult entertainment use* must be set back a minimum of 50 metres from Johnston Road and 30 metres from any other public road; and despite Section 4.14.1 Off-Street Parking Requirements, parking for *adult entertainment use* shall be provided as follows: 1 parking space per every 18.6 m² (200 ft²) of commercial floor area.

6.16.2 Lot Size:

- 1) Subject to section 9 c), minimum lot width, lot depth and lot area in the CR-1 zone are as follows:

<i>Lot width</i>	18.0m (59.0ft)
<i>Lot depth</i>	30.48m (100.0ft)
<i>Lot area</i>	548.64m ² (5,905.5ft ²)

6.16.3 Lot Coverage:

- 1) *Lot coverage* per fee simple lot shall not exceed 65%.
- 2) Despite section 6.16.3(1), on a *lot* exceeding 3,035m² (0.75 acres) in area, the area of impermeable materials on the *lot* shall not exceed 90 percent of the total lot area, and the minimum horizontal (length or width) dimensions for any permeable areas included toward this calculation is 4.0m (13.1 ft).
- 3) For the purposes of section 6.16.3(2), the following materials are impermeable: asphalt, concrete, brick, and stone. Gravel, river rock less than 5 cm in size, wood chips, bark mulch, and other materials which have fully permeable characteristics when in place installed on grade with no associated layer of impermeable material (such as plastic sheeting) that would impede the movement of water directly into the soil below are excluded from the area of impermeable materials.

6.16.4 Density:

The permitted maximum density is varied throughout this zone.

- 1) The maximum *gross floor area* shall not exceed 1.75 times the *lot area*.
- 2) Despite Section 6.16.4.1, maximum *gross floor area* may be increased if:
 - a) the owner of the *lot*
 - (i) provides a community amenity described in the City's *Community Amenity Reserve Fund Bylaw, 2017, No. 2190*, as amended, or
 - (ii) elects to pay to the City cash in lieu of the provision of the amenity under that bylaw in the amount of \$430 per square metre of *gross floor area* above 1.75 times the *lot area* in accordance with an amenity agreement

and a section 219 covenant granted to the City by the owner of the subject real property to secure the amenity;

b) the *lot* size meets the minimums in the table below; and

Minimum Lot Area	Maximum density (<i>gross floor area</i>)
3,035m ² (0.75 acres)	2.3 times the <i>lot</i> area
5,058m ² (1.25 acres)	3.5 times the <i>lot</i> area
8,094m ² (2.0 acres)	4.0 times the <i>lot</i> area*

*maximum density may exceed 3.5 times the *lot* area only for lots north of Russell Avenue

c) the uses within a principal building on a *lot* include:


- i. a minimum of 30% of the dwelling units secured through a housing agreement registered on title as residential rental tenure for the life of the building; or
- ii. a minimum of 10% of the dwelling units secured through a housing agreement registered on title as residential rental tenure for the life of the building at rents 10% below the average rents for the primary rental market in the City as determined by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; or
- iii. only non-residential uses.

3) Despite Section 6.16.4.1 and 6.16.4.2, if a development permit allowing density above 1.75 times the lot area for a *lot* has been issued for the construction of a *principal building* prior to December 31, 2020, the maximum *gross floor area* for that *lot* is the maximum *gross floor area* that applied at the time of development permit issuance.

6.16.5 Building Heights:

The permitted maximum building height is varied throughout this zone.

- 1) *Principal buildings* shall not exceed a *height* of 10.7m (35.1ft).
- 2) Despite Section 6.16.5.1, maximum *heights* may be increased to a maximum of 13.7m (44.95ft) and a maximum of four (4) *storeys*, if the building is set back a minimum 7.0m from the *lot line* adjacent to Johnston Road, and the exterior wall of the top *storey* of a building facing Johnston Road is set back a minimum 2.0m from the exterior wall of the *storey* below it.
- 3) Despite Section 6.16.5.1, if a *lot* qualifies for the increased density described in section 6.16.4.2, the maximum permitted number of *storeys* for a *principal building* on the *lot* shall be in accordance with the number of *storeys* indicated by the following diagram, and in no case shall a *principal building* exceed a *height* of 90.0m (295.3ft).
- 4) Despite Section 6.16.5.1, if a development permit allowing a *principal building* with a maximum *height* over 10.7 metres for a lot has been issued for the construction of a *principal building* prior to December 31, 2020, the maximum *height* for that *lot* is the maximum *height* that applied at the time of development permit issuance.



For certainty, the ^ symbol on the diagram above identifies where additional height is permitted if an on-site *community amenity space* (such as a City-owned conference centre, art gallery, or City Hall) is provided in addition to the amenity contribution in section 6.16.4(2)(a), with a minimum floor area of 1,400 square metres (15,069 square feet). The maximum height in *storeys* on these *lots* without such *community amenity space* is ten (10) *storeys*.

The * symbol on the diagram above identifies where a fourth *storey* is permitted if the building complies with the additional setback requirements in section 6.16.5.2; The maximum height in *storeys* on these *lots* without such setbacks is three (3) *storeys* and 10.7m, per section 6.16.5.1.

6.16.6 Minimum Setback Requirements:

- 1) *Principal buildings* and *structures* in the CR-1 zone shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum *setback* requirements:

Setback	Principal Building	Structures
Front lot line (abutting Johnston Road)	15.24m (50ft) from the street centreline	0.0m (0.0ft) See s. 6.16.7
Front lot line (not abutting Johnston Road)	3.0m (9.84ft)	0.0m (0.0ft) See s. 6.16.7
Exterior side lot line (abutting Johnston Road)	15.24m (50ft) from the street centreline	0.0m (0.0ft) See s. 6.16.7
Exterior side lot line (not abutting Johnston Road)	3.0m (9.84ft)	0.0m (0.0ft) See s. 6.16.7
Interior side lot line	0.0m (0.0ft)	0.0m (0.0ft)
Rear lot line (abutting a street)	3.0m (9.84ft)	Not permitted
Rear lot line (abutting a lane)	0.0m (0.0ft)	Not permitted
Rear lot line (abutting another lot)	0.0m (0.0ft)	Not permitted

- 2) Where the *lot line* abuts another *lot* zoned CR-1 or CD and permitting a principal building that exceeds a height of 13.7 m (44.95ft), the portion of the *principal building* above 13.7m (44.95ft) shall be located a minimum of 12.2m (40.0ft) from the *lot line* to ensure a minimum separation distance of 24.4m (80.0ft) between buildings above 13.7m (44.95ft) in height.

6.16.7 Ancillary Buildings and Structures:

Except as otherwise provided in Section 4.13 and in addition to the provisions of sub-section 6.16.6 above, the following also applies:

- 1) *ancillary buildings* are not permitted.
- 2) *ancillary structures* shall not be sited less than 3.0m from a *principal building* on the same *lot*.
- 3) despite sub-sections 6.16.6 and 6.16.7 (2), patios and awnings are permitted in the front and exterior side yard areas in accordance with White Rock License Agreement (Sidewalk Café / Business License) Bylaw requirements.

6.16.8 Accessory off-street parking shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of Section 4.14.

6.16.9 Accessory off-street loading spaces shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of Section 4.15.

6.16.10 Bicycle parking facilities shall be provided in accordance with the standards of Section 4.16.2 and in the quantities indicated in Section 4.16.3.

6.16.11 Adaptable Units:

In a building containing a multi-unit residential use, a minimum of 50% of the dwelling units shall be adaptable housing units that are constructed to comply with the Adaptable Housing standards prescribed in the *British Columbia Building Code*.

2. This bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “*Zoning Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 2376*”.

Read a first time this 22nd day of February, 2021

Read a second time this 22nd day of February, 2021

Considered at a Public Hearing this day of , 2021

Read a third time this _____ day of _____, 2021

Adopted this day of , 2021

Mayor

Director of Corporate Administration

6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial / Residential Zone

The intent of this zone is to accommodate commercial and multi-unit residential uses, and to facilitate redevelopment in accordance with the direction provided in the 2011 Town Centre Urban Design Plan.

6.16.1 Permitted Uses:

The following uses are permitted in one (1) or more principal buildings:

- 1) *retail service group 1 uses*;
- 2) *licensed establishments*, including *liquor primary, food primary, liquor store, agent store, u-brew, u-vin, and licensed manufacturer*;
- 3) *hotel*;
- 4) *civic use*;
- 5) *medical or dental clinic*;
- 6) *multi-unit residential use* in conjunction with not more than one of the following *accessory uses per dwelling unit*:
 - a) *accessory home occupation* in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.3.;
 - b) *accessory boarding use* in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.4.
- 7) a *one-unit residential use, a two-unit residential use or a three-unit residential use* accessory to a *retail service group 1 use*, and limited to the storey or storeys above the portion of a building used for *retail service group 1 uses*.
- 8) *adult entertainment use* in accordance with the following provisions:
 - a) the *adult entertainment use* has a valid business license;
 - b) the *adult entertainment use* shall not operate in conjunction with a liquor licence in the same establishment;
 - c) the *adult entertainment use* shall not be located within 500 metres of a school;
 - d) notwithstanding Section 6.16.2 Lot Size, the minimum lot width of a lot with an *adult entertainment use* shall not be less than 45 metres;
 - e) any lot accommodating an *adult entertainment use* must have a *lot line* common with North Bluff Road;
 - f) any establishment accommodating an *adult entertainment use* must be setback a minimum of 50 metres from Johnston Road, and 30 metres from any other public road; and
 - g) notwithstanding Section 4.14.1 Off-Street Parking Requirements, parking for *adult entertainment use* shall be provided 1 parking space per every 18.6 m² (200 ft²) of commercial floor area.

6.16.2 Lot Size:

- 1) Minimum *lot width, lot depth and lot area* in the CR-1 zone are as follows:

Lot width	18.0m (59.0ft)
Lot depth	30.48m (100.0ft)
Lot area	548.64m ² (5,905.5ft ²)

6.16.3 Lot Coverage:

- 1) Maximum *lot coverage* per fee-simple lot is 65%.

6.16.4 Density:

Maximum *gross floor area* (GFA) of all uses shall be 1.75 times the *lot area*.

Notwithstanding, maximum *gross floor area* (GFA) for all uses may be increased to a maximum of 5.4 times the *lot area* where the proponents enter into amenity agreement with the City. Terms of the agreement shall be in accordance with the City of White Rock Community Amenity Contribution Policy for redevelopment, as follows:

- i) redevelopment shall be consistent with the design principles, land use and key ideas in the City of White Rock August 2011 Town Centre Urban Design Plan;
- ii) maximum density and location of building mass for each site shall be consistent with the recommendations of the City of White Rock August 2011 Town Centre Urban Design Plan; and
- iii) site specifics and design details will be confirmed through the development permit approval process.

6.16.5 Building Heights:

Principal buildings shall not exceed a *height* of 10.7m (35.1ft). Notwithstanding, maximum *heights* may be increased to a maximum of 80.7m (265.0ft) where the proponents enter into amenity agreement with the City. Terms of the agreement shall be in accordance with the City of White Rock Community Amenity Contribution Policy for redevelopment as follows:

- i) redevelopment shall be generally as outlined in the City of White Rock August 2011 Town Centre Urban Design Plan;
- ii) maximum building *height* and location of building mass for each site shall generally conform to the recommendations of the City of White Rock August 2011 Town Centre Urban Design Plan; and
- iii) site specifics and design details will be confirmed through the development permit approval process.

6.16.6 Minimum Setback Requirements:

- 1) *Principal buildings* and *structures* in the CR-1 zone shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum *setback* requirements:

Setback	Principal Building	Structures
Front lot line	1.5m (4.92ft)	Not permitted *
Exterior side lot line	3.0m (9.84ft)	3.0m (9.84ft)

- 2) Where the *lot line* abuts *another lot* zoned CR-1 or CD and permitting a *principal building* that exceeds a height of 10.7m (35.1ft), the portion of the *principal building* above 10.7m (35.1ft) shall be located a minimum of 12.2m (40.0ft) from the *lot line* to ensure a minimum separation distance of 24.4m (80.0ft) between buildings above 10.7m (35.1ft) height.

6.16.7 Ancillary Buildings and Structures:

Except as otherwise provided in Section 4.13 and in addition to the provisions of subsection 6.16.6 above, the following also applies:

- 1) *ancillary buildings* shall not be permitted.
- 2) *structures* shall not be sited less than 3.0m from a *principal building* on the same *lot*.

- 3) * notwithstanding sub-sections 6.16.6 and 6.16.7 (2), patios and awnings are permitted in the front and exterior side yard areas in accordance with White Rock License Agreement (Sidewalk Café / Business License) Bylaw requirements.
- 6.16.8 Accessory off-street parking shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of Section 4.14.
- 6.16.9 Accessory off-street loading spaces shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of sub-sections 4.15.2 and 4.15.3.






TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	Purpose	2
1.2	Town Centre Study Area	2
2	PLANNING PROCESS	4
3	URBAN DESIGN PRINCIPLES	5
4	URBAN DESIGN PLAN	6
4.1	Potential Development Sites	6
4.2	Open Space Network	6
4.3	Land Use	7
4.4	Annotated Illustrative Plan	8
4.5	Public Transit	11
4.6	Public Art	11
4.7	Street Sections	12
4.8	Urban Design Plan Model	15
4.8.1	Height Diagram	15
4.8.2	Development Statistics	16
4.8.3	3D Model Views	17
Appendix 1	Community Consultation Report	19
Appendix 2	Charrette Drawings	21

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The City of White Rock has prepared this Urban Design Plan for the Town Centre with assistance from a planning and design consultant team led by Urban Forum Associates.

The overall purpose of this plan was to develop a long-term vision for the Town Centre that will result in mixed commercial/residential growth and a healthy business environment. The primary objective was to design an achievable Town Centre Plan that is dynamic, vital and people-friendly.

The vision for the Town Centre reflects:

- The aesthetic standards and aspirations of the community for both private lands and the public realm;
- The requirements of the local business/development community; and
- Current sustainability/resiliency principles and best practices for Town Centres.

This Urban Design Plan includes an illustrated Vision of the potential physical form of the Town Centre, and Design Guidelines for both Built Form (buildings) and the Public Realm (public spaces).

It is important to note that this Urban Design Plan is not an Official Development Plan. Rather, it provides a roadmap to what White Rock Town Centre could become in 25 years when and if the various ideas embedded in the Plan are implemented.

Some elements of this Plan may be implemented as public investments by the City. Other elements will require partnerships with private landowners/developers.

The Plan will be implemented on an incremental basis over many years, as and when various properties are assembled and/or redeveloped. Market conditions will determine when specific properties are redeveloped. Implementation will not happen all at once, and it will require the agreement of and partnerships with key landowners. Nothing in this Plan supersedes established private land ownership rights.

The public easements/rights-of-way and various other public amenities identified and proposed in this Plan will be typically realized through the rezoning and development approvals process, in the form of agreed amenity contributions by private landowners/developers as a condition of the City's approval of additional development rights.

1.2 Town Centre Study Area

The Town Centre is identified in the White Rock Official Community Plan 2008 (OCP) as being bounded by:

North: North Bluff Road
East: George Street
South: Thrift Avenue
West: Martin Street

The White Rock OCP designates this area as 'Town Centre Mixed Use'. It includes high density, mixed use (primarily residential and commercial) development specific to the Town Centre.

The Town Centre has struggled to maintain its commercial presence in recent years, having lost several key businesses to South Surrey. However, recent new development has occurred:

- The Miramar is a major mixed residential/commercial project consisting of four towers, commercial space and a community centre. The first phase of this project has been completed, and Phase 2 has been approved and is expected to begin construction in the near future.
- In addition, two other major development projects have been approved, and are either under construction (the Avra project) or awaiting final permits (the Essence project).

The northern boundary of the study area along North Bluff Road also represents the municipal boundary between White Rock and Surrey.

The Town Centre is an area in need of visioning to direct other future developments and to stimulate further enthusiasm and vitality for redevelopment.

The map to the right identifies the Town Centre Urban Design Plan study area.



Town Centre Study Area

2 Planning Process

This Urban Design Plan was developed as a key component of a long term vision for the White Rock Town Centre. A separate study was undertaken (by others) to assess the market needs and sustainability of commercial businesses in White Rock.

The key components of this Town Centre planning process included:

- a) A review of past documents related to the White Rock Town Centre, as provided by the City
- b) Integration of initial results from the White Rock Business Needs Assessment study¹
- c) A community consultation process including:
 - A three-day Design Charrette to develop the vision
 - Meetings with relevant stakeholders including the White Rock BIA, the White Rock ADP, and the South Surrey/White Rock Chamber of Commerce
 - Public information meetings to present the vision
 - Community Consultation report for Council
- d) Development of Design Guidelines for Building Form and the Public Realm
- e) Provision of long term recommendations for future redevelopment and revitalization of the Town Centre.

This Urban Design Plan has been largely driven and informed by the involvement of a wide cross-section of stakeholders and the general community.

The City's design consultants facilitated an Urban Design Plan Charrette (design workshop), working with multiple stakeholders to develop the draft Urban Design Plan. The Town Centre Urban Design Plan Charrette took place from 19-21 April 2011. A wide range of stakeholders participated in the process over a period of three days. Stakeholders worked with the City's design consultants to generate and prioritize ideas and design solutions, and the consultants integrated these into an overall draft Urban Design Plan. This draft plan was presented at a Public Open House on the evening of 21 April, and feedback was solicited.

Following refinements to the draft Urban Design Plan, further community input was provided at a Community Consultative Forum held on June 29, 2011. More than 60 people attended. Approximately 13 feedback forms were received and reviewed following this event. This feedback further refined the Plan.

This Urban Design Plan thus substantially reflects the majority views expressed by community and stakeholder participants during and after the charrette process, and many of the ideas generated by these stakeholders have found their way into the plan.

The ideas and drawings developed during the Urban Design Plan Charrette are included as an Appendix to this report.

The community consultation process and feedback is also documented as a separate Appendix to this report.

¹ The White Rock Business Needs Assessment study was not yet complete at the time of preparing this report



Urban Design Plan Charrette, April 2011

3 Urban Design Principles

The following key urban design principles were developed during the planning process for this Town Centre Urban Design Plan:

- Embody a move 'from grey to green' (from car-oriented asphalt to people-oriented green systems and spaces)
- Improve and enhance pedestrian connectivity throughout the Town Centre
- Increase residential densities to support local businesses and public transit, and in support of Metro Vancouver's regional growth strategy which identifies downtown White Rock/South Surrey as a Municipal Town Centre
- Encourage a mix of land uses
- Encourage a diversity of housing types and tenures to attract a mix of residents of different ages, income levels and lifestyles
- Establish the Town Centre as the cultural and civic heart of White Rock by creating a central public space at the heart of the Town Centre and clustering civic, social and cultural uses around this space
- Plan and design for a more sustainable urbanism
- Create streets for all modes of travel prioritizing pedestrians, transit and cyclists
- Maintain the character of the community



Examples of Urban Design Principles


4 Urban Design Plan

This section is a summary of the key elements that form the Urban Design Plan, as illustrated by the accompanying drawings.

4.1 Potential Development Sites

A substantial portion of the study area has already been redeveloped in recent years or is slated for redevelopment (including approved projects such as Miramar Phase 2, Essence, Avra, etc.). Once these recently developed properties are excluded, likely future development sites account for approximately 50% of the total study area. As noted on this diagram, most of the likely future redevelopment in the Town Centre will occur north of Russell Avenue, and between Foster and Martin Streets. Larger development sites will require property consolidations in many cases. Property consolidations will happen as market forces and private interests dictate.

The diagram to the right identifies likely future redevelopment sites in the Town Centre.



4.2 Open Space Network

The Town Centre Urban Design Plan is founded on the key principle of enhanced pedestrian connectivity through the creation of a network of open spaces throughout the Town Centre.

The diagram to the right illustrates the proposed Open Space Network in the Town Centre. The green colour indicates parkspace, greenways, green pathways, etc., and the brown colour indicates more urban hard-surfaced open spaces, plazas, squares, sidewalks, etc.

The Open Space Network builds on the existing street and laneway grid and adds additional pedestrian routes and public spaces. It also proposes landscape enhancements along existing street sidewalks. A finer-grained network of pedestrian pathways, green streets and sidewalks is proposed to break up larger existing blocks.

A 'green spine' is proposed along the length of Russell Avenue, extending westward towards Centennial Park and eastward across George Street.

A new Town Square is proposed at the northeast corner of the Johnston Road–Russell Avenue intersection.


A new Neighbourhood Park and Playground is proposed at the centre of the superblock bounded by North Bluff Road, Johnston Road, Russell Avenue and Foster Street as the focus of a higher density residential precinct.




4.3 Land Use

The Urban Design Plan proposes the following general land use designations:

- Require future *street-fronting retail/commercial uses* along both sides of Johnston Road and along a short portion of Russell Avenue and North Bluff Road (on the first blocks either side of Johnston Road), except for the proposed Civic Centre.
- Do not require or encourage future street-fronting retail/commercial uses beyond Johnston Road and along the first portion of Russell Avenue and North Bluff Road on either side of Johnston Road.
- Do not permit future street-fronting retail/commercial uses on the following streets:
 - Martin Street
 - Foster Street
 - George Street
 - North Bluff Road (Westerly portion)
 - Russell Avenue (Westerly portion)
 - Thrift Avenue (Westerly portion)
- Focus future *civic and cultural uses* close to the 'Heart of the Community' intersection of Johnston Road and Russell Avenue, in the block bounded by Johnston Road, Russell Avenue, George Street and Thrift Avenue.
- Concentrate the highest *residential densification* on the precincts bounded by Foster Street, North Bluff Road, Johnston Road and Russell Avenue, focused on a central neighbourhood park and playground; and on the block bounded by Johnston Road, North Bluff Road, George Street and Russell Avenue.
- Focus *additional residential uses* on the blocks bounded by Martin Street, North Bluff Road, Foster Street, and Thrift Avenue, with densities and heights reduced towards the southern and western edges of this precinct.
- A network of Parks and Public Open Spaces throughout the Town Centre, including:
 - a northern extension of Bryant park across Russell Avenue
 - a new neighbourhood park and playground at the centre of the residential precinct between Russell Avenue and North Bluff Road
 - a greenway buffer along North Bluff Road
 - a green space extending Russell Avenue westwards to Martin Street
 - a number of public open spaces that act as plazas or gateway sites



Land Use Plan



The following simplified land use diagram represents these general land use considerations.


4.4 Annotated Illustrative Plan

The key planning and design ideas that emerged through the planning process are denoted in this Illustrative Plan, which consolidates all the ideas into one image of what the Town Centre may look like in 25 years.

Note: This *Illustrative Plan* is not intended to convey what will happen on specific sites, or where specific buildings will be developed, or specific heights. Rather, it is intended to provide a “snapshot” composite illustration of what White Rock’s Town Centre may generally look like if and when all the Urban Design Plan components are implemented over time. Future buildings are not necessarily required to be located exactly where illustrated.

Legend

- 1 Town Square
- 2 Gateway Feature
- 3 Johnston Road ‘Main Street’
- 4 Pedestrian Connections
- 5 Heart of the Community
- 6 Neighbourhood Park and Playground
- 7 ‘Green’ Streets (New)
- 8 Bryant Park Extension
- 9 Civic Plaza
- 10 Civic Centre
- 11 Civic Theatre / Arts Centre
- 12 Lookout Platform
- 13 Green Buffer
- 14 Bus Loop



Key Ideas

The following key ideas are embedded in the *Illustrative Plan*

- Restrict future street-fronting retail/commercial uses to Johnston Road and along a short portion of Russell Avenue and North Bluff Road (on the first blocks either side of Johnston Road)
- Require continuous weather protection on retail streets
- Create a broad Greenway setback along the south side of North Bluff Road between Foster and George streets: plant a double row of street trees and incorporate a pedestrian/bicycle pathway
- Create a “Gateway” arrival space at the intersection of Johnston Road and North Bluff Road, by setting back new development on the either side of Johnston on the south side; design this space as a plaza with public art and or a Town Centre welcome feature/sign
- Consolidate surface parking areas into new developments and restrict future surface parking
- Focus niche retail that does not compete directly with malls and that complements the adjacent big box/mall retail, on Johnston Road
- Permit a range of building heights across the study area, with lower heights at the western and southern edges to respond to the surrounding neighbourhood context, and taller buildings located on either side of Johnston Road
- Maintain a low scale building streetwall fronting onto Johnston Road (maximum 1 floor at the property line, with additional floors set back from the property line)
- Create a “Heart of the Community” space at the Johnston Road – Russell Avenue crossroads, by setting back future buildings on all four corners of this key intersection and enhancing the public realm
- Create a Town Square on the northeast corner of the Johnston Road-Russell Avenue intersection, which should include public art, formal landscaping, and programmed uses.
- Develop a new Civic Centre in the heart of the community by relocating City Hall and adding other potential civic facilities e.g. Civic Theatre, Arts Centre, etc.
- Develop new commuter and recreational bicycle routes and facilities as per the OCP Bicycle Network Plan
- Enhance future pedestrian connections to Miramar Plaza from Johnston Road and Thrift Avenue
- Reduce large block sizes by introducing a finer-grained street grid, lane network and mid-block pedestrian routes, etc. (to be negotiated with land owners as and when sites are redeveloped)
- Concentrate residential intensification in the northern and western parts of the study area, along North Bluff Road, Foster and Martin streets, with densities and heights reducing towards the western and southern edges of the study area
- Orient and space taller buildings to minimize view blockage, shadowing and privacy overlook; optimize spatial separation between adjacent towers, with a minimum 30 m (100 ft.) between towers; encourage slimmer towers with smaller floorplates
- Encourage a range of housing types and forms, including street-oriented townhouses, ground-oriented low-mid-rise apartments and condominium towers
- Undertake public realm streetscape improvements with new sidewalks, street trees, landscaping, street furniture, and improved pedestrian crossings on Johnston Road, North Bluff Road, Russell Avenue
- Undertake a comprehensive streetscape redesign of Johnston Road as the Town Centre “High Street”: build on and extend the new streetscape standards established by the Miramar project
- Create more park space and green connections throughout the Town Centre
- Extend Bryant Park northwards across Russell Avenue
- Create a high-density residential precinct in the superbblock bound by Russell, Foster, North Bluff and Johnston, focused on a new neighbourhood park and playground at the centre of the block and surrounded by pedestrian friendly narrow streets
- Create a terminated visual axis at the west end of Russell Avenue (statue, public artwork, etc.)
- Extend the alignment of Russell Avenue westwards across Martin Street as a pedestrian Greenway that connects to Centennial Park
- Construct a public “Lookout” platform/roundabout at the intersection of Johnston Road and Thrift Avenue; this will form a “Gateway” feature at the southern entrance to the Town Centre
- Create a more walkable Town Centre by pedestrianizing some streets/lanes, introducing new pedestrian routes, and consolidating parking



Additional Key Policy/Strategic Ideas

This Urban Design Plan encourages the City of White Rock to implement, support and advocate for the following key policy and/or strategic planning directions:

- Encourage mixed-use projects and higher residential densities in Town Centre
- Encourage and incentivize a range of housing choices and tenureships including affordable housing, family housing, and special needs housing
- Develop design guidelines that raise the design bar for both streetscapes and buildings
- Enhance connections between Town Centre and the waterfront
- Introduce a public art program funded by all future private redevelopment in the Town Centre
- Identify City incentives for attracting new businesses/retail uses through property tax holidays, DCC relief, reduced on-site parking requirements, streamlined approval processes, etc.
- Work with Translink to improve transit service between Town Centre and waterfront, including evenings
- Work with Translink to enhance passenger amenities at all Town Centre bus stops to improve access, safety and amenity, by providing:
 - Bus Shelters
 - Benches
 - Litter Receptacles
 - Newspaper Vending Machines
 - Signage/Maps
 - Real Time Transit Information
- Work with Translink to develop an enhanced bus transit exchange along North Bluff Road (exact location and layout subject to detailed technical design)



4.5 Public Transit

Effective, frequent and affordable public transit is a key ingredient in achieving a complete, sustainable Town Centre. Current transit service is limited and also has some gaps in areas served, according to feedback received during the planning process. Concerns were also expressed about the bus layover impacts along North Bluff Road.

While this Urban Design Plan did not include a mandate to undertake transit planning, the following potential high-level transit modifications are proposed for the City's consideration, subject to further detailed planning and evaluation:

- Consider developing a separate busway and bus exchange along the south side of North Bluff Road between Foster Street and Johnston Road.
- Consider re-routing buses off Johnston Road onto parallel north-south streets including George Street, with a possible one-way loop around the Town Centre (e.g. southbound on George Street, northbound on Foster Street).
- In consultation with Translink, consider bus route and schedule modifications to improve transit connections between the Town Centre and the waterfront.

These proposals are subject to detailed planning, technical design and operational evaluation in cooperation with Translink.


The diagram opposite illustrates these proposed modifications to the existing transit network plan.

4.6 Public Art

Public art can be a key element in enhancing the Public Realm and reinforcing a sense of place for the Town Centre.

As noted above, this Urban Design Plan proposes that the City develop and approve a City-wide Public Art Program, which would be funded primarily by future private developments in the Town Centre. Future public art projects should be commissioned through a new public art program which is inclusive, transparent, and based on Council policy.

The diagram opposite identifies potential locations for major public artworks in the Town Centre.



4.7 Street Sections


The following sections illustrate what key streets in the Town Centre might look like after redevelopment has taken place.

Johnston Road


This section illustrates Johnston Road 'Main Street' with the proposed built form of one storey street-fronting retail with up to four upper floors maximum set back along both sides of Johnston Road. This will maintain the lower-scale pedestrian-oriented character of Johnston Road.

Key features of the proposed street design include:

- +/- 4.0 m wide sidewalks, with corner bulges at intersections
- angled parking on both sides of the street
- boulevard trees on both sides of the street
- boulevard trees in corner bulges
- a landscaped central median
- light fixtures that include pedestrian lighting as well as roadway lighting



Johnston Road Cross Section




Johnston Road Plan

Johnston Road “Lookout”

This conceptual diagram illustrates the proposed public ‘Lookout’ platform at the intersection of Johnston Road and Thrift Avenue. The Lookout would be developed in the centre of the intersection as a traffic roundabout. The platform would take advantage of the sloping grades to provide panoramic views south towards the water.


The Lookout roundabout would also function as a traffic-calming device and act as a southern Gateway to the Town Centre. The platform retaining wall on the south side could include a Town Centre welcome sign.

The Lookout would be accessed by pedestrian crosswalks from both sides of Johnston Road.



Johnston Road Lookout Conceptual Diagram

View South from Johnston Road & Thrift Street



Johnston Road Lookout Plan



Residential Street

This section illustrates what a typical pedestrian-friendly residential street would look like in the proposed Residential Precinct.


This section illustrates a proposed built form of four-storey street-fronting residential set back from the property line by approximately 4.0 m, with raised front patios, along both sides of the street. Additional upper floors are set back even further. This will maintain the lower-scale pedestrian-oriented character of these residential streets.

Key features of the proposed street design include:

- Typical curb-to-curb street width of 11.0 m (36 ft.)
- Sidewalks are 3.5 m (12 ft.) wide, within a proposed 18.0 m (60 ft.) right-of-way
- Regularly spaced street trees on both sides of the street
- Pedestrian lamp posts located on both sides of the street
- A landscape boulevard along both sides of the street (approx. 1.5 m wide)
- Parallel parking on both sides of the street



Residential Street Cross Section



Residential Street Plan

4.8 Urban Design Plan Model


4.8.1 Building Heights

The annotated plan to the right identifies the proposed maximum building heights for potential development sites in the Town Centre, as illustrated in the 3D computer model.

Note: Not all buildings illustrated on this plan would necessarily be approved at the maximum heights or in the exact locations shown here. Specific rezoning and development applications should be reviewed by the City on a case-by-case basis. City approval of ultimate building heights should take into account such factors as:

- contextual fit with the surrounding urban fabric
- shadowing impacts on the public realm
- view impacts, both to and from the waterfront
- overlook and privacy impacts on neighbouring buildings
- impacts on the overall Town Centre skyline
- distance between adjacent tall buildings
- impacts on any nearby heritage structures
- building form and massing to mitigate negative impacts of tall buildings

In general, proposed building heights reflect a range of heights, with taller buildings located towards the northern and eastern parts of the study area, and heights decreasing towards the south and west. This will help optimize views towards the water, reduce shadowing impacts, and respects the surrounding residential neighbourhood context.




Building Heights

4.8.2 Development Statistics

The following table provides the theoretical (maximum) development statistics that are represented in the 3D computer model.

These development statistics are included here as a general guideline to the overall amount and type of development that is envisaged in this Plan, and are subject to review and refinement on a project-by-project basis. Project-specific variations may be considered by the City provided the overall intention of the Plan is being met.



BLOCK NUMBER	FLOOR AREA (GROSS / SQ. FT.)	SITE AREA (SQ. FT.)	FLOOR SPACE RATIO	SITE COVERAGE
1	296,169 sf	106,381 sf	2.8	37%
2	96,971 sf	49,730 sf	2.0	39%
3	136,189 sf	48,872 sf	2.8	40%
4	798,547 sf	247,660 sf	3.2	38%
5	241,192 sf	48,640 sf	5.0	72%
6	233,400 sf	77,902 sf	3.0	67%
7	272,185 sf	45,982 sf	5.4	36%
8	143,863 sf	84,203 sf	1.7	74%

4.8.3 3D Model Views

The following snapshot views are of a 3D computer model of the Urban Design Plan that was developed during the planning process to test and evaluate the proposed form of development.

This model illustrates in three dimensions the general form of development proposed in the Urban Design Plan.

Note: Building forms shown in this 3D model are generic and are not meant to indicate detailed design of final built form or ultimate building heights, or exact locations. Project-specific variations may be considered by the City provided the overall intention of the Plan is being met.



View to Northeast



View to Northwest



Illustrative Plan

Appendices

Appendix 1 Community Consultation Report

This report summarizes the community consultation process undertaken in developing the White Rock Town Centre Urban Design Plan.

As the City noted in its Request for Proposals, the Town Centre Urban Design Plan was based on input from the community, the Business Improvement Association and the Surrey White Rock Chamber of Commerce.

The community consultation process included a number of elements during the course of the planning process, with several opportunities for stakeholders and community members to provide input and feedback:

- A three-day Charrette (Design Workshop) to develop the Urban Design Plan vision
- Meetings with relevant stakeholders including the White Rock BIA, the White Rock ADP, and the South Surrey/White Rock Chamber of Commerce
- A Community Consultative Forum to present the draft Urban Design Plan
- A Feedback Questionnaire
- A Public Information Meeting to present the Urban Design Plan vision

This Urban Design Plan has been driven and informed by the involvement of a wide cross-section of stakeholders and the general community.

Charrette

The City’s design consultants facilitated a three-day Urban Design Plan Charrette (Design Workshop), which included the participation of multiple stakeholders to develop the draft Urban Design Plan.

A detailed *Design Brief* was prepared and distributed to all attendees prior to the Charrette. This Design Brief outlined the purpose and background of the Town Centre Urban Design Plan, explained the Charrette process, schedule and anticipated outcomes, etc., and identified a set of key Issues and Opportunities.

The Charrette took place from 19–21 April 2011 at the new White Rock Community Centre in the Town Centre. A wide range of stakeholders participated in the process over a period of three days. Stakeholders represented the following organizations or interest groups:

- Residents
- Business Owners
- Developers
- Chamber of Commerce
- Health and Social Committee
- Transportation Committee
- Cultural Committee

- Environment Committee
- Economic, Investment and Revitalization Committee
- Advisory Design Panel
- Kent Street Seniors Centre

Stakeholders worked with the City’s design consultants to generate and prioritize ideas and design solutions, and the consultants integrated these into an overall draft Urban Design Plan. This draft plan was presented at a Public Open House on the evening of 21 April, and feedback was solicited.

Community Consultative Forum

Following refinements to the draft Urban Design Plan that emerged from the Charrette, a Community Consultative Forum held on June 29, 2011. Approximately 60 people attended this public event, including several charrette participants. Community input was invited via a question and answer session plus distribution of a detailed *Feedback Questionnaire*. The questionnaire listed all the key ideas that emerged through the charrette process and asked respondents to indicate their level of support for each idea.

Thirteen completed feedback questionnaires were received and reviewed following this event. This feedback resulted in further refinements to the Plan.

Feedback Questionnaire

A summary of the feedback results follows:

Question 1. Require future street-fronting retail uses on Johnston Road and along a short portion of Russell Avenue and North Bluff Road (on the first blocks either side of Johnston Road)?

Strongly agree or agree	100% (13)
Disagree or strongly disagree	0% (0)

Question 2. Create a broad Greenway setback along the south side of North Bluff Road between Foster and George streets, with a double row of street trees and pedestrian/bike path?

Strongly agree or agree	85% (11)
Disagree or strongly disagree	15% (2)

Question 3. Create a “Gateway” arrival space at the intersection of Johnston Road and North Bluff Road, by setting back new development on the either side of Johnston on the south side, and design this space as a plaza with public art and/or a Town Centre welcome feature/sign?

Strongly agree or agree	92% (12)
Disagree or strongly disagree	8% (1)

Question 4. Undertake public realm streetscape improvements with new sidewalks, street trees, street furniture and improved pedestrian crossings on Johnston Road, North Bluff Road, Russell Avenue?

Strongly agree or agree	100% (13)
Disagree or strongly disagree	0% (0)

Question 5. Consolidate surface parking areas into new developments and restrict future surface parking?

Strongly agree or agree	85% (11)
Disagree or strongly disagree	15% (2)

Question 6. Focus niche retail that does not compete directly with malls and that complements the adjacent big box/mall retail, on Johnston Road?

Strongly agree or agree	92% (12)
Disagree or strongly disagree	8% (1)

Question 7. Permit a range of building heights across the study area, with lower heights at the western and southern edges to respond to the surrounding neighbourhood context, and taller buildings located on either side of Johnston Road?

Strongly agree or agree	91% (11)*
Disagree or strongly disagree	9% (1)

Question 8. Maintain a low scale building streetwall fronting directly onto Johnston Road (one floor retail plus 4 floors max residential)?

Strongly agree or agree	91% (11)*
Disagree or strongly disagree	9% (1)

Question 9. Create a “Heart of the Community” space at the Johnston Road & Russell Avenue crossroads?

Strongly agree or agree	92% (12)
Disagree or strongly disagree	8% (1)

Question 10. Create a focal Civic Square on the northeast corner of the Johnston Road-Russell Avenue intersection?

Strongly agree or agree	77% (10)
Disagree or strongly disagree	23% (3)

Question 11. Develop a new Civic Centre in the heart of the community, by relocating City Hall and adding other potential civic facilities e.g. Civic Theatre, Arts Centre, etc.?

Strongly agree or agree	69% (9)
Disagree or strongly disagree	31% (4)

Question 12. Develop new commuter and recreational bicycle routes and facilities as per the OCP Bicycle Network Plan?

Strongly agree or agree 100% (12)*
Disagree or strongly disagree 0% (0)

Question 13. Enhance future pedestrian connections to Miramar Plaza from Johnston Road & Thrift Avenue?

Strongly agree or agree 100% (13)
Disagree or strongly disagree 0% (0)

Question 14. Reduce large block sizes by introducing a finer-grained street grid, lane network and mid-block pedestrian routes, etc. (to be negotiated with land owners as and when sites are redeveloped)?

Strongly agree or agree 100% (13)
Disagree or strongly disagree 0% (0)

Question 15. Concentrate residential intensification primarily in the northern and western parts of the study area, along North Bluff Road, Foster and Martin streets?

Strongly agree or agree 85% (11)
Disagree or strongly disagree 15% (2)

Question 16. Orient and space taller buildings to minimize view blockage, shadowing and privacy overlook; encourage slimmer towers with smaller floorplates?

Strongly agree or agree 100% (13)
Disagree or strongly disagree 0% (0)

Question 17. Encourage a range of housing choices, including townhouses, ground-oriented low- and mid-rise apartments, and condominium towers?

Strongly agree or agree 100% (12)*
Disagree or strongly disagree 0% (0)

Question 18. Create more green space and pedestrian connections throughout the Town Centre?

Strongly agree or agree 100% (13)
Disagree or strongly disagree 0% (0)

Question 19. Extend Bryant Park northwards across Russell Avenue?

Strongly agree or agree 92% (12)
Disagree or strongly disagree 8% (1)

Question 20. Create a higher-density residential precinct in the superblock bound by Russell, Foster, North Bluff and Johnston, focused on a new neighbourhood park and playground at the centre of the block and surrounded by pedestrian-friendly streets?

Strongly agree or agree 91% (11)*
Disagree or strongly disagree 9% (1)

Question 21. Create a terminated visual axis at the west end of Russell Avenue (statue, public art, etc.)?

Strongly agree or agree 91% (11)*
Disagree or strongly disagree 9% (1)

Question 22. Extend the alignment of Russell Avenue westwards across Martin Street as a pedestrian Greenway that connects to Centennial Park?

Strongly agree or agree 92% (12)
Disagree or strongly disagree 8% (1)

Question 23. Construct a public “Lookout” platform at the intersection of Johnston Road and Thrift Avenue?

Strongly agree or agree 77% (10)
Disagree or strongly disagree 23% (3)

Question 24. Create a more walkable Town Centre by pedestrianizing some streets, introducing new pedestrian routes, and consolidating surface parking?

Strongly agree or agree 100% (13)
Disagree or strongly disagree 0% (0)

Question 25. Encourage mixed-use projects and higher residential densities in Town Centre?

Strongly agree or agree 77% (10)
Disagree or strongly disagree 23% (3)

Note: * means one respondent did not answer the question

As can be seen from the results above, a very strong majority of respondents support the key ideas in the Urban Design Plan. However caution should be applied, noting that the sample size is rather modest.

Public Information Meeting


To follow

Appendix 2 Charrette Drawings


Below are a few representational drawings from the charrette.



Massing Study from Charrette



Preliminary Open Space Network Diagram



Preliminary Development Parcels Diagram



Early Block Configurations



Aerial View down Johnston Road

THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK
15322 BUENA VISTA AVENUE, WHITE ROCK, B.C. V4B 1Y6



R-3

POLICY TITLE: DENSITY BONUS / AMENITY CONTRIBUTION

POLICY NUMBER: COUNCIL - 511

Date of Council Adoption: April 15, 2013	Date of Last Amendment: October 19, 2020
Council Resolution Number: 2017-309; 2020-511	
Originating Department: Planning and Development Services	Date last reviewed by the Land Use and Planning Committee: October 19, 2020

Policy:

Purpose

The purpose of density bonus/amenity contribution requirements is to permit an increase in allowable densities in exchange for providing community amenities, consistent with section 482 of the *Local Government Act* which allows Council to establish, within a zoning bylaw, conditions relating to the conservation or provision of amenities, affordable housing and special needs housing. It allows the City to participate in a share of the increase in property values resulting from increases to the allowable densities and provide for amenities that help with the impact of increased development. Variables such as location, land value, lot size, building costs and market conditions affect the feasibility of value increases to the land when greater density is permitted. If these variables provide worthwhile economic gains to a property owner proposing redevelopment of their site, over and above the costs of providing the amenity contribution, then density bonus is a realistic way of acquiring benefit for the community.

Amenities

Section 8.12.1 of the 2017 Official Community Plan (OCP) identifies the need to utilize land use in a manner that provides social, economic and ecological benefits across the City. The City's Community Amenity Reserve Fund Bylaw, 2017, No. 2190, as amended, identifies a list of eligible amenity contributions, which includes, but is not limited to:

- A building or space within a building for civic uses, including meeting or convention space
- The provision and improvement of new publicly accessible open space, including a public square and/or pedestrian routes, either through dedication, easement, statutory right-of-way or covenant
- The improvement of existing publicly accessible open space and/or pedestrian routes
- Underground publicly accessible parking

- Publicly accessible parking
- Outdoor public art
- A transit station, “bus loop” and/or transit shelters
- Special needs or non-market affordable housing
- Transportation and transit services, including people movement infrastructure (e.g. outdoor escalators, funiculars, or gondola) to link Uptown to the Waterfront
- Other land
- A park or other public place
- Park improvements, including playgrounds
- Landscaping of City land
- A library, a museum or archive
- An arts and cultural centre
- A child care facility
- A community centre
- A recreation facility
- Heritage conservation
- City meeting and administration facilities
- A greenhouse gas reduction measure
- A community energy facility
- Similar things that benefit the City and the well being of its community

Process

In the Town Centre, Town Centre Transition, Waterfront Village and Lower Town Centre land use designations of the Official Community Plan, where the City has established the zoning that includes the maximum allowable densities both with and without the amenity contribution requirements, or where a new Amenity Zoning Bylaw or Phased Development Agreement is proposed, proponents for redevelopment will be required to deliver an amenity agreement and related section 219 covenant prior to the issuance of building permits. Densities are expressed in terms of “Floor Area Ratio” (FAR) which is determined by dividing the gross floor area by the total site area.

For all other areas outside the land use designations named above where higher densities are permitted in the OCP, redevelopment projects greater than 3 storeys in height , will require rezoning to an Amenity Zoning Bylaw, and will be required to enter into agreement to establish the requirements for density bonus / amenity contribution prior to final approval of rezoning. Further, market research will be required to determine the appropriate amount of density bonus / amenity contribution required, on a project by project basis.

Unless otherwise decided by Council, all amenity contributions will be in the form of payment-in-lieu. A reserve account will be created for deposit of these funds. Funds within

this account will only be expended for those types of amenities identified in the Community Amenity Reserve Fund Bylaw for the benefit of the overall community. Where Council has agreed to accept the amenity contribution to be developed on-site in conjunction with the redevelopment proposal, the specific amenities to be provided will be determined through discussion and negotiation between the City and the proponent. When it is agreed that the amenities are to be provided on-site, public access to the amenity will be secured through written agreement or covenant registered prior to issuance of a building permit.

Determination of Amenity to be Provided

Amenity contributions are required for every development:

- a) In the Town Centre, Waterfront Village and Lower Town Centre land use designations for developments exceeding three (3) storeys in height and/or 1.75 FAR;
- b) In the Town Centre Transition land use designation for developments exceeding four (4) storeys in height and/or 1.5 FAR; and
- c) For every rezoning outside of the land use designations named above for proposed developments exceeding three (3) storeys in height.

Exemption of Above Ground Parkade Floorspace

Above ground parking floorspace areas, when contained within an above ground enclosed building, and not utilized for pay parking purposes or other revenue generating purpose, are exempt from providing amenity contributions.

Amenity Contribution Approach

1. Within the Town Centre land use designation, amenity contributions will be determined by using the following target rate as a guide in identifying the equal share of the increase in property value resulting from an increase in allowable density:
 - \$0 for the 1st 1.75 FAR;
 - \$430 per m² for FAR of 1.75 to 5.4.
2. Within the Lower Town Centre land use designation, amenity contributions will be determined by using the following target rate as a guide in identifying the equal share of the increase in property value resulting from an increase in allowable density:
 - \$0 for the 1st 1.75 FAR;
 - \$323 per m² for FAR of 1.75 to 3.5.
3. Within the Town Centre Transition land use designation, amenity contributions will be determined by using the following target rate as a guide in identifying the equal share of the increase in property value resulting from an increase in allowable density:
 - a) For properties containing three or more units of purpose-built rental housing:
 - \$0 for the 1st 1.5 FAR;
 - \$430 per m² for FAR of 1.5 to 3.5.
 - b) For properties without purpose-built rental housing:
 - \$0 for the 1st 1.5 FAR;
 - \$215 per m² for FAR of 1.5 to 3.5.

4. Within the Waterfront Village land use designation, amenity contributions will be determined by using the following target rate as a guide in identifying the equal share of the increase in property value resulting from an increase in allowable density:
 - \$0 for the 1st 1.75 FAR;
 - \$646 per m² for FAR of 1.75 to 2.0.
5. For every rezoning outside of the land use designations named above, the amenity contribution required will be determined for the entire project, on a project by project basis, based on the advice and recommendations of a qualified market research consultant specific to that project. Proponents will be required to submit the market research report at the time of application submission, and the City reserves the right to commission a 2nd report from an alternate consultant to determine the amenity contribution for that project.

In establishing the value of a proposed amenity, hard costs, soft costs and land costs will be considered. Eligible costs for on-site amenities, when approved by Council, therefore include:

- i) Hard Costs – all material and labour costs for the construction of the amenity;
- ii) Soft Costs – all fees and costs for the construction of the amenity; and
- iii) Land Costs – eligible only where the ownership of the land containing the amenity is transferred or dedicated to the City.

To determine the value of the on-site amenity, a 3rd party appraisal will be required.

Affordable Housing

Secured non market and market rental housing, as well as other forms of affordable housing, are considered community amenities as they provide for a more diverse range of housing types, tenures and rent or price levels that are available to White Rock residents. On this basis, and on upon the recommendations of the City's 2016 Rental Housing Task Force, the City will consider waiving or reducing community amenity contributions for these types of development applications, on a project-by-project basis, through using the following approaches as a guide in determining appropriate amenity contribution reductions.

Consideration of Amenity Contribution Reductions

1. Affordable Rental Floorspace:
 - Affordable rental housing developments are those in which at least 30% of the units are owned or managed by non-profit groups and designed to be affordable for low and moderate income households.
 - Consider waiver of up to 100 percent of applicable community amenity contribution for affordable rental floorspace, subject to this floorspace being secured by relevant legal agreements, and a review of the relevant development application and its merits in providing an affordable rental housing amenity that benefits the community. Projects will also be evaluated in way that considers how the proposed non or below market rental unit rates relate to what is currently available on the

housing market, as determined by local and sub-regional housing market and household income indicators.

2. Displaced Tenant Housing:

- Displaced Tenant Housing consists of residential units within a new development which are intended to provide housing at below market costs for existing tenants who are displaced through the redevelopment of purpose-built rental housing.
- Consider waiving up to a maximum of 50 percent of applicable amenity contribution for displaced tenant housing where the owner has:
 - i. provided compensation to displaced tenants in accordance with Council Policy 514: Tenant Relocation Policy;
 - ii. has committed, through a Housing Agreement Bylaw, to offering displaced tenants with the first right of refusal to return in accordance with Council Policy 514: Tenant Relocation Policy; and
 - iii. has committed, through a Housing Agreement Bylaw, that where a displaced tenants does not return to the building, that the initial maximum rent for that unit in the new development be no less than 10% below starting market rent for a similar unit for a period of one (1) year, after which rents may increase in accordance with the *Residential Tenancy Act*.

3. Secured Market Rental Floorspace:

- Secured market rental housing developments are those designated for rental purposes only and protected with a covenant, lease agreement, or housing agreement registered against title for the life of the building.
- Consider waiving up to a maximum of 50 percent of applicable amenity contribution for secured market rental floorspace, subject to this floorspace being secured by relevant legal agreements, and a review of the relevant development application and its merits in providing a secured market rental housing amenity that benefits the community.
- In combination with the waiver of amenity contributions for Displaced Tenant Housing, up to 100 percent of the applicable community amenity contribution may be waived where a redevelopment of a purpose-built rental building consists entirely of secured market rental housing and displaced tenants are provided with compensation and first right of refusal in accordance with Council Policy 514: Tenant Relocation Policy.

4. Amenity contribution reductions may also be considered for other types of affordable housing applications, on the condition that the proposals demonstrate the ability to provide rental, home ownership and/or other tenure models and dwelling units that are rented or purchased at rates below what is currently available on the housing market, as determined by local and sub-regional housing market and household income indicators, and continue to be offered at below market rates for a time period specified by the City of White Rock and secured by relevant legal agreements. A market research/housing consultant may be utilized in determining potential amenity contribution reductions, on a project by project basis, and consistent with the approach described above regarding the determination of amenity contribution value.

THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK
 CORPORATE REPORT



DATE: February 11, 2019

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Carl Johannsen, Director of Planning & Development Services

SUBJECT: Implications for Including a Town Centre Area Height and Density Review in the 2019 OCP Review

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Mayor and Council receive for information the corporate report dated February 11, 2019, from the Director of Planning & Development Services, titled “Implications for Including a Town Centre Area Height and Density Review in the 2019 OCP Review.”

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On January 14, 2019, Council directed staff to draft a corporate report regarding the implications of reviewing the Town Centre’s height and density, and how this might affect the 2019 OCP Review. This corporate report analyzes the Town Centre’s land use, zoning and property context, as well as future redevelopment potential, and identifies the potential implications that this review may have on the present and future Town Centre and its surroundings.

Any height and density changes will have the most impact on the Town Centre’s CR-1 zoned properties located near North Bluff Road and Johnston Road, as these properties are the most likely to redevelop in the next two decades. Reduced heights and densities could create an inconsistency between the OCP and the Zoning Bylaw, diminish the Town Centre’s role as a growth focus area, and extend the OCP Review by 6 to 8 months, among other implications.

Maintaining the current Council-endorsed 2019 OCP Review scope will:

- enable the OCP Review to focus on key areas of interest to Council and the community;
- address contentious issues in a shorter time frame;
- apply resources to a clearly-defined work plan, and allow for other project work; and
- maintain the Town Centre as the City’s growth focus area.

INTRODUCTION

On December 10, 2018 Council approved the scope of the 2019 OCP Review, which includes:

- reviewing building heights outside of the Town Centre;
- updating affordable housing policies;
- enhancing design and character guidelines for the Waterfront;
- strengthening policies regarding transit, greenspace and the Peace Arch Hospital; and

- developing an OCP scorecard to measure success and track OCP implementation.

This OCP Review process includes three phases, to be completed by December 2019.

Council Direction Regarding a Potential Town Centre Height and Density Review

On January 14, 2019, following discussion on the OCP Review, Council passed the following resolution:

“That Council direct staff to draft a corporate report that outlines what the implications to the existing review would be if the review of the Town Centre’s height and density were included within the scope, and that the report also include the legal implications regarding this potential review.” (Resolution 2019-026)

In response to Council’s resolution, this corporate report:

- identifies the implications of a Town Centre building height and density review, related to the scope and process of the 2019 OCP Review, the Town Centre’s land use, zoning, and property conditions, and other OCP and City policies, plans and Bylaws; and
- provides an opportunity for Council to provide feedback on the content of this report.

BACKGROUND

2019 OCP Review: Building Height Review Scope

The 2019 OCP Review scope includes reviewing building heights outside of the Town Centre (location shown in Appendix A). Focusing on the Town Centre Transition (TCT) land use and other areas, this review will obtain public input on building heights and involve technical review by staff. Specific height review areas/neighbourhoods are shown in Appendix B.

This approach will seek ‘feedback by area,’ which will assist staff in recommending building heights that follow OCP height transition principles (ie. transitioning downward from North Bluff Road to the Waterfront) yet are better tailored to specific areas or neighbourhoods.

This approach may identify ‘maximum heights’, instead of the current ‘guidelines’ (Appendix A). Providing flexibility at the property level, but following the broader OCP height transition principle, these guidelines recognize different property sizes and building designs create different building heights, even if these properties are the same density (Floor Area Ratio or ‘FAR’). Heights above the guidelines do not require an OCP change; a reasonable interpretation of this is a maximum 1 to 2 storeys over the guideline, to account for property size/slope, zoning, and design variations, and to ensure the OCP provides certainty regarding height.

Previously Suggested Scope of Height Review

At the November 19, 2018 LUPC meeting, staff suggested that the OCP Review should focus on reviewing building heights outside of the Town Centre area, for these reasons:

- the Town Centre land use in the previous OCP (2008) identified buildings up to 21 storeys, and the Council-endorsed *Town Centre Urban Design Plan* (2011) includes heights of 22 to 25 storeys, in the Town Centre blocks north of Russell Avenue;
- the Town Centre is identified in the OCP’s Regional Context Statement (RCS) as being consistent with the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), which identifies municipal town centres as ‘focus areas’ for accommodating a share of regional growth;
- maintaining current OCP building heights in this area could, through redevelopment over the long term, help achieve the significant public realm amenities and parks identified in the *Town Centre Urban Design Plan*; and

- maintaining current building heights, with the use of high-rise ‘floorplate’ restrictions, will also help to achieve slenderer buildings, which will reduce building shadowing at ground level, create view corridors, and allow more public open and green space. Lower buildings tend to be bulkier, and can increase shadowing and view blockage.

Staff also noted that a building height review will need to consider existing zoning and FARs. Following LUPC discussion, LUPC directed staff to include a building height review, for areas outside of the Town Centre, in the scope of an OCP Review.

As noted above, this height review approach was endorsed by Council on December 10, 2018. On January 14, 2019, Council directed staff to bring forward a corporate report on the implications that a Town Centre height and density review might have on the OCP Review. Staff noted at the time that this would require additional, direct consultation with the owners of Town Centre properties that are pre-zoned ‘CR-1,’ which allows a maximum 80.7 metre height.

ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION

The Town Centre is a complex planning area with many ‘moving parts,’ in terms of land use, zoning, amenities, transportation, infrastructure and current and past policies. As Council has not given direction to staff regarding the scope of a height and density review (ie. specific height, density numbers), it is logical to posit this review results in one of these outcomes:

1. Increased height and density: this scenario is unlikely. The North Bluff Study, which proposed additional height/density in exchange for parkland, affordable housing and other amenities, was deferred by Council; or
2. No change: based on public input and staff analysis, Council decides to make no changes to height and density in the Town Centre; or
3. Decreased height and density: based on public input and staff analysis, Council decides to reduce height and density in select areas or across the entire Town Centre area.

The following section begins with an analysis of the Town Centre’s land use, zoning and property context, as well as its future redevelopment potential, in order to ‘know the site’ and understand the existing and potential future condition of the Town Centre. This is followed by identifying the implications of a height and density review, including the potential effects of decreasing building heights and densities in the Town Centre.

Town Centre: Land Use, Zoning, Property Characteristics and Redevelopment Potential

The Town Centre, bounded by North Bluff Road, George Street, Thrift Avenue and Martin Street, includes 39 acres (15.8 hectares) of private properties, parks and streets (Appendix C).

OCP Land Use: ‘Town Centre’ Designation

The OCP (pp. 28, 32) identifies the Town Centre as ‘the heart of the City’, ‘the centre for cultural, civic, economic and public life,’ a ‘neighbourhood, city-wide and regional destination’ and the City’s growth focus area. The Town Centre land use designation (Appendix D) applies to forty-two (42) properties, which recognizes current existing uses and enables ‘a concentrated mix of multi-unit residential and commercial uses’ on these properties in the future.

Based on this, the Town Centre will have the highest building heights and densities in the City, and new public amenities, through the redevelopment of existing commercial ‘strip malls’ and surface parking lots into mixed-use, street-fronting buildings. This is consistent with the 2008 OCP, which also called for high density, mixed-use development in the Town Centre. The infrastructure required to support the Town Centre’s existing and planned density is identified in the City’s water, sanitary sewer and storm water management Master Plans.

The ‘Bones’: Street, Block and Public Realm Pattern

The Town Centre’s ‘grid’ street and block pattern is well-suited to host high density, mixed-use development, through multiple parallel streets and intersections that create many ‘pathways’ (Appendix D) that distribute pedestrian, cyclist and vehicular traffic throughout the network, enhance walkability and support efficient transit service. Future improvements to the Town Centre’s pedestrian, cyclist and transit and vehicular facilities are outlined in the City’s *Strategic Transportation Plan*. The square/ rectangular blocks in this pattern create logical redevelopment and property assembly opportunities with many ‘block faces’ that create highly visible retail units and multiple commercial and underground parking access points.

The Town Centre’s ‘public realm’ is the network of sidewalks, mid-block pedestrian paths, patio areas, plazas, squares and parks, set within the overall street and block pattern. This includes Bryant Park and Miramar Plaza, highly valued open spaces that new public realm investments can connect to and compliment as the Town Centre grows. The OCP and the *Town Centre Urban Design Plan* identify enhancements to the Town Centre’s public realm, to ensure new development is accompanied by new sidewalks, parks and plazas that create safe, ‘delightful public places’ and new greenspace, support a thriving business environment, and ensure the Town Centre is highly walkable and accessible for all ages and abilities.

Height and Density Guidelines

Figure 10 in the OCP identifies height guidelines that follow a downward height transition as one moves from the Town Centre to the Waterfront. Specific Town Centre guidelines are 25 storeys at North Bluff Road and Johnston Road, transitioning downward to 16 storeys at Thrift Avenue and Johnston Road and 8 storeys at Thrift Avenue and Martin Street (Appendix E). Heights also transition downward as one moves east and west along North Bluff Road. Existing building heights in the Town Centre are shown in Appendix G.

Figure 9 in OCP and Appendix E show the maximum density or FAR in the Town Centre, which follows a downward transition, from 5.4 FAR at North Bluff Road and Johnston Road, down to 4.0 FAR at Thrift Avenue and Johnston Road and 3.0 FAR at Thrift Avenue and George Street.

Town Centre Zoning (Appendix F)

11.6 acres of the Town Centre is comprised of Comprehensive Development or ‘CD’ zones, which are tailored to specific building designs. 1.3 acres is zoned P1 Civic/ Institutional Use (parks), and 0.5 acres is zoned RM-2 Medium Density Multi-Unit Residential Zone.

About 25.6 acres of the Town Centre is zoned CR-1 Town Centre Commercial/Residential Zone. This zone has a base 1.75 FAR and height of 10.7 metres (3 storeys), which can be increased to maximum of 5.4 FAR and 80.7 metres (23-26 storeys, depending on floor to ceiling heights per storey), if a Community Amenity Contribution or ‘CAC’ is provided to the City according to Council’s *Density Bonus/Amenity Contribution Policy*. CACs are a negotiated amenity contribution, using a ‘target rate’ of \$40 a square foot for floor area above 1.75 FAR. A CR-1 redevelopment also needs to reflect the *Town Centre Urban Design Plan*, and requires a Council-approved Development Permit (DP) for the form and character or design of the building.

Existing Conditions and Likely Redevelopment Properties (Appendix G)

About two-thirds of all properties in the Town Centre are unlikely to redevelop within the OCP’s 2045 time frame. These properties have existing buildings or buildings currently under construction, or future new buildings that will start construction in the next two years. This premise assumes that concrete buildings, including those recently completed, under construction, and those about to be constructed (and completed by 2025), are unlikely to redevelop in the next 50 to 80 years. Projects currently under construction or about to start construction include (with completion date noted): Oceana PARC (2019), Miramar 2 (2020), Semiah (2020); Foster Martin

(2025), Soleil (2021) and Verve (2021). This also assumes that existing residential strata buildings are unlikely to dissolve and sell their buildings for redevelopment in the next 20 years.

There is one 20 unit rental apartment (1461 Foster Street) in the Town Centre; it is not known if the owner is considering redevelopment. Due to the small size of this property, which limits its redevelopment potential and may require assembly with adjacent stratas, it is unlikely this rental property will be redeveloped in the next 20 years. There are also four (4) rental units at 1446 Johnston Road; this CR-1 zoned property may redevelop earlier given its high profile location.

After discounting these properties, about one-third (12.3 acres) of CR-1 zoned properties remain, largely consisting of 'strip mall' properties in the nine (9) acre block bounded by North Bluff Road, Johnston Road, Russell Avenue and Foster Street, and near Johnston Road and Russell Avenue intersection. These properties are most likely to redevelop in the next two decades, due to:

- existing buildings that are nearing end-of-life, many of which are single-use commercial construction and 40 to 60 years old. In the last 15 years, redevelopment has only occurred on Town Centre properties with existing commercial and public use buildings;
- a higher land value relative to building value. In these cases, if a higher density is available, it is attractive to redevelop and create higher-value buildings (converting a property to 'highest and best use'). CR-1 zoning enables property owners to increase their density from ~0.5 FAR, which exists now on many properties, to 5.4 FAR, and increase the height of buildings to 80.7 metres. Increased height also creates ocean and mountain views, which also increases the value of new buildings;
- redeveloping commercial properties, although disruptive to existing tenants and resulting in forgone lease revenue, is less risky for property owners, relative to redeveloping residential strata or rental properties. This is due to residential building values being higher than single-use commercial buildings, and requiring the dissolution and sale of stratas, or relocating / rehousing tenants and providing related financial assistance.
- these properties are large enough to be redeveloped in practical, cost-effective manner (or be assembled with adjacent properties to enough land area), which requires cost-efficient underground parkades (min. 40 metre width for parking spaces, aisles, ramps, elevators) and enough above-ground space for designing marketable and leasable buildings; and
- these properties are located adjacent to the high traffic North Bluff Road and Johnston Road corridors, which increases the viability of retail and office spaces in new buildings. This is attractive for property owners looking for a reliable income stream from leases, and supports a healthy and successful business environment.

Town Centre Redevelopment and Surrounding Neighbourhoods

As noted above and shown in Appendix G, most future redevelopment activity will be located away from the Town Centre's edges, which interface with adjacent lower density, lower-rise areas. In addition, once construction of current redevelopments is complete, new redevelopment on the Town Centre's western and southern edges (Thrift, Martin) is unlikely to occur for decades. For example, once Miramar 2 and Semiah are completed in 2020, the northern side of Thrift Avenue (between Foster Street and George Street) will be 'finished and stable' and won't redevelop for 50+ years. The George Street edge, between Thrift Avenue and North Bluff Road, could experience redevelopment along 30 percent of this edge in the coming two decades.

Beyond the six (6) current redevelopment projects, no new applications have been submitted to the City. Staff anticipate, assuming no OCP policy or market changes, that new application activity will slow in the Town Centre for the next 2 to 5 years, as there is a significant amount of new development underway that needs to be ‘absorbed’ by a cooling real estate market.

Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan Process (City of Surrey)

The City of Surrey is undertaking an update of the Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan, located north of the Town Centre. A 2006 Local Area Plan for this area outlined the possibility of 21 to 36 storey apartment buildings and 400,000 square feet of commercial on the Semiahmoo Mall site.

This Local Area Plan was updated in 2012, with an updated height limit of 20 storeys and potential additional height for ‘landmark’ high-rises at 16 Avenue and 152 Street. It is unclear at this point what the density and height outcomes of the current Semiahmoo Plan review will be, and how they might relate to White Rock’s Town Centre. Staff will consult with Surrey staff as a part of the OCP Review and Semiahmoo Plan review, and report back to Council.

Town Centre: The Relationship between OCP Land Use and Zoning

The City’s OCP identifies what White Rock aspires to become over time. Adopted in 2017, the OCP’s creation was informed by extensive public input and detailed policy and technical analysis between 2015 and 2017, with over 1,500 participant interactions and 25 public events.

OCPs designate properties with land uses that identify existing and ‘intended’ or future use. Council uses this as a guide when considering development applications, such as re-zonings proposing to change a property’s use, density, height, etc. The City’s Zoning Bylaw implements OCP land uses by assigning zones to individual properties, which identify an owner’s legal rights regarding the use of their land and the density and form of buildings on their land.

The relationship between OCP land use and zoning is best described as layers on a property. For example, the OCP land use or top layer for a house is ‘Mature Neighbourhood’, which allows single family homes. Underneath is the ‘RS-1 Zone’ layer, which relates back to the land use layer above by allowing a house through this zone’s uses, density, height and other parameters.

Rezoning: changing an existing zone to a new zone (to change use, increase density/height)

If an RS-1 owner wants to rebuild their house based on the RS-1 zone, they only need a building permit from the City to do this. However, if this owner wants to build a four storey apartment, their property’s zoning will need to be changed or ‘re-zoned’ by Council.

Property re-zonings need to be consistent with OCP land use, based on Section 478 of the *Local Government Act* (‘LGA’). This Section requires that Zoning Bylaws adopted by a Council (this includes Zoning Bylaw changes, re-zonings), after the adoption of an OCP, must be consistent with the OCP. This approach provides land use certainty and predictability for the community.

Based on this, if Council re-zones this RS-1 property to allow a new multi-family zone that gives the owner the right to build a four storey apartment, the overriding OCP land use layer must permit four storey apartments. However if the land use layer only supports three storey apartments, the OCP land use will need to be changed by Council first, to allow four storey apartments, prior to Council adopting a new zone that allows a four storey apartment.

Prezoning: existing zone already allows new uses, higher densities and height

In White Rock, changing a property’s use, density and height through re-zoning is common, except in one location – the Town Centre, where many properties are ‘pre-zoned’.

Pre-zoning allows properties with existing buildings to redevelop with higher density and taller buildings, without rezoning. Thirty-three Town Centre properties are pre-zoned CR-1, which

permits the base 1.75 FAR and 10.7 metre height in this zone to be increased to 5.4 FAR and 80.7 metres, if a CAC is provided and the proposal reflects the *Town Centre Urban Design Plan*.

Although rare in the region, pre-zoning has created land use certainty and spurred renewal in the Town Centre (PARC, Foster Martin, and Soleil are CR-1 properties). However, this approach limits Council to only influencing the ‘form and character’ of a proposed building, through the required DP. Council can only approve or deny a DP based on how well a proposal’s design follows the OCP’s Development Permit Guidelines, not based solely on use, density or height.

The Town Centre height guidelines reflect likely building heights on the CR-1 properties that are most likely to redevelop in the coming decades (Appendix G). Assuming a 5.4 FAR density, and high-rise building floorplates (square footage of a storey) of 7000 square feet, above a two storey podium building, many CR-1 properties north of Russell Avenue are large enough to generate a building that can reach 25 storeys, and meet OCP and CR-1 height. Large properties (like 1530 Foster in Appendix G), can also generate enough floor area for multiple high-rises, but not all of these buildings will reach 25 storeys (ie. one building is 25 storeys, the other is 18 storeys).

For CR-1 properties south of the Russell Avenue/Johnston Road intersection, assuming 5.4 FAR, heights could be 16 to 22 storeys near Russell Avenue and 6 to 13 storeys further south. This is due to smaller size of these properties, which generates less floor area and thus less height. The OCP height guideline near Russell/Johnston is 21 storeys, derived from ‘splitting the difference’ between 25 storeys at North Bluff Road and 16 storeys at Thrift Avenue (see Appendix E).

Implications of a Town Centre Height and Density Review

Implications for Pre-zoned Properties

If a Town Centre review results in lower building heights and densities in the OCP, this will create an inconsistency between the OCP and Zoning Bylaw (see Appendix H). For example, if the OCP height guideline near the North Bluff Road and Johnston Road intersection is lowered under the current 25 storeys, but the height of the CR-1 zone is not reduced as well, CR-1 zoned property owners will still have the legal right, through pre-zoning to submit a building permit for an 80.7 metre building – potentially higher than the OCP. This would also apply for FAR.

As noted above, in this case Council can only influence the building’s form and character, not its height and/or density, through a DP. Council would also not be able to refuse a building permit for this building once it is submitted to the City.

The reason behind this is that the CR-1 zone was adopted in 2013, prior to the current OCP. This means the CR-1 zone remains in legal effect and will continue to do so despite OCP changes - unless this zone is changed to align with the OCP, through a Zoning Bylaw update.

Based on this, if Town Centre density and height changes are made without changes to the Zoning Bylaw, Council may not be able to prevent development that inconsistent with the OCP. This will compromise the OCP’s ability to provide land use certainty for residents, businesses, property owners and the public. Therefore, if heights and densities are reduced in the OCP, the CR-1 zone should be updated to ensure these reductions are effective.

Implications for Process and Timing of 2019 OCP Review

Including a Town Centre height and density review in the OCP Review scope will require additional consultation and time. If this review results in reducing height and density in the OCP and the CR-1 zone, all CR-1 landowners will need to be notified and provided opportunities to give feedback on the proposed changes to Council. This will involve additional Public Information Meetings and/or workshops in each phase of the OCP Review, to ensure an

appropriate level of ‘early and ongoing consultation’. This consultation, with related policy and technical work, will extend the OCP Review timeline by six to eight months (fall 2020).

Reducing density and height in the Zoning Bylaw, or ‘downzoning’, requires Council to strictly follow requisite planning and public notification procedures. If this is not done, a property owner could successfully petition a court to quash a downzoning, on the basis that Council did not adequately follow procedures. If this occurs, existing zoning remains in legal effect.

Potential New Development Applications

Staff note there is a risk that a Town Centre height and density review may compel some CR-1 property owners to submit Building Permit and Development Permit applications, for buildings that ‘max out’ current CR-1 FAR and height, prior to adoption of OCP/Zoning Bylaw changes. Although new applications are anticipated to be years away due to the current high volume of development and a cooling market, if a Building Permit application is submitted before the OCP Review (and possible Zoning Bylaw update) is completed, the City may not be able to refuse it.

Implications of Height and Density Review on the City’s ‘Growth Focus Area’

If a review results in lower building heights and densities, within the CR-1 zoned areas likely to redevelop in the next two decades, this will reduce residential population growth in the Town Centre. This in turn will weaken the Town Centre’s role as the City’s growth focus area, and its ability to absorb the majority of White Rock’s population growth projected to occur by 2045.

This implication should be first considered in relation to the Town Centre’s estimated future population growth. Once all of the current redevelopment projects are completed, 5-6 years from now, the Town Centre’s population will have grown by about 1,500 residents. If the ‘most likely’ CR-1 properties (shown in Appendix G) are redeveloped in the next 20 years, and current height and density stays the same on these properties, another 3,200 residents could be added. Based on current and future growth, a ‘built-out’ Town Centre could grow by 4,700 residents by 2040-45 (based on 3,350 new units, and the Town Centre occupant rate of 1.4 residents per unit).

Noting the City’s current population of about 20,000 residents, the OCP projects the City’s population will reach between 23,900 (low) and 27,300 (high) residents by 2045. The City’s Regional Context Statement or ‘RCS’, which identifies how the OCP relates to the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy or ‘RGS’ (which calls for creating a compact urban area and focusing in multiple ‘town centres’, including White Rock’s), estimates 25,600 residents by 2045, which is midway between the OCP’s low and high population ranges. When new growth from current and future Town Centre redevelopment is compared to these projections, the Town Centre will likely accommodate a significant share of White Rock’s growth by 2045:

1. Current Redevelopment: Town Centre’s Share of City Growth (+1500 residents in Town Centre, relative to total City-wide growth above the City’s current 20,000 population)
 - a. OCP Low (23,900) = 38 percent
 - b. RCS (25,600) = 27 percent
 - c. OCP High (27,300) = 21 percent
2. Current + Future Redevelopment: Town Centre’s Share of City Growth (+4700 residents)
 - a. OCP Low (23,900) = 121 percent
 - b. RCS (25,600) = 84 percent
 - c. OCP High (27,300) = 64 percent

These numbers indicate that future growth within the Town Centre could account for almost 85 percent of the RCS population estimate for White Rock. This underscores the significant role the

Town Centre plays in effectively managing White Rock's future growth - including providing a clearly identified area where growth pressures, in the City as a whole, can be 're-directed' to.

Also, as population and land use trends indicate continued growth in the Semiahmoo Peninsula and the Metro Vancouver region over the next 25 years, if the Town Centre's ability to host new growth is diminished, this will place higher redevelopment pressure on properties and neighbourhoods outside the Town Centre. This could result in increased speculation and applications to redevelop buildings near the Town Centre (ie. between Martin Street and Oxford Street, George Street and Best Street), many of which are purpose-built rental apartments.

Potential RCS and RGS Amendment

Noting that a height and density reduction will reduce future growth in the Town Centre (which is part of the Semiahmoo Municipal Town Centre in the RGS), this may require an amendment to the RCS and RGS to adjust White Rock's population projection downward. This in turn will require consultation with Metro Vancouver and the City of Surrey, beyond what was identified in the 2019 OCP Review Scope, and a possible amendment to the RGS as well.

Potential Impacts on Economic Development and Investment

Reduced height and density in the Town Centre may diminish the ability to attract new commercial/employment-generating uses to the Town Centre. This in turn could reduce land valuation and investment, which has significantly increased in the last five (5) years. While this may 'cool' redevelopment activity in the short term, this could have a detrimental long-term effect, where potential new investment in White Rock's Town Centre is re-directed to South Surrey's multiple existing and future commercial sites. This could also negatively affect economic development and new investment into White Rock as a whole, including the Waterfront area.

The Town Centre's high land values also make taller concrete buildings more financially viable than wood-frame buildings, which are limited to six (6) storeys by the BC Building Code. Wood buildings are also not able to achieve the high-value ocean/ mountain views that taller concrete buildings can achieve. These factors, and noting the multiple existing and approved high-rises in the Town Centre, make the construction of new wood-frame, lower-rise buildings unlikely.

Other Implications of a Town Centre Height and Density Review

Potential Impact on 'Strengthening Transit Service'

OCP policy identifies the Town Centre as a transit 'anchor point' or node, and supports improved transit by enabling the land use and urban design required for higher-frequency transit:

- high commercial/employment and residential densities;
- mixed commercial and residential uses and buildings;
- major public, commercial and employment destinations;
- a well-connected, grid street, sidewalk and block pattern; and
- a safe, accessible and pedestrian-friendly urban environment.

The 2019 OCP Review calls for adding new OCP policy that strengthens transit service to White Rock, including a 'B-Line or Better' high frequency route (every 5-10 minutes) to the Town Centre. Following Council's endorsement of the 2019 OCP Review scope, staff had a preliminary discussion with TransLink staff about the OCP Review, the intent to strengthen transit policy further, and TransLink's plans for improved transit service to White Rock. If a height and density review results in a lower Town Centre population, this will weaken the City's position in advocating for improved transit. Many municipalities are seeking improved transit from TransLink, which tends to prioritize population/job nodes for high-frequency transit.

Reduced Town Centre Amenities, CACs, DCCs

Lower heights and densities in the Town Centre could limit the City's ability to create new public amenities, identified through public consultation, in the *Town Centre Urban Design Plan*. These amenities, including a 1 acre 'central park' in the block bounded by North Bluff Road, Johnston Road, Russell Avenue and Foster Street (see Appendix D), are key to maintaining a high level of livability and creating new green spaces in the Town Centre over the long term.

Lower densities will also lower CAC contributions and limit Council's ability to fund new amenities, including Waterfront improvements and potential partnership-based affordable housing projects, without needing to use other funding sources. Lower densities could also result in lower Development Cost Charge (DCCs) revenue from development projects, which will impact the City's ability to fund infrastructure improvements, as identified in the City's Water, Sanitary and Stormwater Master Plans. Lower commercial and residential investment in the Town Centre could also impact the City's tax base.

Impact on Sustainability and Affordability

Quantitative research indicates that high density, mixed use and walkable areas are more 'sustainable', relative to lower density and car-dependent areas, because they use land and infrastructure more efficiently (less 'sprawl'), use less energy, produce less harmful and climate change-inducing emissions, and offer smaller, more affordable forms of home ownership and rental housing. The OCP's Town Centre policies, which call for a higher density, mixed use, walkable/ transit-supportive urban area, support more sustainable urban growth.

If a Town Centre review results in lower densities, the ability of development in the Town Centre to 'do its part' in helping to reduce energy use and emissions in White Rock will be diminished, and growth may be redirected elsewhere and occur in a less sustainable manner. This outcome could also impact the ability to produce new, affordable strata and rental units in the Town Centre area, assuming that most new multi-family units are nominally-sized (<1,200 square feet), not 'luxury' units, and are priced lower than single family homes in White Rock.

Influence of a Town Centre Height Review on Height Review in Surrounding Areas

The 2019 OCP Review assumes that the Town Centre's height guidelines remain 'as is.' This approach uses the western, southern and eastern edges of the Town Centre as 'high points', where building heights in areas around the Town Centre should transition downward from (following the OCP height transition principle). If Town Centre heights are also under review, more time and complexity will be added to the process. This approach will also take the focus off reviewing and updating heights in neighbourhoods around the Town Centre, where the majority of contentious redevelopment projects, in terms of building height, are located.

Benefits of the 2019 OCP Review Scope

This corporate report identifies implications associated with a potential Town Centre height and density review, for Council's information and consideration. With these in mind, it is important to highlight the benefits of the Council-endorsed scope of the 2019 OCP Review:

1. Focusing on key areas of interest to Council and the community: Focusing the height review on areas outside the Town Centre will address concerns of taller buildings in lower-rise areas, and focusing on the Waterfront will help update OCP policy, design guidelines, zoning and the public realm, with the aim of improving business viability and new investment. Staff are already working on the Waterfront scope component.
2. Addressing contentious issues in a shorter time frame: The OCP Review is anticipated to be complete by the end of 2019, with key outcomes that address building heights outside of the Town Centre and provide updated direction for a revitalizing Waterfront. Including the Town

Centre review process will add more complexity, additional time, risk regarding due process for affected property owners, and potentially take the focus away from the Waterfront and/or building height review components of the OCP Review.

3. Applying resources to a clearly defined scope and allowing for other projects: The consultation and technical work related to a Town Centre height and density review may affect the ability of staff to work on other Council priorities and complete them in a timely manner. Of note is the potential for multiple Zoning Bylaw updates, involving Waterfront Commercial zones, coach homes/secondary suites and single family home setbacks and lot coverage, each of which may require considerable consultation and technical work, among other Council priorities that may arise.
4. Maintains the Town Centre as the City's growth focus area: As noted above, the Town Centre can absorb much of the City's growth, which can reduce redevelopment pressures on other areas and on purpose-built rental properties. If the Town Centre provides opportunities for new investment, this will help to maintain a healthy economic development environment, which can lead to new Waterfront investments.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

The potential additional consultation and technical review outlined in this corporate report can be undertaken using existing staff resources, pending further direction from Council.

OPTIONS

Council may:

1. Receive for information this corporate report, and provide feedback to staff; or
2. Request that staff undertake further research and report back to Committee with alternative options and recommendations, as directed by Council.

Staff recommend Option 1.

CONCLUSION

This corporate report identifies the implications of a Town Centre height and density review, for Council's information and consideration. Most future redevelopment activity in the Town Centre will be concentrated near North Bluff Road and Johnston Road and away from adjacent neighbourhoods. Reduced heights and densities could create an inconsistency between the OCP and the Zoning Bylaw, diminish the Town Centre's role as the City's growth focus area and transit 'anchor', and extend the OCP Review by 6 to 8 months, among other implications.

Maintaining the current OCP Review scope will enable work to focus on key areas of interest to Council and the community, and address contentious issues in a shorter time frame.

Respectfully submitted,



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

Comments from the Chief Administrative Officer:

This corporate report is provided for information.




Dan Bottrill
Chief Administrative Officer

- Appendix A: Town Centre Location, OCP Height Guidelines (in storeys) and Transitions
- Appendix B: Building Height Review and Design/Character Study Areas
- Appendix C: Town Centre Aerial Map
- Appendix D: Town Centre OCP Land Use Layer; Street, Block and Public Realm Pattern
- Appendix E: Town Centre OCP Height Guidelines and OCP Densities
- Appendix F: Town Centre Zoning
- Appendix G: CR-1 Properties Most Likely to Redevelop in the Next Two Decades; Potential
Maximum Building Height on CR-1 Properties Most Likely to Redevelop
- Appendix H: Potential Inconsistency between OCP and Zoning Bylaw (Building Heights)


APPENDIX A

Town Centre Location, OCP Height Guidelines (in storeys) and Transitions (OCP Figure 10)




APPENDIX B

Building Height Review and Design/Character Study Areas




APPENDIX C

Town Centre Aerial Map




APPENDIX D

Town Centre OCP Land Use Layer (Red Colour)




Town Centre Street, Block and Public Realm Pattern (green lines- new pedestrian paths)




APPENDIX E

Town Centre Land Use Layer and OCP Height Guidelines




Town Centre Land Use Layer and OCP Densities (FARs)




APPENDIX F

Town Centre Zoning (CR-1 Properties in Red)



APPENDIX G

**CR-1 Properties (Red) Most Likely to Redevelop in Next Two Decades;
Stable Properties (Blue) Unlikely to Redevelop. Existing Building Heights in Yellow Text**





Potential Maximum New Building Height (Large White Text) on CR-1 Properties Most Likely to Redevelop (Red). Not all Buildings on Larger Sites will Reach Maximum Height.




APPENDIX H

Potential Inconsistency Between OCP and Zoning Bylaw (Building Heights)



THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK
CORPORATE REPORT



DATE: November 4, 2019

TO: Land Use and Planning Committee

FROM: Carl Isaak, Director of Planning and Development Services

SUBJECT: Official Community Plan Review - Summary of Phase 1 Public Engagement

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Land Use and Planning Committee receive for information the corporate report dated November 4, 2019 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled “Official Community Plan Review - Summary of Phase 1 Public Engagement.”

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this corporate report is to provide the Land Use and Planning Committee (LUPC) with a summary of the public engagement that occurred and feedback that has been received in Phase 1 of the Official Community Plan Review, as well as to identify the next steps moving forward. A similar report was provided to LUPC on October 7, 2019 specifically addressing the Waterfront scope within the OCP Review (the ‘Waterfront Enhancement Strategy’ or ‘WES’); this report therefore focuses on the other seven topics within the scope of the OCP Review, as follows:

- Reviewing the Town Centre (Height, Density and Public Space / Green Spaces)
- Reviewing Building Heights outside of the Town Centre
- Expanding Peace Arch Hospital
- Greening the City
- Strengthening Transit
- Monitoring OCP Goals to Measure Success and Track Implementation
- Improving Housing Affordability

At the launch of the OCP Review, an online community survey to gather initial public feedback was open between May and July 2019 on the City’s public engagement platform (www.talkwhiterock.ca), and 151 total responses were received. The complete survey responses are attached to this report as Appendix A, including verbatim comments on open-ended questions (with usernames removed to protect the privacy of individuals).

On June 25, 2019 a public open house for the OCP Review was held at the White Rock Community Centre on the seven topics listed above, and 31 people signed in. At the open house, display panels for each of these topics were shared, with the following content: general background information on the topic, existing related City policies, potential ideas, a “what we’ve heard so far” section that shared early results of the online survey, and a “give us some feedback!” section soliciting input from attendees. The display panels from the public open house are attached to this report as Appendix B, and the results of the questions in the “give us feedback” sections are attached as Appendix C.

On July 6 and July 9, 2019, two community workshops on the Town Centre, identical in content, were held to provide a highly visual and interactive session focusing on urban design and public spaces in the area. The consultants who are working with staff on the Town Centre portion of the OCP Review have provided an engagement summary for the Town Centre topic/workshops, which is attached to this report as Appendix D.

Phase 2 of the OCP Review will focus on identifying new policy and land use options that can supplement or improve the existing OCP policies and ensure they are aligned with Council and the community’s priorities. These newly proposed policies will build on the input generated through Phase 1 public engagement as well as issues that have been identified by staff through the implementation and administration of the current OCP.

The next public engagement events for the OCP Review are two open houses on the draft WES, which are scheduled for Sunday, November 24 (2pm-5pm) and Tuesday, November 26 (6pm-8pm), both at the White Rock Community Centre. Staff also intend to provide a small-scale ‘pop-up’ engagement on the draft WES closer to the waterfront, inside the Museum during the Christmas Craft Fair. Details will be added to the City’s website as they become available.

There will be an open house for the Town Centre held on December 10, 2019 at the White Rock Community Centre. Staff are also intending to provide a small-scale ‘pop-up’ engagement on this topic at the Landmark PopUpTown Gallery in Central Plaza. Details regarding this will be added to the City’s website calendar as they become available.

Following LUPC’s receipt of this report and pending any comments from the Committee on the initial directions contained in this report for the remaining topics, staff will schedule public engagement for the overall OCP Review (not including the Waterfront Enhancement Strategy) to be held in January or February 2020.

An online community survey will be developed for both the WES and the other OCP Review topics, to allow for input from those unable to attend the open houses or pop-up engagement.

BACKGROUND

On March 13, 2019 Council endorsed a revised scope and process for the OCP Review, which included a three phase process and an anticipated Summer 2020 completion date.

ANALYSIS

Phase 2 of the OCP Review involves creating draft policies and land use options in each of the topics, building on the input generated through Phase 1 public engagement as well as issues that have been identified by staff through the implementation and administration of the current OCP. The focus of Phase 2 public engagement will be on obtaining public feedback (support/non-support) on the draft policy and land use options, while also being open to capturing new ideas.

While these draft policies are still being formulated, highlights of the initial policy directions for each topic are provided in the sections below for reference.

Initial Policy Directions

Reviewing the Town Centre (Height, Density and Public Space / Green Spaces)

- To increase the tree canopy with coniferous trees with the possibility of a long lifespan, requiring a certain portion (e.g. 10-20%) of large redevelopment sites to be maintained as continuous soil (i.e. soil not on top of a parking structure) by setting back the parkade from the property lines.
- To ensure a 'high-street' retail shopping atmosphere along Johnston Road, limiting building heights within 20 metres of Johnston Road to four storeys, and identifying where land assembly would be expected for towers.
- To encourage the mix of functions and land uses (i.e. beyond residential strata) that are needed for a vibrant Town Centre area, revising the Zoning Bylaw to require that a certain portion of the floor area allowed on properties be restricted to employment-generating uses (retail/office), civic and cultural uses, and rental housing.

The City of Surrey is currently updating their Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan for a 336 acre (136 hectare) area adjacent to the White Rock Town Centre, and a public open house for the final Stage 1 draft plan was held on October 29, 2019. A summary of the plan from the City of Surrey is attached to this report as Appendix E. Staff will continue to monitor the progress of this plan and liaise with staff from the City of Surrey as needed on issues that impact White Rock. The Stage 2 plan (an engineering servicing plan) will follow the consideration of the Stage 1 plan.

Reviewing Building Heights outside of the Town Centre

- To provide greater certainty on height maximums in the Town Centre Transition area, revising the height transition diagram to a specific height of storeys within a defined area.
- Moderately increasing heights in the Town Centre Transition area along North Bluff Road between Everall Street and Finlay Street and reducing heights further south near Thrift Avenue.

Expanding Peace Arch Hospital

- To support future redevelopment of the Hospital and an expansion of medical services, identifying a maximum building height of 50 metres (15-16 storeys equivalent) for the Hospital area and the adjacent land owned by the Peace Arch Hospital Foundation, to be considered once a Rapid Bus line (high capacity and frequency) service is available to the hospital area and additional parking facilities are provided on site.

Greening the City

- To ensure replacement trees can be viably planted when single family homes are redeveloped, revising the Zoning Bylaw in residential zones to establish minimum pervious areas where adequate soil volumes are available on the property.

Strengthening Transit

- To support better service employees, visitors and residents of the City's primary attraction (the waterfront area), advocating with TransLink for later bus service to connect the Marine Drive area to the White Rock Centre Bus Exchange and offsetting bus schedules to reduce bunching.

A Transit Forum was held at the White Rock Community Centre on October 28, 2019 to discuss service changes to the 351 route which provides service from Crescent Beach through White Rock to the Canada Line at Bridgeport Station. Pending the outcome of this forum, Phase 2 of the OCP Review may consider obtaining public feedback on improvements to this route.

Monitoring OCP Goals to Measure Success and Track Implementation

- To track availability and suitability of housing in the community, use the Provincially-required Housing Needs Report as a basis for annual updates on the housing supply (including affordable and rental units).
- To track the health of local businesses, report annually on the percent of business licences for in-town businesses that are renewed as well as the number of new business licences.
- To expand the supply of rental housing, revising the Zoning Bylaw for the Town Centre area (CR-1) to reserve a portion of the allowed floor area for secured rental housing.

Improving Housing Affordability

- To improve the viability of creating new purpose built rental housing, reducing the percentage of three-bedroom units required in rental buildings from 10% to 5%.
- To allow the redevelopment and expansion of existing senior's living facilities, allowing residential care facilities as a permitted use where they are currently occupied by and zoned for a care facility in the Urban Neighborhood land use designation.

Council has recently selected a Housing Advisory Committee, which will hold its first meeting on November 25, 2019. This committee will provide further input and review of the draft policies to improve housing affordability.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the public engagement that occurred and feedback that has been received in Phase 1 of the Official Community Plan Review, as well as to identify the next steps moving forward in Phase 2. Several public engagement events have been scheduled before the end of 2019 for the Waterfront Enhancement Strategy and Town Centre components of the OCP Review, and the other topics in the OCP Review will be the subject of a public open house in early 2020. An online community survey will also be conducted in conjunction with the public engagement events for those unable to attend or who prefer to provide their feedback online.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl Isaak MCIP RPP
Director of Planning and Development Services

Comments from the Chief Administrative Officer:

This corporate report is provided for information.



Dan Bottrill
Chief Administrative Officer

- Appendix A: OCP Review Online Community Survey Responses
- Appendix B: OCP Review Open House (June 15, 2019) Display Panels
- Appendix C: OCP Review Open House (June 15, 2019) Public Feedback Report
- Appendix D: Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm - Phase 1 Engagement Summary
- Appendix E: Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan – Stage 1 Plan Summary (from July 2019)

Survey Report

22 May 2019 - 15 July 2019


On your marks! Get set...

PROJECT: OCP Review

Talk White Rock



Q1 What is your connection to White Rock?




Question options

● Resident
 ● Property Owner
 ● Business Owner
 ● Work Here
 ● Shop Here
 ● Visit Here

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q2 Have you previously participated in a City planning exercise? (OCP, development application, Johnston Road Revitalization, ...)



Question options

● Yes
 ● No

Optional question (150 responses, 1 skipped)

Q3 | **Why have you not participated before?**

We have small children and it is difficult for us to attend

I believe the last council did not share the same concerns I have with the City of White Rock.

Didn't know about it

I am new to the area

focus on marine drive didn't occur except for the white elephant garage.

Didn't know how

no opportunity

Hostile council, not enough advance notice, unable to navigate online

Did not know how to get involved

No time to do so

Haven't been as concerned about the city until now

because

No opportunity - I did go to informational meetings for Johnston Road

No opportunity.

never lived in white rock before moved here a couple years ago

I have not made it a priority.

Unsure

6/07/2019 12:14 PM

Time conflicts

Didn't know about it

No time

Moved here recently. Unaware of opportunity.

Old council didn't seem to care

I signed up for the committee (OCP) but wasn't accepted. I did participate in getting signatures on a petition to try to stop the two towers on Oxford Street.

When I previously lived in White Rock there was nothing like this; I have recently returned.

Busy; not sure how to

I didn't know about it

Total frustration with the maintenance(or lack of together with flagrant waste of funds).

Newly moved to WR

Life gets busy

Not enough time once I learned of the opportunity

No survey seen.

Not much interested

was not invited to by previous council

Unfriendly atmosphere and lack of access

Did not like the previous council

Didn't live here

Felt that feedback was not valued

I thought there was no point when the mayor was Baldwin, but now there may be a point.

No mechanisms to do so

I have not lived here long enough to have been part of any previous surveys

Too complacent

Timing of events

Didn't know about it

Went to one meeting where most people were developers. We were very discouraged!

No easy online options. Consultation workshops were at inconvenient times (too early in the day or too long)

I have not made it a priority in my calendar. Young children. Other work priorities. Not taking the time to reflect on how important these events are.

Fairly new to the area

Only lived here 2 years

To my understanding they were during held at the community centre at times I was unable to attend.

Did not know about it

This is more convenient

I am usually busy working-also, I honestly felt no-one listens to the residents anyway. Developers seem to have all the power.

Didn't know about it

Recent arrival to city.

Never asked

you never listen

Previously living in South Surrey

Relatively new to the city and just getting familiar enough to get involved.

Didn't have long enough residence here to have an informed opinion.

didn't live here.


n/a

Do not always get the PAN delivered therefore not informed

I now have the time as I have just retired

Optional question (63 responses, 88 skipped)

Q4 How would you like us to involve you in the OCP Review?



Question options

- Completing surveys
- Receiving updates on the process
- Attending public open houses
- Chatting with a planner at a community event
- Participating in a design workshop with other community members, staff and consultants
- Other

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q5 | **How would you like to get involved in the OCP Review?**

Town Hall meeting with OCP and Building Heights and density as the topics

I would like to see the planners look at other successful countries who build communities


accept written submission and include the same as appendix to any report to council

online opinion forum

All of the above

Optional question (5 responses, 146 skipped)

Q6 | If the City held a public open house on the OCP Review, would you attend if available?



Question options

● Yes ● No

Optional question (148 responses, 3 skipped)

Q7 | Is there a reason you would not attend a public open house?

Just difficult to go and find these events very slow

We already have an official community plan, and I participated in that process

Limited time

Schedule conflict

I use my time wisely.

Don't know for sure. There should be a "Maybe" option on this question.

Health


I rather provide feedback online

Child care

Prefer surveys

Optional question (10 responses, 141 skipped)

Q8 If the City held a public open house on the OCP Review, when would it be most convenient for you?




Question options

- Weekday (Monday - Friday) Daytime
- Weekday (Monday - Friday) Evening
- Weekend (Saturday - Sunday) Daytime
- Weekend (Saturday - Sunday) Evening

Optional question (148 responses, 3 skipped)

Q9 Of all the topics included in the review of the OCP, what is most important to you? Please rank from 1 (most important) to ...



Question options

- Reviewing Town Centre (Height, Density and Public Space / Green spaces)
- Reviewing Building Heights outside of the Town Centre
- Enhancing the Waterfront (Waterfront Enhancement Strategy)
- Expanding Peace Arch Hospital
- Greening the City (on new green space and tree planting)
- Strengthening Transit
- Monitoring OCP Goals to Measure Success and Track Implementation
- Improving Housing Affordability

Q10 | What is your favourite part of the waterfront and Marine Drive businesses? (e.g. walking the promenade and pier, eating at a restaurant, shopping, playing on the beach, etc.)

We love taking our kids to the beach to play. Love the safety of the area so kids have some freedom. Also love being able to grab a coffee on the go.

Cycling Marine Drive and walking on the beach at low tide. Would like to see cycling allowed on the promenade during the off season since dogs are being allowed.

I do not want to see any building heights any higher than 3 storeys. I do not want to see people lose their views of the waterfront.

Playing at the beach

Walking the promenade and pier. Dining at restaurants. Playing at the beach.

walking the promenade

Hanging out on the beach.

Promenade, pier, restaurants

Walking the promenade and pier

Walking and looking out at the views in a peaceful atmosphere.

Promenade, restaurants, beach

Using the dock for Nexus customs check in

Beach and restaurants

View

Walking the promenade, paddle boarding, swimming, walking on the beach, fish and chips, going for coffee, building sandcastles with our grandchildren

walking and having a meal on Marine Drive

Promenade and pier.

Picnic on the beach and then walking the promenade

Walking the promenade whn I can takmy dog. Stopping for coffee or lunch.

Restaurants and walking the promenade.

The promenade (hope you do not let dogs on all year round)

Walking the promenade and pier

walking the promenade and pier,

Waterfront, sitting and painting flora and fauna, taking photo's, walking and chilling out, eating with friends or by myself

Walking

Walking the promenade and pier, eating at a restaurant and playing in the sand

walking the dog free promenade

Eating at restaurants

Walking the promenade

Eating at restaurants and walking the promenade and pier.

enjoying a dog free promenade

walking the beach promenade, visiting restaurants, shops if there were some there, sitting on the beach, quaintness and funkyness of the buildings that are there now. A very nice ambiance that needs improvement.
Local shops, and we NEED MORE SUPPORT for them.

Walking the beach and promenade

walking promenade & pier, eating at East Beach restaurants

Walking the pier

Promenade and beach

The food

The water

looking at the water and walking the strip

walking on the promenade & pier before or after grabbing a bite or drink from coffee shop or restaurant, or visiting some of the shops

walking the promenade & pier and eating in the restaurants. I would like to see a pier restaurant built and the promenade extended further west.

Walking along the beach when the tide is out. Walking the promenade. Enjoying buskers (when they are given approval), seeing the families, all abilities, languages and cultures enjoying this one amenity. Please fix the White Rock Pier as it is a main attraction in the city.

Beach and shoreline

Promenade, pier and rights of way from Marine Drive to upper White Rock

taking dogs to beach

Walking the promenade with no dogs allowed.

Promenade, pier, beach, restaurants

Walking the DOG FREE promenade.

We love to walk the promenade and the pier and, occasionally, eat at a restaurant.

Walking the promenade and pier

Walking promenade and beach, eating

The ocean views

shoopping

Playing on the beach

Walking the promenade and pier

Walking the promenade and pier

All three mentioned above. So excited to be able to have dog join us on promenade on off season.

Pedestrian friendly, diversity of food choice, shoppingpedestrian friendly

The restaurants are a favourite, the pier is awesome and the promenade is wonderful. We have a small dog and are looking forward to walking on the promenade.

walking safely at the promenade and pier,no dogs no sleeping transients

Pier and restaurants

Walking in the morning is wonderful and free parking until 10. Also we love going down for Happy hour at the restaurants that have a nice patio

i regularly walk the promenade (and pier when available) and enjoy the beachfront restaurants.

Good restaurants, walking pier, green space

Walking on the tidal flats, eating at restaurants (for family style, not super expensive), getting ice cream, walking the pier

I enjoy walking all along the beach, or the promenade, preferably on a weekday. Dining in any of the restaurants is a pleasure.

Listening to music at one of the local establishments

Love to walk the promenade, grab lunch, coffee or ice cream. Sitting on a bench and enjoying the sea air.

All of the above! but I'd say mostly walking the promenade & pier, since eating at restaurants is pricey and so many have closed there aren't a lot of options. Just being on the beach & breathing the sea air is #1.

Walking, pier, restaurants

Eating at a restaurant, then getting ice cream and walking along the promenade

walking the promenade and pier

We enjoy the promenade - less so when there are so many dogs - even when they are theoretically not allowed. We fail to understand how a waterpark was put on the most strategic location of the waterfront, when many people struggle to pay their water bills
eating at restaurants, walking the promenade and pier

Walking the promenade and pier, taking grandkids to the beach.

Walking, restaurant

Walking

strolling the promenade, eating, watching the water and beach.

Walking the promenade

Walking and running the promenade and the business. Amendment to the OCP should consider mixed employment opportunities.

Walking along the promenade and pier, shopping and eating.

Walking the promenade

enjoying the promenade & bringing visitors here fo fish & chips

watching the activity, the people, seeing a diversity of buildings and businesses, access to the beach

Walking on the tidal flats

Walking the promenade and pier, playing on the beach, eating at a restaurant

Walking and eating

visiting east beach shops and restaurants, but mostly walking on east beach

Restaurant

Relaxing in East Beach

Walking promenade and beach

The beauty of the sea and the ambiance of the restaurants, pier and beach

Having a coastal setting ,I.e. Carmel U.S.

Walking promenade and pier, walking on the sand.

Walking on the prom & pier - we'll be so glad when it's back to normal again.
Eating at the restaurants.

I've walked the promenade dailyh for 25 years

I like walking on the promenade and maybe having a meal, or coffee, or drink
after

The Pier and the restaurants

Walking promenade, restaurant

Walking on sand during low tide, walk along promenade and pier

Promenade, pier, no dogs on the beach ever, safety of beach for kids and
sea life

I enjoy walking the promenade and enjoying the mix of old and new
buildings. I don't eat at the restaurants, but enjoy the fact that they are busy

and lively. It is pleasant to see people playing on the beach, but as I have dogs I don't visit the beach.

Walking on seashore

Walking on the promenade.

Walking on the promenade and pier, playing on the beach, eating, shopping

Walking the promenade and the pier... perhaps sitting for a while to enjoy the ocean breezes and views

walking the promenade and pier, eating at a restaurant

Promenade and beach

We are frequently on Marine Dr and the Promenade. We eat out often and enjoy the various restaurants. We like to walk.

views of the water to the south, low-rise buildings to the north don't obstruct hillside

All of the above except shopping. My wife shops at a bathing suit store, but there aren't many shops down there. I don't shop unless I need something and I seldom need anything. Eat, drink, play! Don't by crap.

I am looking forward to a walk on the promenade with my dog.

Eating in restaurants

Accessing the beach.

The promenade and the beach....and then the shopping and dining.

walking and eating

Pier and playing on the beach

I enjoy walks down there, going for a coffee or a meal. I would like to be able to terming my leashed dog with me. I now drive to Crescent beach in Surrey to do that!

Beach and Pier

Walking the Waterfront and eating at a restaurant.

It was the pier

I love to walk the promenade through out the year. I also like to browse the shops, unfortunately there are not many left.

Beach time

Beach & Pier

Promenade

Our favorite part of the waterfront is the beach. We also occasionally eat out or shop at the small book stores.

Walking along the ocean

Promenade, restaurants, beach, pier, pubs

We like walking to and from the beach on a variety of natural trails and paths. We enjoy taking in the natural beauty walking and cycling along the full length of the waterfront. We enjoy walking the loop to Coldicutt Park. We support nicer restaurants.

Memorial Park

Walking the pier and promenade. Patio dining.

walking on the Promenade (No longer go there since dogs are now allowed)

walking the promenade and pier , and eating out at a restaurant.

Walking the promenade and pier.

there is nothing else quite like it - it's unique, authentic, quirky, never boring but natural

walking the promenade

Walking the promenade and pier, eating in restaurants

Walking the Promenade

I love walking the promenade and the pier. Being close to the ocean is wonderful. People seem to be at their best when they are just out for a walk. I very much appreciate the absence of smoking, bikes and dogs. I enjoy being able to buy a parking sticker
Walking the promenade and pier

walking on the promenade and Marine Dr. sidewalk

the promenade and pier

east beach was the best before all the sludge appeared with the planting of eel grass. it is now too dangerous for me to walk by the shore line slipping numerous times. used to but the quality has diminished a lot
I walk the promenade and pier almost daily and frequent the restaurants and shops as well. No increased building height is welcome in this area at all!

Walking the promenade & pier, the beach, eating & bringing visitors there. Would shop there if there were better options. Would get rid of the tattoo parlours, & hokey little stores.
Being able to walk the promenade and pier plus we have about five restaurants we frequent.

Restaurants, beauty, water, green space

Walking the Promenade and Pier.

eating at a restaurant, paddleboarding, playing with dog in water

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q11 | What is the one thing you would change about Marine Drive that would make you go there more often to eat, shop, play and do business?

small playground or more family friendly restaurants

More free entertainment, small musical or theatrical events or themed happenings.

Stop development on the BNSF lands

One day month, no cars. Less traffic !

Inspect the restaurants for cleanliness and make them conform on close.

new buildings would encourage name brand restaurants to move down to the strip (Cactus Club, Earls etc)

I live on Marine Drive, so I'm there every day. If I could change one thing, it would be the cost of food/beverages at restaurants.

Needs a facelift, buildings look old and some decrepit. Empty buildings need to be rented out or pop-ups put in to fill the spaces.

Change the name of Memorial Park to something that more effectively represents the vibrancy and fun associated with a beach based park. Reduce the train impact, reduce the parking and make all parts of the Whiter Rock pier accessible to everyone.

Make it more people, pedestrian friendly, e.g. wider sidewalks, less parking along the water, and less traffic

No parking charge. It's Waaaay too expensive and is a major deterrent for me

More policing of loud vehicles and reckless driving

It's great as it is evolving.

Incentivize property owners to improve their facades. It looks dirty and weathered.

It needs to be more beautiful, to look and have the feel of Fort Langley or Steveston. It needs more diversity of stores. The 10 year plan, about seven years ago, was to eliminate the power poles. This would help in the beautification.

- make Marine Drive pet friendly -

Add a funicular from City Hall down Fir Street to Marine Drive

Make it more attractive. It looks rundown and dying

Dogs allowed on the Promenade year round.

More shopping, I guess. I think there are enough restaurants, but I never go to the beach for shopping. Maybe some incentives to fill the plethora of empty buildings with retail?

Improve sidewalks (create a village walk atmosphere) some spots already look good with hanging baskets benches try and make the whole area cohesive

more accessibility either by a trolley or some type of shuttle so I can park at one end

free parking for residents,

Not to allow business to be bought and never opened, to sit idle or to make rent so expensive that business cannot operate, City not to charge artists a fee to sell at the beach

Traffic free

More parking

better access by transit

More free parking for seniors

More variety in the types of businesses

When walking the west beach commercial strip it feels scuzzy due to all the vacant businesses (some of which have been vacant for over 10 years).

Besides being vacant most are in disrepair - old, crappy, and ugly. In my view these are very bad neighbours,

Make it a pedestrian zone only.

Different shops besides restaurants, allow a vendor to rent beach umbrellas, have owners update some of the restaurants with a coat of paint, flowers, new

awnings or outdoor furniture. Keep the beach area quaint, but if developed, low rise only

More shops that reflect a seaside sensibility,

make use of the empty storefronts

Remove traffic on Marine Drive between Johnson Rd and Vidal Street on Sat. & Sun. 9am-9pm allowing more street cafes, pedestrian activities and less traffic interaction with pedestrians, and less noise. Ban & ticket loud motorcycles and cars.

More businesses.

Ensure empty business places are leased and all store fronts tidied up and cared for.

Better restuarants

Eat

more things to do

enforce the signage bylaw - make all business owners keep their awnings/store fronts clean and in excellent repair

I go there very often as is, but I would suggest that the buildings (storefronts, restaurant, patios) always be kept clean and painted and flower boxes. The city should continue to put up window prints and outside furniture if their vacant.

I want to see more attention paid to the park maintenance aspects i.e the grass, trees, litter, washroom cleanliness, beautifying features such as flowers, lights and benches

Provide more parking spaces.

More opportunities for activities along the waterfront

Fully leased premises

improve food quality and value

Make the road car less during the summer months

funicular!

Get rid of the trains by relocating them. There is no future for Marine Drive and its businesses until we have full control of the waterfront.

Some type of parking incentive ie: a restaurant that validates parking whilst eating

Less cars, more sidewalk for entertainment, displays, restaurant patio seating

Rejuvenate buildings! Clean up litter. Marine Dr. is s mess!

More different crestuarants would be nice

I want more newer buildings some of them are a eye soar

Eating and icecream

parking especially handicap

More green space, less concrete

A variety of good food, established shops like the bathing suit store. Sidewalk along all of both sides.

Pedestrian friendly, quaintness, not new buildings, maintain the history,

Parking, parking parkin

widen walkways ,safe crosswalks with flashing lights

More restaurant

Unique businessws (not tattoos or Chinese restaurants

Train noise and traffic. ie. during one recent meal , three trains loaded with coal and other products went by.

More fun restaurants (pubs)

Nothing, i go fairly regularly. I love the new park and parkade -- think they were great additions

There is too much concrete around where grass used to be planted. It looks far too sterile, so planting clover instead of grass and planting more trees would help.

Better restaurants

I have WR parking pass, but I know many many people who don't live in WR who say they will not come to eat in our lovely restaurants or visit our beach because they refuse to pay all that money for parking, especially if they just want to go for food

I have the parking sticker so that's not a problem. There aren't many shops open these days (high rents? cost of parking? makes them close). More diversity would be nice 'cause once you've been there a few times, there's nothing new to see.

More artsy/seasides has like La Connor

Less cars, more variety of businesses

make it more accessible without having to use a car to get there

The area lacks cohesion - many stores need revitalising - tattoo stores next to restaurants, the buildings appear run down and unappealing.

eliminate traffic on Marine Drive, widen sidewalks, get rid of trains and tracks and do more plantings

Accessibility, parking, consistent quality of restaurants

Improve parking

Clean up the side walks...no dogs

complete the construction and support the businesses to be individualistic and a bit funky; support small shops, not just restaurants.

More and larger restaurant patios.

Better entertainment, that is things to do. Not just eat and drink. Also having more commercial and employment will improve viability of businesses in the off season

More free parking!

Have more variety in stores. Pay parking is a problem for many people. We have the yearly sticker which again has become far too expensive.

replant the trees that were demolished several years ago

more seating along the promenade

More varied restaurants on East Beach (not all fish and chips)

less construction

Wider patio, good mix of buildings..no high rises

Lessen the vehicle traffic. Too much noise and exhaust to enjoy it on busy days. West beach is a disaster on a warm spring and summer day. Too crowded with narrow sidewalks and too polluted on busy days.

More restaurants

Create an environment where businesses will stay on the strip. Currently every business i used to frequent has had to move in order to stay in business (Tea Shop, Saje, Book Store, many a restaurant)

Cheaper parking, more diverse restaurants

cheaper parking rates

Improve the drainage to avoid flooding , clean up the rats

Deal with loud vehicle noise, modified exhaust cars and motorcycles revving and cracking

It looks pretty bad and worn down. A lot of the buildings either need facelifts or knocking down and rebuilding.

Eating establishments that have adequate customer service and a half decent product

I would close it to motor vehicles and have a frequent shuttle bus moving people in and out. This frees up space for businesses to have patios, etc. and will solve the parking problems.

Parking needs to be more affordable and conducive to businesses staying open.

Develop a theme (ocean or railroad) as in Ft. Langley

More attractive businesses. East beach has turned all non shopping - whats left is trashy. West Beach too many restaurants and stores are trashy.

Nothing there one would want to buy.

more fun and interesting shopping for guests when they visit--more of a marine theme in signage and also showcasing First Nations history

A varied mix of businesses with pavement cafes and possibly the implementation of a one-way system for traffic with more sidewalk space created.

Accessibility and. Revitalize after storm damage. Finish the work on east beach

Cost of parking.

not sure

Restaurant owner attitudes! They seem to think they should be busy just because of location. NO! They need to offer GOOD food and GREAT value e.g. Sawbucks pub or Three Dogs Brewing. Creative menus and coupons/offers for local residents would help too better stores for shopping ladies clothing, high quality art stores, local artisan products

Having more special events and concerts

The City should compel the landlords to get businesses in the empty units. Are the taxes too high? Could the City rebate businesses to help them out from under the overheads?? And what's with the wires and poles in the middle of the sidewalks?

unifying theme with building facades - new, but made to look like old village

Such a good picture! Do we want to be a city by the sea or concrete?

Maintaining attractive buildings, like this blue one, that reflect and build, if you will, on the character of a beach town will help businesses thrive. Dogs on the promenade are great!

Work with the businesses.

More decent restaurants. Improving affordability so that good restaurants can move in and survive 12 months a year

Make the beach accessible for people with mobility issues.

The cost of parking is what keeps people going to South Surrey rather than the Beach....Especially now the parkade is open, there is space. Of course the fact East Beach has been almost impossible to find parking....that has prevented me from attending.
nothing to add

Redevelopment revitalize

Add a more diverse range of services and activities

Redevelop Marine Drive building to have a cool west coast beach town theme instead of a mish-mash of old run down buildings, some ultra-modern, some retro and everything else.
Parking Availability and improved public transportation especially during special events

Less construction

More retail gift shops.

Having actual shops. Not just tourist shops and restaurants..can only eat so many Gelatos

Wider Sidewalks on the commerical side

Free parking

I'm not sure. I don't care for crowds and often avoid this area at busy times.

Bike racks so I don't have to park a car

Live music, longer promenade, more activities like on long weekends,

Marine Drive needs a substantial overhaul in terms of cleanliness, power poles, incredibly tacky restaurant decks. The beach needs a theme and less mix and match of sidewalks, paving, curbs and fences. I hope artists can paint the yellow seawall curbs
Restaurant on the pier

Later business hours.

More parks, less concrete, no dogs allowed on Promenade.

Parking would be easier to access.

To many vacant storefronts. Work with landlords to attract small businesses.

more businesses, free winter parking

bylaw enforcement for dogs and not allowing business vehicles to use public parking. for example, surf boarding schools

Parking improvements

I'd arrange for transit between Marine Drive & Semiahmoo Shopping Centre (for parking) with stops along Johnston St

I have a parking sticker, and that would be an issue had I not. Restaurant s are varied and good. Shops are geared to tourists, and I'm not.

modernize the buildings and restuarants

Better quality restaurants. The ones we have tried did not have very good food.

more entertainment options (eg. string quartet; symphony; street buskers)

railway gone, possible 1 way for road to enable cyclists, skateboarders and pedestrians their own lane (rail removal would alter this opinion). allow for more beach activities similar to rental of boards and kites currently at east beach.

Lately the construction has been the biggest burden. Parking should be free in the winter to encourage business.

Would get rid of the tatoo parlours, and chinese tea places. they are very specialized.

It would be really nice to get rid of the cars but barring that just getting rid of the telephone poles, cleaning up the weeds and sidewalks, widening the sidewalk and not allowing the empty businesses to look so tacky.

Better design and hewer buildings

More space by relocating the railway line and plan upscale buildings and

restaurants.

Try to find a happy medium where both locals and tourists will want to go

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q12 | What is your favourite green space in the City? (e.g. Centennial/Ruth Johnson Park, Bryant Park, Coldicutt Ravine, Hodgson Park, etc.)

Our favourite is Centennial for the playground and treed area. Bryant Park is our most used park because of proximity to our place.

Coldicutt Ravine

Coldicutt Ravine

Rj Allan Hogg's park.

Centennial Park

Centennial/Ruth Johnson Park - love walking down to beach from there (gondola would be a great tourist attraction)

Ruth Johnston and Memorial Park

Centennial and Duprez Ravine

White Rock Promenade and Pier

Along waterfront, but it should be "greener"

Don't know

Ruth Johnson

Bayview Park

The new park space at the waterfront by the pier. thank you to the previous council for vision and determination to get it done.

Centennial Park

Centennial

Promenade area

Centennial park

Centennial/Ruth Johnson Park.

The only park I ever go to is Emerson because it is walking distance.

Centennial park

Centennial Park and Colidcutt Ravine

Bay Street Park, Ruth Johnson Park

The Beach, Centennial Park FYI there is no flat space for seniors or people to walk

They are all green

Centennial Park

do not have a favourite - we do not have enough green space

The promenade

Coldicutt ravine

The ravines.

Centennial Park

Hodgson Park

Ruth Johnston/Ravine

Coldicutt Ravine

Davey Park because it is relaxing area within the built-up city

Coldicutt Ravine

Road ends parks although they are often neglected. They are a White Rock treasure

Centennial

Centennial

hodgson park

Dr Hogg park

Ruth Johnson park and Generations playground

the ravines and walkways going from the beach to the town centre. However, the maintenance standards are disgusting and unkempt making for unsafe areas, loitering and drug dealing.
Centennial Park is nice.

Bryant Park

Each of the rights of way which connect the waterfront to upper White Rock

centennial

Centennial park, Coldicutt Ravine,all the road end right of ways.

Emerson park

Hogg Rotary Park - a little known green treasure in the city.

Ruth Johnson Park

Don't really have one.

Nothing specific

Coldicutt ravine

centennial park

Bryant park

all green space is important

It used to be the promenade until it became a concrete jungle

The beach of course and Ruth Johnson Park

I need. To visit these parks.

Coldicutt Ravie

bryant park

Centennial park

I don't go to the parks, but have enjoyed centennial walk through the woods to the beach

Centennial/Ruth Johnson Park

Memorial park

centenniel

My favourite green space s are the community gardens in Centennial Park.

Coldicutt Ravine, the former hump (before it was clear cut)

Centennial park

Centennial/Ruth Johnson Park

Coldicutt ravine

Coldicutt Steps

Coldicutt Ravine

Ravine coming down from Centennial/Ruth Johnson Park.

Centennial Park and Eva Bene Butterfly Garden

Centennial/ Ruth Johnson Park

Hodgson park.

Just walking from home to shopping and walking to beach

Hodgson Park

Promenade

Coldicutt Ravine

The Beach area

Centennial/Ruth Johnson Park

Centennial

Hodgson Park but Bryant Park has tremendous potential to be a link between residents and uptown. Understandably during construction Bryant Park is laying dormant right now.

Ruth Johnson Park Ravine

Bryant Park

Coldicutt Ravine

Centennial Park particularly the dog park, treed area around dog park and the ravine.

Centennial

It used to be little ones in and around east beach and central white rock neighbourhoods, but now a lot of them look terrible so hard to say. These need to be restored.

Mccaud, Hogg, Bryant, right in the city within walking distance. More like these in city center.

Davie Park

Centennial/Ruth Johnson park

Centennial Park Ravine (whichever it is that connects to Duprez)

Centennial

None

the ravine behind Centennial park

The Beach.

Centennial

Ravine - as its the only space that can be called green. We need to plant more trees not keep cutting them down.

Bryant Park.....keep up the good work and add even more.....

Centennail Park and Coldicutt Ravine.

Hogg park

Coldicutt Ravine

Centennial Park

Lane between condos on 1200 block between Merklin & Fir

all green spaces are great

Centennial park is nice with the new playground improvements

We love Centennial/Ruth Johnson. Please do not "improve it", leave it natural but just keep the trails maintained and safe for walkers.

Centennial Park

We have so very little green space, thin strips mostly except for some tiny manicured squares like below. I go to the Urban Forest, but White Rock has little space. I used to like Bryant Park but it is literally "overshadowed" by the new Bosa towers.

I used to be Bryant Park, but now there is the Bosa highrises. Worried if trees will survive.

the beach

Centennial

Centennial and that whole area is excellent. We need more park space. and larger trees.

Centennial and the Ravine

Centennial Park

Centennial park

The green spaces going down the hill to beach

No preference

None listed

I love to walk to Dr. Hogg park. Located on Buena vista ave.

Ruth Johnson

Centennial Park & the Ravines

Centennial

Centennial park and Barge park

Centennial Park

Centennial arena area

Centennial and Coldicutt are my faves. We are excited about the greenway project and wish it could go faster. Hope you can acquire more property to make this even better. The greenway should go all the way to the hospital so encourage planning now

Memorial Park

No favourite.

Centennial

Bryant Park

Centennial Park

Ravine

centennial/ruth johnson

No preference

Coldicutt Ravine & the steps down to Marine Drive

The ocean

the beach

the ravine that runs from the waterfront up to 16th. [Centennial Park?], Bryant Park

bryant park

right of ways (hillside walkways), centennial park, rotary park, EAST BEACH

All of the current green spaces are welcome. The problem is too much density. Too many high rises and not enough green space.

the green space by the waterfront and all green spaces around town centre

Centennial and Coldicutt Ravine

Centennial

Hodgson Park so far.

Coldicutt Ravine

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q13 | How would you like the City to increase our connection and access to nature? (e.g. planting more trees beside sidewalks, creating new public green spaces in our Town Centre and areas where new buildings are constructed, etc.)

The more the better. A big area in town centre would be awesome.

In general preserve trees when major/minor projects are being built. No more clear cutting whenever a new home or major development is approved. Plant more trees. such as at Memorial Park and along the promenade. Revitalize the Hump as promise and plant more
Bring back out beautiful Cherry Trees along Johnson Road

Create more public green space in uptown. Connect uptown with beach, more walking or vanicular.

Creating new Off-Leash dog park that is maintained and is a a model of dog parks in North America.

we need to give residents something to do in these spaces ex. Kent St park there is nothing there put in some swings or picnic tables

More trees

This picture is beautiful. You need that done all over the city. Uptown looking very sterile right now.

Connecting all the Park Areas with designated cycling/walking trails - preferably off the main roads. Publishing a walking trail map and making a land trail connection between East Beach and the First Nation parking lot at Washington Avenue Grill.

Increase number of small parks especially in high development areas such as the town centre. And as much tree canopy as possible along major streets such as Marine Dr and Johnston Rd.

New public green space

Yes

Build master planned live/work communities with integrated green spaces

The city is the size of a postage stamp. Quit trying to think you live in an urban Forest.

Improve access to the beach.

improve our rec centre

Not much room for any of that

More trees and benches to sit and enjoy.

All of the above.

I am never going to drive to a park in White Rock, so they need to be walking distance. If parks were connected somehow, that would encourage more hiking, etc. Partnering with Semiahmoo First Nations to make their spaces available would be good too.

Definitely improve sidewalks plant trees increase walkways in green spaces to encourage walk rather than drive

Creating new public green spaces in town centre where new buildings will be constructed

Planting trees beside sidewalk is NOT a good idea. Roots grow and push up sidewalks, trees are in the way of pedestrians.

More green spaces, less development, flat space where seniors to walk in greenery, there is none, I have to use Crescent Park in Surrey or the Park is so small you can't take a walk

Do not increase

Creating new public green spaces in our Town Centre and areas where new buildings are constructed

developing the street allowances into gardens and parks, protecting the wildlife management area on the beach

More tree planting

More green spaces

Green spaces in Town Centre are extremely important - they make you want to go there and improve the city's ambience.

Improve public awareness and education about our existing natural assets such as the Semiahmoo foreshore.

More trees, flower baskets, trees on the road islands and many more new

trees in new construction. Trees though should not impede views.

All of the above, as well as greening roofs.

Add to the public green spaces uptown

The wider, more open Johnston Rd is wonderful. it just needs more green space and plantings from North Bluff to Thrift.

More trees. Replant cherry blossom trees along Johnston rd. Was so beautiful.

Create more green spaces in the town centre and STOP allowing development where lot coverage is almost totally concrete, eg towers with assive podiums Demand more creative, environment and people friendly development. Set higher standards for creative gro

Trails

New public green space in town center

more green space in town center

new public green spaces in Town Centre/around new construction as well as having new trees planted on properties where new house construction has removed older trees

I like the plan for the new public square at Russell & Johnson. This will be a great addition to the Town centre.

Do not create any new spaces until you maintain and service what we already have!!!! You can easily create a better connection to nature by maintaining the unique hillside parks that White Rock is fortunate to have.

They are embarrassing to our community.

Incorporate green spaces with new development.

Yes, for sure

Increase the standard of maintenance for the rights of way. Develop and implement plans for each.

I hope there will be a path from uptown to centennial south of north bluff

Be sensitive to sight lines, especially by the ocean. Tall ornamental grass does not work.

New and more green spaces

The higher/denser the buildings, the more greenspace around them is required. More trees and more benches (with backs, not those stupid backless benches on Johnston) will allow the residents to enjoy these public spaces.

More park benches for seniors, but must be facing south.

More trees along sidewalks , public green spaces in our Town Centres with comfortable seating to reflect and watch the world go by .

Prune existing trees on city property

Yes more trails

more benches i have a hard time walking and need more benches

New public green spaces in town center

yes

Creating more green spaces within the city e.g. Russell and Johnston (now a car park)

The more green walkways the better. This means space beside buildings. Like Hodgson Park idea.

If possible, it would be wonderful to have trees planted that would equal the buildings' carbon footprint.

More green would be totally welcome

greening is nice but...regular trimming of bushes and trees ,to remove hiding and sleeping places,for our safety.

Plant more trees

More public green spaces between buildings

Keeping the trees to a reasonable height. There are too many Tall evergreens that block views and light.

More green spaces would be great

because of climate change with have a ethical imperative to figure out how to make our buildings and lifestyles more green and ecofriendly -- paying attention to this is essential

All new construction should include green spaces and trees. More community gardens would be welcome.

Maintaining and enhancing our existing parks and walkways

Creating green spaces & benches in town centre and where all the high rises are

More public green spaces, less concrete. More trees, bushes that change to beautiful colours in the fall, flowers in the spring. Benches in the green spaces.

New public accessible green spaces

More green space in the town centre so shoppers/residents have a great place to relax and the trees can purify the air

creating new public green spaces in the Town Cente

Focus on offsetting buildings so low rise next to a wide walkway with higher density off set to give allusion of space in the centre.

might be too late now but just adding more trees and open spaces

Planting more trees and creating new green spaces around new developments

More trees in the sidewalk.

Trees..love the flowers

all of the above

More green area

Pay more attention to the human scale design aspects of developments. Particularly social spaces for residents to form connections

More parks and public green spaces in the Town Centre.

Do more planting & MAINTAIN THE GREEN GARDEN AREAS.
PRESENTLY ALONG JOHNSTON & STAYTE STREETS IT OVERALL IS
PATHETIC.

new public green spaces in town center

Pocket green spaces at a people level. Maintaining access to sea views is
important.

Seriously? It can't be blank? Maybe I don't have an opinion on this one.

Improve landscaping and seasonal planting. Shabby and bland!

Create green areas in new buildings

Maintain and improve existing walkways on hillside by planting trees and
shrubs.

More sidewalks

Preserve old large trees as much as possible. Even on private property,
losing our old trees destroy the character of the city and it's happening at an
alarming rate. The removal of the Johnston road trees was tragic and that
street will never be the same

Public green spaces in center and around new buildings to possibly get from
one place to another through green spaces rather than streets.

Trees are great, but please don't plant trees to block views

New green space with new building

Clean up existng parks, boulevards, road ends and celebrate them before
adding new. City isn't maintaining what we already have. Make clear walking
routes throughout the City, add to sidewalk network for improved safety.

Really like the idea of more green spaces for the public, as we get more and
more tall buildings. The developers should include welcoming, green public
spaces in their plans

Stop spending so much \$\$\$ on Park Signage - this could have been done
considerably cheaper

planting vegetation, not necessarily trees, along sidewalks and buildings.
Trees have roots that can be very destructive.

Integrate natural elements into design of new developments

More public space

More trees, community garden in the City Centre or on City owned green spaces next to walkways going to the beach

Yes, creating more green spaces in all the above. More community gardens

To create more green spaces in the city centre area that are public access and working on the lower end of Johnston street to bring it into harmony with the newly developed upper end.

Less cement. Plant and water trees

Return the trees, make significant green spaces mandatory with development.

Creating new spaces in town centre--but keep building heights very low

Both examples above are valid... the more the better. Also use connecting green sections between parks, e.g. connecting to the Semiahmoo trail

trees and flowers are great

Having food trucks along Johnson st would be a fun idea

I think the City is doing an excellent job incorporating GS into the design around new buildings and keeping the existing GS up and looking good. (Except the Hump--we are losing the best views in the Lower Mainland--weeds/brambles/scrub brush!!

limit home and building sizes - we've lost too much green space to "monster homes" and high rises

All of the above, of course, but quit building towers. Buildings can fit into nature or stand apart from it. And don't manicure every inch of green space.

That's controlling nature, not connecting with it.

plant more big leafed trees, create more green spaces and parks

New green spaces in town centre and in/around five corners that are multi-user

All of the above!

We need more trees that are not just ornamental. The loss of trees in the past 2 years was so upsetting.

nothing to add

Plant trees

Utilize our road ends

Let trees mature. It seems like City crews tear out trees every 3 or 4 years.

No need to increase

More downtown

Yes, there needs to be mor green space.

Yes public green space and more walkable places

Continue to repair the sidewalks on Johnson Russell South. Enforce a new decibel bylaw to stop excessively noisy vehicles in the community. Monitor the progress of the contracted RCMP to patrol the streets at night versus a statuc reactive role

Yes

More green spaces with benches in the town center would be nice-be sure to include some trees.

ensuring maintenance is performed in existing parks

Maintain the city owned walkways that ascend from the waterfront to uptown. Most are overgrown and in poor condition. The walk away north of Cypress and Victoria once had a Children's play apparatus. Set on fire 4 years ago, removed and nothing since.

Connecting green spaces is the best idea for our small community. The trails, paths and parks should be connected as much as possible. Walking city is a great theme for us

Green the new park at Russell/Johnston

No increase needed.

More trees less concrete

Planting more trees in the town centre beside sidewalks, increasing public green spaces

All of the above.

improve / promote trails to waterfront

nothing

Planting more trees beside sidewalks

Plant more trees along Johnson St, keep on maintaining the walking paths throughout the City & down to Marine Drive

The city is doing well at this. it is a fact that tall buildings block the sun and that green things don't grow when covered with concrete

Connect uptown areas to beach area to allow all residents to use the waterside as their green space

All the above. Consider "greening" the buildings themselves with planted balconies.

more shade trees along sidewalks; preserving trees and natural habitats

What sidewalks? took 35+ years for Centre St south of Pacific. Require all new buildings to provide roof top and balcony green spaces. insure green space includes actual trees for shade. There should be greenspace all along trek down 152

There should be more trees planted beside sidewalks or wherever possible and also with any and all new construction. The trees that have been removed along Johnston road is a blight on our city
bike trails, walking trails and green space around new buildings

Your Green way path is a great idea and should already be in the works from Oxford to Everall as planned. It would be great to have it continue all the way to the hospital. All the street ends to the beach should be trees instead of weeds. should

More trees


Increase our connection thru walkways to Marine drive and Surrey green trails

trees planted of a larger size and variety not twigs

7/11/2019 06:07 PM

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q14 Do you agree with the guiding principle for the Town Centre?



Question options

● Yes ● No

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q15 | **Why not?**

The hights in the Town Center must come down to 8 to 6 storye

I agree with town square in the town centre but park no - lets improve the facility we have now. Maintain our rec centre and Centennial Park

I Would like to see less highrises that people can't afford and more like the Saltaire and the Royce

I don't see how it can be considered the economic center. I hardly ever go to town center. There are no store there that I shop at and instead I go to Granview Corners or the mall. I do go to Blue Frog Studios and the Theatre, and maybe a retaurant or two
Building are too tall and impersonal

Need to focus on filling up the businesses on waterfront. To many empty buildings.

I think heights should be reduced in town center and increased in the transition areas

More density should be given to the transition areas instead of having highrises in the town center

Not enough green space and too many high rise residents. It has lost its character

Does not work towards giving a feeling of space with design of buildings, lacks forward planning.

Rather have restaurants and shopping

Because there is no mention of employment. A primary means of reducing car dependence is local jobs see City of Surrey C35 by-law. At 1/3rd of the town center should be commercial. The podium of towers ought to be commercial and active retail at ground

The town center will be a concrete nightmare. Too dense for the amount of traffic the city roads support. We may not have enough water to support such density. Planting a few trees won't fix the environment.

It needs to keep buuilding heights very low

White Rock has a theme 'City by the Sea', but instead after all the highrises get built, it will look like every other suburb in North America. The town centre should have looked more like Ft Langley, only bigger and more shops for

non-tourists.

The proposed and existing buildings are way to high - it looks so out of place for this area. 8-10 flors is more than enough

In the 20 years since I've moved back to the area, White rock has changed from a small town with a community feel to a downtown construction site.

Much of the good shopping has moved further out with nothing to replace it.

There are few compensations.


too much concrete not enough charm

the increased density is destroying the neighbourhoods in and adjacent to town centre

What view towers block what was left. Great place like Blue Frog has been compromised. We are not Whistler or Yale Town don't need another art gallery or boutique. Attention not paid to actual shopping for locals daily needs.

Optional question (20 responses, 131 skipped)

Q16 Should creating new public greenspace be a priority in the future of the Town Centre?



Question options

● Yes ● No

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q17 | What do you think makes for a great Town Centre? What would make you more likely to visit, live, shop, and relax in the Town Centre?

We live on George Street on love the Town Centre because of walkability. Would like an increase of areas to relax and eat lunch mixed in with the shops of the Town Centre. Also we should encourage patio's for an increase on outside atmosphere.

More plazas with green space. A plaza surrounded by boutique shops , mini restaurants ,patios . Community meeting spaces,parks,childrens playground . Same as they do in Europe to encourage Community.

No Towers, nobody wants to come out to White Rock to sit amongst the towers.

Public spaces, less traffic, events.

A bylaw that taxes a shop owner for a shop that has been vacant for some time.

name brand stores and restaurants like Grandview Corners

Art, music, locally-owned shops.

Town Centre not welcoming right now. Has lost the seaside town vibe.

Concentration needs to be put on ground level with greenery, sidewalk cafes, pretty stores, think of La Connor or Ft Langley. You need a beautiful boutique hotel to keep visitors here

Underground parking that will help increase activity for local stores and businesses. A more vibrant and coordinated effort to draw residents of South Surrey to White Rock. Showcasing the cultural opportunities available in White Rock to draw more people

An area easy to park and enjoyable to walk, with a people-friendly feel, e.g. not feeling in a high-rise concrete jungle.

Easy parking, cool shops

Better parking, a grocery store

Pedestrian only village squares with retail front street animation.

get rid of all these one and two-story flat-roofed boring old wooden buildings that have been neglected. You have no room to grow out so you must go up.

Many of the existing building where the stores are located are unattractive

6/03/2019 07:30 PM

and uninviting

create underground parking spaces or above ground spaces and keep streets for people to be able to walk , shop, and relax.

All construction is completed

Nice shops, cafe's, pedestrian friendly and green space

More greenspace. A grocery store.

They need an anchor store that will encourage people to go there. Whole foods or the Bay as examples: something not at Granv. People will come for the anchor and then visit the other shops to walk around. A good modern movie theatre would be another idea.

Yes a variety of quality interesting stores mixed with essential stores

We need some anchor tenant like Buy-Low where you could run in and get groceries and not do the huge stores. We also need some more buildings with restaurants in the bottom and coffee shops. Also more parking available up there.

We need a grocery store and a couple of banks/credit unions

A variety of eclectic stores not big business, no franchises or chain stores a park with trees and art by more than just one mural artist on the walls of buildings, vendors on the street, local and foreign large public art biennale style, no smoking

Pedestrian Mall

Shops

places for people to gather and rest; smooth, even, safe and wide walkways; access to parking; safe, accessible pedestrian crossings

Uber

More shops, walkability and easily accessed free parking (parkade?)

The number, look, and ambience of the shops is most important, otherwise what is the draw. Some like the "old" look but I think they just look rundown and unappealing- in bad need of paint.They should look funky and attractive no more highrise towers

More small shops. A grocery store in White Rock is desperately needed.

Some spaces for stopping and enjoying a seat. There are great ideas in other towns that we can borrow - use narrow, unused places for mini parks where buskers can work, people can sit with their drinks, play games on table tops, etc.

Open, wide sidewalks and place to sit and enjoy the scenery

Get rid of all old derelict one-two story tall strip mall buildings within one block of Johnston Rd. Without their removal the upper town will never be accepted as a modern inviting place. Start with the building on the north side of Russell Ave.

Parking. There is very little and what parking is available is being used by contractors for the new buildings being built.

Green space, lots of trees, walkways and gardens between buildings, patios, independent small business, public art, bike lanes, creative architecture, less concrete, limit lot coverage with new development

More restaurants

Shopping

more amenities

less of the travel agencies, nail bars/salons and a more diverse type of businesses like W4th ave or Commercial drive

has to be accessible for everyone. The wider sidewalks and benches that have been installed are great for young & old. A variety of businesses, which the new Bosa building will bring.

walkability, outdoor spaces for the businesses, slow traffic, places for people to mix and mingle, space for buskers and entertainment, beautification such as flowers, trees and plant materials, public art and opportunity for local artists and musicians

Coffee shops and restaurants as well as stores.

Renewed structures and infrastructure. Residential density with significant public spaces.

A greater critical mass of shops and restaurants combined with increased emphasis on walkability and street life

coffee shops, stores, cafes that increase foot traffic

A good selection of planters, shops and cafes with outdoor patios.

Need to redevelop the older buildings

Wide sidewalks, lots of benches (like in photo), convince building owners to renovate building fronts (subsidies?), entice new independent businesses to locate in White Rock.

A mixture of vibrant shops, restaurants, green space and adequate and affordable parking, with time limits. Plus a strict limit on noise pollution by such things as leaf blowers and power washers.

More character needed -extended overhangs and striped awnings. No more boring flat overhangs. Peaked overhangs bring character.

More shopping options other than thrift stores, a small grocery store

People

i like that bench and wish there were more

More shopping and entertainment would be very nice to have as I really like to frequent the area and spend alot of my day there not just in and out

parking

More small businesses and affordable shopping areas.

I like shops under housing.

Benches, walking

the new shops are great and we look forward to the Mirimar II completion

good lighting ,good level sidewalks,senior accessability should be factored in to future plans.more policing for the town centre area and town square.

Parks and businesses

More shops and restaurants

More diverse shopping, from boutique to grocery stores, street tables at restaurants.

Restaurants, pubs, live music, special events

great shops, restaurants, coffee shops and places to hang out

There is a good variety of stores and businesses around the Centre, and it is a walkable area. More trees to soften some of the hard lines of buildings helps and the sidewalks are now much wider, making it easier for wheelchairs etc.

Low to mid-rise buildings with a look and feel of the west coast (similar to the Royce and The building on the SE corner of Thrift and Johnston

Shops, benches, love the cafes & little brewery pubs like 3 dog, they add to the ambiance.

Bring back some of the old stores that got pushed out. Deal's World, a favourite for so many - I still miss it! Buy-Low - there isn't a supermarket in WR (Nature's Fare too specialized & pricey). WR now looks like every other town, it's lost ambiance.

More shops; easier parking; restaurants

A communal area such as a Town Square and better transit

interesting stores and improving on the tired, tacky looking store front facades

The area on the photo above is a good example of what we would like to see.

traffic free and places to sit and people watch and eat and drink

The ability to easily access shops, restaurants, social houses

Live, shop, work.

Love the small shops

small inviting shops... very individualistic, a bit funky.

Restaurant patios

It it became a great place to work

More shops and restaurants

OVERALL A BETTER LEVEL OF STORES. NOT THRIFT STORES. THE CITY NEEDS SOME VIBRANT & INTERESTING MERCHANTS. SINCE WE HAVE LIVED HERE (20+ YEARS) WE HAVE LOST SEVERAL KEY STORES TO SOUTH SURREY. IN REALITY WE SELDOM SHOP IN WHITE ROCK.

less traffic congestion/constant building (detours, slow downs, cranes, mega height buildings)

interesting shops, street level residences and businesses, activity (restaurant patios, green spaces)

More restaurants and cafes.

Cohesive and themed landscaping, more sitting areas, more nature and less concrete

Good mix of retail businesses-

I live near the beach, I rarely have any reason to visit the town center. Maybe a mini granville island style open market may attract me to the town center. I'll visit entertainment venues like the White Rock Playhouse on occasion but Blue Frog studios

More atores

We've lost a great little record store. We need more small, original businesses, not just tacky mainstream shops. More focus on character or at least not losing existing character.

It's pretty good as it is. 3 dogs brewing is a great addition, more like this, bakery, outside seating at cafes

Love it as is

Small business, bakery , coffee shops (not Tim Hortons)

Not a dark tunnel between highrises (think a street back from Coal Harbour - no thanks). Incent varied heights so not all are at max. I don't come now with all the construction. Town Centre needs great transit access.

Again, many of the shops and buildings are dated and run down. The ones that are incorporated into the new buildings look great. I hope there's an opportunity for me to make a suggestion at the end of this survey!

Space with no cars - central plaza like European cities

Shops/businesses OTHER than nail salons and getting rid of the very outdated/old looking shops/businesses that currently line much of Johnston

Walkability! Having many residents focused here and major retail is a good idea.

Variety of shops

The Handpicked Home is a great example of what stores/buildings should look like. Take a look at Fort Langley and how they are rebuilding their town centre. It doesn't help that the highrise stores are mostly still empty and again lots of trashy businessse

Great question.....gathering spaces, greenery, coffee shops, affordable and interesting shopping, incentives for older building to tidy up and perhaps paint, lots of trees, perhaps a nautical theme, more benches.

Allowing small businesses to operate with reasonable rents that allow for a mix of business and add to the interest of the town centre. We really don't need more of the larger Starbucks etc companies that would make the town the same as any other.

Market is lovely And successful

Public gathering spaces, galleries, performance spaces, art studios, intimate cafés and small, ethnic restaurants.

more public spaces to relax, with an open sky, and construction not happening so much

A great streetscape at pedestrian level - shops and cafes (or green spaces) to look at rather than pharmacies; health care and "service" industry. Photo is a good example. Also cafes with outdoor seating interesting and a variety of stores, green spaces, very limited high rises that prevent enjoyment of the ocean views and bring too much traffic

I would like to see more big box stores in town centre as I'm always going to Grandview for most of my shopping needs

A cluster of vibrant businesses and restaurants would attract shoppers. Some of the old buildings and dowdy storefronts are Not exciting! I look forward to the new buildings and updating the place. walkability, wide array of unique, affordable local stores

This part of the survey is contrived BS. Yes, the town centre is the heart, and you cut it out! So little is salvageable. You have cut out real stores (e.g. Buy Low) and left us with those pictured above. This is your vision of heart?

Hands off the soul!

We should have shop that people need for day to day living, and they should be on the main street, not in an enclosed highrise shopping centre.

Diverse business - stores that cater to all age ranges and diverse populations. Micro green spaces - outdoor eating and relaxing areas.

I think paying attention to green space, public art, place making, shops that go well together, shops that increase walking traffic

We lost our affordable grocery store.....it was a community hive. We need something like it back..and easy parking

Shops pubs and restaurants

More stores

A diverse mix of businesses and services

More sidewalk cafes and interaction with public areas.

Parking

More social spaces

There should be more stores, the city should make it easier for businesses to set up in White Rock.

Walkable areas! North bluff and Johnson needs a pedestrian scramble crosswalk just like the one in Steveston. Hundreds of people walking around can not compete with the growing traffic.

Focus on the arts and accessibility

Community events, festivals, buskers

I think they need more shopping that is not boutique as well as interesting amenities such as art galleries ,local history museums, and definitely more green and garden spaces. Also, there should be some parking.

Nicer storefront like the one shown above - currently many of them look run down and tired.

Density, lots of people,shops, restaurants, theatre, destination for social and cultural activities.

The sales pitch for the town center was that we were trading height for bulk. Unfortunately, we got height and bulk as all the tall towers have a wide base that makes the town center dark and unnatural. Need more open space/more attractive pedestn. areas
More restaurants and a performing centre

Dense residential creating lots of foot traffic. Large variety of restaurants and useful retail (not Deals World for example).

More green space, less traffic, better access

Lively shops, restaurants and coffee shops with character - unique style.

Lots of shops and restaurants/puds, sidewalk patios not surrounded by monolithic towers.

greater density, amenities, more people... encourage more development and retail storefronts. improve the area around the KFC and develop the surface lots.

better shopping options and more variety

Vital and relevant retail and restaurants

Less construction traffic & noise. Benches & trees make Johnson more welcoming. I love the patios from the restaurants.

Grew up in Forest Hill in Toronto the village has remained a small town. Yorkville went from small town to upscale. I moved here because I like small town. I find myself going to Ocean Park now often, lately
side walk cafes

A variety of activities, restaurants, shops and services., places to sit indoors and out with sun and shade and weather protection.

more pedestrian areas and fewer cars; no smoking or vaping allowed

would have liked to see a permanent open market south of Thrift such as a mini Granville Island. Could have done my shopping locally and would be a tourist draw.

The high rises that are currently there should have never been approved and the citizens have clearly stated in the past election we don't want any more. I am in favor of responsible development that does not stretch our resources, but no more high rises.

wine bars, and restaurants with outside space like portland, cannon beach,

fairhaven in the U.S.


The brew pubs and their decks is a great start. The sales pitch for the towers was to create open space below but so far that hasn't happened. We got height and bulk when we need open spaces and sunlight.
People

Town Centre has to planed with open spaces inside and and green spaces outside. Inviting Public Place.

more craft brew houses and street food vendors

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q18 What principles do you think should guide the growth of the City? Check all that you agree with.



Question options

- New development should be located where residents can walk to shops and services
- New development should be located close to existing bus routes
- New development should result in new public spaces for the whole community
- New development should be required to upgrade the adjoining streets and sidewalks
- New development should be phased with growth in hospital services
- New development should not occur in White Rock
- New development should add employment space to the community
- New residential development should be focused on rental housing or other affordable forms of housing
- Other
- Existing mature neighbourhoods (i.e. mainly detached homes) should remain as they are.

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q19 | What other principle(s) do you think should guide the growth of the City?

New development should fit in with the needs of the residents of White Rock and not the developers or land owners.

Protecting renters.

new development should include public parking. A new development should be provided with incentives to include a new City Hall facility. Direct Access between the "heart of the city" and the "soul of the city" via a funicular or moving walkway device

Residential housing within a block of North Bluff road should be restricted to multi-family to reduce the number of driveway accesses.

New development should be located on North Bluff Road. Height allowed on our North Border and reducing in height as we get closer to Marine Drive.

Get control of offshore real estate buying and flipping and buying and flipping Ponzi schemes

Enough foreign investment, investors should work collaboratively with the community not dictate what they want, this is our community not theirs, seniors need safe, beautiful affordable housing we do not have that currently. Think community first.

Absolutely no building should be approved if the height of the new building exceeds the height guidelines of the OCP

Allow the town center transition area to remain under the current ocp density and heights and lower the heights in the town center.

The town centers transition areas should be the only areas where the densities should even be increased because it seems as they can handle the greater density.

new development should include some form of mixed income housing and affordable rental housing

new development should not add burden to traffic, view, water, emergency services, etc.

New development should, wherever possible, maintain existing view corridors and sun access. Bus routes can always be changed to meet residential needs.

Older rental buildings less than 6 storeys should not be demolished for greedy developers

Graduated height decrease North Bluff down to maintain the maintenance vistas as you travel through White Rock.

No more than 6 storeys on Russell, four on Thrift and no higher anywhere south.

No more new development until the existing ones are finished. If uptown Johnston & 16th is zoned 25 stories, why is the new RBC bldg allowed to be higher (as I've been given to understand, 26 or 27)?

Higher density housing to limit sprawl (such as allowing lane homes, encouraging rental suites, etc.)

The dwtn core should be pedestrian friendly with an accessible and intactive streetscape. The current development have no cohesiveness except the theme of more. White Rock Town Centre has no identity other than concrete All new highrises should have ground commercial space and office space second floor. Good for view from apts. should be interspersed so as not to block each others views, also not create closed sky look.

Do not build high rise on top of aquifers. Keep highrises in the city center and step them down as they develop on the hillside to preserve views.

While I checked off "should be focused on rental/affordable housing" that's not quite right. There should be a % of that new housing, which include subsidized/cheaper units within the building. And renters/owners should use the same front doors!

Strict guidelines that favour people benefit over profit

Height limits as shown on the plan above should be adhered to; developers should not expect an OK just because they offer to add something in exchange for a green light on additional height. New builds should NOT fill entire lots (e.g. no monster homes))

New development should not be higher than 8 in the town centre, each housing development should be required to have some social / subsidized housinghousing

Fire and ambulance service needs to be taken into account alongside growth. Does the fire department have the resources they need to fight high-rise tower fires?

Height should not be feared. It is the future and density will make it better and more attractive for new businesses and services to locate in White a Rock. Somehow taxes need to be lowered!

North bluff and Johnstone needs a pedestrian scramble crosswalk

New residential developments should include but not be solely built for rental or affordable housing. Developers should include all aspects of housing or contribute \$\$ Into a pool for affordable housing for seniors and families. City must then relax DCC's

Old structures need replacement at a moderate pace. WR looks to be growing faster than Surrey where we chose not to live.


Be creative with existing areas that will come up for demolition and rebuilding

highrises restricted to North Bluff; all other new apartment buildings 4-6 stories only; more duplexes and quadplexes; no megahouses

There has been too much development too fast. We do not have the resources e.g. water, hospital services to service this many residents. Development should stop and there should be no buildings over 6 stories tall in future.

Optional question (33 responses, 118 skipped)

Q21 | Current height guidelines allow for some variations in height according to the map above, and the OCP doesn't need to be am...



Question options

- Continue to use height guidelines in this area and allow for variation/flexibility without amendment to the OCP.
- Change the building height policies to have specific limits.

Optional question (147 responses, 4 skipped)

Q22 | Do you have further thoughts about building heights in the City?

I think our biggest buildings should be in our core. Growth is needed to support more business and I believe our Town Centre will improve with growth.

Building height should be high in the uptown area.

Town Centre and North Bluff should have the tallest heights and transition down to residential areas

I don't care, as long as height isn't allowed near the beach.

discover what building height limits or other incentives would motivate land owners to improve the marine drive area of the city

To maximize walk-ability density should be provided close to transit routes and on all sides of the Peace Arch Hospital.

this heights plan is terrific and a lot of thought and input went into it already. This survey and your effort is a waste of time. Shame on you for putting your staff through this again.

High rises bring in young people which we need in White Rock and new businesses. White Rock needs to embrace the 21st century.

Along 16th (East to West) higher buildings (25-8 stories) are fine as we are not blocking ocean views.

No

The tallest buildings should be above Thrift Avenue. The height of buildings should reduced as we go from that point down.

Please leave building heights in the town center transition as they are and lower them in the town center

Allow 6 storey building in the town center transition and lower building heights in town center to 6 stories all building should be 6 storey

Allow 6 storey buildings in the town center transition area and lower heights in the town center there should be no more high rises and just low rises in the town center and transiton areas no highrises or lowrises in the lower town center.

nothing above 4-6 stories below Thrift in upper WR

yes town centre should be 25 storeys like it has been for years and North Bluff should be same.

Allow for high density along the North Bluff corridor.

I would rather have less tall buildings than an ocean of condos. Look at Willoughby in Langley

I think they should expand the town center instead of keeping it so small

east of the hospital on North Bluff should have higher heights

pre approved developements should not be changed by the city council alone.

Not sure

i think it is a great idea to build up in the city centre and i don't agree with limiting building heights. in fact, we should be looking at further densification in other parts of the city.

I was horrified to see the skyscrapers which have been and still are being built here. I support the council's move to restrict the height of the Lady Alexandra development.

Higher density belongs close to transit and services in order to reduce vehicle traffic but increase accessibility

CITY HALL NEEDS TO DO A BETTER JOB OF SUPPORTING MERCHANTS. STOP MAKING PAY PARKING SUCH A PRIORITY FOR REVENUE. ACTUALLY I FIND WE OVERALL ARE A GREAT CITY BUT I'M FAR FROM CONVINCED THAT WE TAKE PRIDE IN MAKING OUR CITY A FRIENDLY PLACE TO VISIT .

Having tall buildings in the Town Centre, where there is access to transit services and shopping, makes a lot of sense and allows older White Rock residents to downsize from single-family homes into condos.

Consistency in decision making.

No change

Stop allowing mammoth homes being built on city lots , 3400 sq.ft. Home on a 3700 sq.ft. Lot. Insist on 25% of the property be green. Have roof lines designed to allow line of sight ,that is stop these excessively high boxes with flat top roof.

I laugh when people who have bought in a highrise complain when their view is impacted by another highrise! Their building took the view away from the people who were living there first, so they should stop complaining!

The tallest building (almost finished now) is as high as I would like to see.

Nothing higher than this one. If the tall buildings stay in the centre I don't have a problem with it.
Building heights should be higher along North Bluff Road

These towers have all happened so quickly and have taken quaintness out of our city.....how do we harmonize the old with the new?

Keep heights within reasonable limits as specified, but also allow public input on proposed developments in the town centre area. They must also take into consideration the toll on the existing infrastructure.

I like the current OCP where tall buildings go into the Town Center, creating nice accommodations, great views and a population for the revitalization of the town center.

I know many older (outspoken) residents of White Rock would love to put height restrictions on buildings. The fact is that the Lower Mainland is in a housing crisis and White Rock and we can't go back to the 1950's. We must build density.

Higher density on all of North bluff from 15200 to 16000 block

Only White Rock residents should have a say in OCP Public Hearings.
Developers should not be allowed to bus in supporters from other Cities

No

It doesn't appear that the map is accurate as a 13 story building is going up on North Bluff and Finlay Street.

There should be view corridors like Yaletown. A true downtown will have high rise buildings, gone are the days of a sleepy White Rock core. This is the 21st century and with our low tax base we must increase density in the uptown.
Design matters more than height - capitalize on views

Building heights along Johnston between Thrift and Roper should be higher than currently proposed.

if we can get more amenities (like the miramar community centre) then that's worth considering and better than setting a specific limit.

Building height should not be the focus here, the focus should be on viability with regards to the number of residents and accompanying traffic issues in this small area. Transportation and services need to improve at the same pace.

I think it is critically important to restrict higher buildings to north of Thrift.

i think the guidelines in the plan for the Town Centre are just about right. It is a relatively small area and therefore impinges little on adjacent areas. the tall

buildings define a urban core and create an alternative living environment
balance building heights for those already constructed that are high, have
taller buildings close by so they dont look out of place. also allow space
between for sunlight and green space, gathering areas, water features, etc.
Follow OCP Core area guidelines without any changes.

Optional question (50 responses, 101 skipped)

Q23 | Do you have further thoughts about building heights in the City?

Future maximum heights should be 8 stories in Town Center and transition down from there.

We are a small town people move here to be in a small town I do not want White Rock to turn into a soulless city of caverns, that is far from being desirable. It might turn into something to escape from. We should be promoting development that works with

A European vibe would have been better with 5-7 story, architecturally beautiful buildings built around a town square. With the tall towers being approved that feeling may not be possible now.

Do not allow for increased heights in exchange for extra funds from developers; In addition to building heights, it is also important to limit footprint in order to have reasonable space between buildings.

High rises restricted to Town Centre

16 story building should be located closer to North Bluff Rd - highest density should be permitted at our North border.

No more empty condos by offshore owners, restrict heights severely. How did we get 14 highrises and the other side of North Bluff Road got none? This needs to be investigated.

In the town center 8 stories and below Thrift 5 storeys

I don't believe the height should be beyond 5 or 6 storeys. Less if possible.

No building should be taller than 10 stories and be allowed ONLY in the town centre.

Yes I have thoughts, no more towers, they block the sun and create cold wind tunnels, the Bosa towers are a prime example, towers do not create community, and our resources are limited, parking, water supply are examples.

We are a view city. No one should lose their view because of a new development. Heights south of White Rock Elementary should not be any higher than 3 stories

4-6 stories maximum anywhere.

Building height policies should be strictly adhered to and the staggered heights of the current OCP respected

Views from current buildings should not be obstructed. Attention to light, airspace, parking, contributions to community amenities. No higher than the

tallest buildings that are currently in the centre. Obviously tiered as it moves down the hill to beach

i would limit building heights to 4 stories south of Thrift Avenue, unless there is an abrupt change in elevation which would not obstruct some views.

Uptown heights could be unrestricted. Johnston Road can be the attractive gateway between uptown/beach

Let's not shut out our sky with tall buildings. See Italy, and most of Europe.

Lower them

Limit the heights in the town center and increase density in transition areas

Enough is enough. Stop this mad over development of our city

Existing housing should not be negatively impacted by new builds south of thrift

As above

I applaud the current council for reducing the heights on lower Johnston

higher density on east side North Bluff Rd as it is the last street in white rock that is not blocking any views and minimal density in the core area

Keep the highrises at 16, don't impede anyone's view

Keep heights low in developments adjacent to established single family homes.

Mid-rise in the town centre, no more than four storeys in the lower town centre, leave mature neighbourhoods alone.

6 stories is high enough, no more high rises, our infrastructure can't take it. We lose our quaint town feel.

What is being built now are ridiculously too high, it has ruined WR. I HATE the Oceana Parc bldg. It's a blight on the landscape, as will be the Royal Plaza one.

no more highrises south of north bluff road in streets that are not in the city centre

in the past leap frogging of developments permitted higher limits in buildings than the surrounding buildings. this smacks of corruption and should not be allowed.

I think the building heights should blend with the neighbourhood better.

These tall buildings that stand alone do nothing to enhance the neighbourhood. Other developments such as on Thrift near Oxford enhance the neighbourhood, not just a tower.

I like the current height limits to new builds

maximize opportunities for views... the beach is the asset.

No

Stop being height sensitive and be more focused on better ground plane. Let design determine height.

Keep the new buildings 3 stories high and no taller. Ruins the feel of Whiterock with the tall towers like downtown Vancouver!

Our beautiful city by the sea is starting to look like a concert jungle (west end) and we are not suited for that - too much traffic congestion & ugly looking high buildings!

Why does White Rock need highrises when south surrey manages to keep their developement under control. Ocean Park has maintained its character without 25 story monoliths. The planning of these buildings has been atrocious. A 25 story condo south of an 8

Highrises destroy the character of the city and we are not building enough proper infrastructure (transit, roads, parking) to support to growing population due to highrises. It's just benefitting developers but not existing residents. More residents the better so higher the better with commercial/office space on lower floors. And properly interspersed with existing low rise and single homes.

Future bldgs max 6 stories within the town and 4 outside the centre.

Towers below Thrift should not be permitted. View protection and creation of view corridors like Vancouver has should be a priority. No more zero lot line variances should be permitted if building is sited to highest point on lot as it inflates height.

4 storey to max of 6 - look West Broadway MacDonal to Alma where old buildings are replaced with reasonable height buildings. Or Fort Langley Town Centre.

Six storey maximum, with great care to maintain view corridors for existing residents and to NOT create dark wind tunnels that deter walking, sidewalk cafés, trees and other natural plantings.

I've always liked the current OCP idea of lower heights radiating out from the core... it's visually coherent and explainable. These should be set as the absolute height limits. No exceptions. Ever.

no more high rises should be considered in any area, 4 story limit in town center

no buildings taller than 10 stories anywhere in White Rock

Stop building ugly towers. It isn't just about height, but height tends to be the issue. Also, your idea of sidewalk and road upgrade is to kill anything living and cement over it. The tower mentality fits with this perverse view of "upgrading".

The question above should have given the current height guidelines. It sounds like it is constructed to get an answer the writer wanted, not to see the views of the citizens.

No more High Rises ...please. Buildings like Saltaire are acceptable. WR should look like Grandview village...not downtown Vancouver. It's totally lost it's charm and appeal. Please STOP!

They are too high

Keep tall buildings downtown. Not beside the hospital.

The more high-rises there are, the higher they will become so the new buildings have a view. This creates wind tunnels and quite a "soulless" feel to the city. I see no improvement to the quality of life for current residents-only a deterioration of life.

We need to have a plan on heights and then stick to it. Very concerned that the random approval process will ultimately be an eyesore that can't be reversed. A tall core and significantly stepped down perimeter makes sense to me.

no higher than 3 stories

There should not be any buildings above three storeys in height south of Thrift Avenue.

Condo towers such as Soleil are totally out of character and scale for Whiterocks town centre. You don't see this happening on the Surrey side of 16th.

Building height do not concern me if the developments are within the OCP maximum height and are tastefully done

restrict buildings to 4-6 stories except along North Bluff.

In the past I agreed with the bubble format for development in White Rock north of Thrift it made sense. This has been bastardized since its inception. Residents now have their hands tied with the precedent setting Bosa 10+ year plan - more to come


Building heights should not exceed 6 stories in most cases

What your OCP shows makes sense but that is not what the variations have

allowed such as 12 stories across from White Rock school and the tall ones in process and planned for Oxford and Thrift. Once the look is ruined there is no going back.

Optional question (63 responses, 88 skipped)

Q24 | White Rock does not have significant vacant land where new dwellings can be located. In order to accommodate future develop...



Question options

- Existing older commercial properties with surface parking lots (Town Centre)
- Existing older apartment buildings being redeveloped to a higher density
- Existing detached homes being redeveloped to a higher density
- Primarily in surrounding communities instead of White Rock
- Other (specify)

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q25 What other types of locations do you believe are appropriate for redevelopment?

White Rock that we will never have due to the fact we do not have the population nor the land mass.

My biggest concern is losing my current AFFORDABLE rental. We love where we live (Silvermoon 1081 Martin). I fear every day that it will be knocked down for \$1 million condos, which I cannot afford.

I think all three of the first choices above should be incorporated into the OCP

Surrey

No more towers, create living space and detached homes four plex with garden space or park create beauty and community, the last thing we need is more density in White Rock

I don't have enough info to answer just one.

laneway houses, develop reasonable height in town centre when adequate transit and schools available

Pretty much everywhere provided that it fits in with a sensible and cohesive plan.

This statement and the choices assume that density has to increase which is already an incorrect premise. So, older apartments do not need to be redeveloped with higher density. Same goes for the SFH areas.

Existing commercial parking lots should not be used for housing but bringing in arts theatre/unique attractions.

Creative duplexes/ town homes that fit into neighbour hood. No meg impact for neighbours.

If larger homes on large property, , using same footprint, multi units, off street parking

this question is formatted poorly in that i can only chose one answer -- i would say a, b, and c

No more

We didn't buy here and pay high taxes to find ourselves in the west end of Vancouver. please stop this over development.

keep future development to a very low minimum

I'm not against "development in White Rock. I'm against your view of development. Look what you have done! Hands off our town! Either get with the "city by the sea" theme or get out.
Why does White Rock need all this development in the first place??

All along north bluff road 15200 to 16000 block


Do not fear height or density anywhere in the City. Towers, midrise and duplex, triplex and coach homes should all be allowed and encouraged throughout the City
I agree with both 1 and 2 and along North Bluff

Why is this a choose one question? 1 and 2 are fine. The third is fine if it is on the perimeter of the core.

The hillside could be redeveloped in a more imaginative way with the elimination of sideyard setbacks but with a variety of pedestrian axes through projects in the manner of some European hillside towns.

Optional question (23 responses, 128 skipped)

Q28 Town Centre



Question options

● Detached (i.e. "single family") and attached (duplex/townhouse) homes ● 1-2 storey commercial buildings ● Low-rise
● Mid-rise ● High-rise ● Additional comments (optional)

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q29 | Do you have any specific comments about your preferred location of building heights and types within this area?

The buildings in the Town Center need to be 6 to 8 storey.

underground free public parking plus a new city hall combined with a high-rise should be a priority

High rise on North Bluff Rd in the town centre - low rise in the south portion of the town centre . We should allow highest density on the North border of our city (North Bluff Rd.) and minimal density to the South border of our city by the water.

No more towers, create community

We must ensure we have sufficient emergency management plan and services to support any new buildings.

Ensure that existing views are not dramatically impacted and ensure significant greenspace

Four stories fronting on to road increase to mid/high rise offset on same property, giving a feeling of space while increasing density.

All allowing for commercial space and rental homes

difficult to determine due to existing high rises

I support the new council reviewing developers insistence on huge high rises

Ok, I'd have been happier if all development was capped at mid-rise - there are some attractive communities on that model but we already have high-rises here so if high rises have to go anywhere it should be here
There are already too many towers, so keep the heights low. I don't trust you or the "developers" considering what you've already done.

Do not limit the height

preferably high rise but not generic


I'd recommend mid-rise buildings with a combo of commercial & residential portions

Build out what is envisioned in the OCP for this area. Let the people who live

in or immediately adjacent to the Town Centre decide on it's future rather than the anti high-risers who do not live there. Offset with green space and 1st to 3rd fl. ret/serv

Optional question (16 responses, 135 skipped)

Q32 Town Centre Transition (West) - North of Thrift Avenue between Oxford Street and Martin Street



Question options

- Detached (i.e. "single family") and attached (duplex/townhouse) homes ● 1-2 storey commercial buildings ● Low-rise
● Mid-rise ● High-rise ● Additional comments (optional)

Optional question (149 responses, 2 skipped)

Q33 | Do you have any specific comments about your preferred location of building heights and types within this area?

same comments as town centre

No more towers

high-rise along 16th and mid-rise below 16th mixed with detached and low-rise

I ticked high-rise, but this area would have a transitioning height from 25 at North bluff down to thrift

instead of having so many towers in town center why not increase the density in this area .

All allowing for commercial space and rental homes


around 5 to 7

high rise along north bluff only

the proposed transitions in height and density are appropriate.

Optional question (9 responses, 142 skipped)

Q36 Town Centre Transition (East) - North of Thrift Avenue between George Street and Best/Hospital Street)



Question options

● Detached (i.e. "single family") and attached (duplex/townhouse) homes ● 1-2 storey commercial buildings ● Low-rise
● Mid-rise ● High-rise ● Additional comments (optional)

Optional question (151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q37 | **Do you have any specific comments about your preferred location of building heights and types within this area?**

same comments as town centre

No more towers

high-rise along 16th and mid-rise below 16th mixed with detached and low-rise


All allowing for commercial space and rental homes

around 5 to 7

the existing OCP is good

Optional question (6 responses, 145 skipped)

Q39 Lower Town Centre / Urban Neighbourhoods (south of Thrift Avenue)



Question options

● Detached (i.e. "single family") and attached (duplex/townhouse) homes ● 1-2 storey commercial buildings ● Low-rise
● Mid-rise ● High-rise ● Additional comments (optional)

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q40 | Do you have any specific comments about your preferred location of building heights and types within this area?

Mid-rise to Roper then low-rise below

No more towers


keep mostly residential buildings as detached and low rise condos/apts except on Johnston Rd where it can be all mid-rise to 6 stories max, residential over commercial on both sides of street
I ticked mid-rise, because high-rise is 12+ storeys. But I feel 12 storeys is fine for Thrift - Roper then down to 4 below that

All allowing for commercial space and rental homes

Please kill the Oxford at Thrift water lands high rise if at all possible. It doesn't belong there, especially at the crest of such a steep hill where additional traffic is problematic.
around 5 to 7

Optional question (7 responses, 144 skipped)

Q41 Peace Arch Hospital District - The existing hospital area including the Peace Arch Hospital Foundation parking lot on Vine ...



Question options

● Detached (i.e. "single family") and attached (duplex/townhouse) homes ● 1-2 storey commercial buildings ● Low-rise
● Mid-rise ● High-rise ● Additional comments (optional)

Optional question (148 responses, 3 skipped)

Q42 | Do you have any specific comments about your preferred location of building heights and types within this area?

No more towers

All allowing for commercial space and rental homes


Possibly mid-rise if transitioned well down from hospital.

around 5 to 7

More medical services

Optional question (5 responses, 146 skipped)

Q43 Waterfront - Marine Drive from Oxford Street to Stayte Street, and immediately adjacent areas



Question options

- Detached (i.e. "single family") and attached (duplex/townhouse) homes
- 1-2 storey commercial buildings
- Low-rise
- Mid-rise
- High-rise
- Additional comments (optional)

Optional question (148 responses, 3 skipped)

Q44 | Do you have any specific comments about your preferred location of building heights and types within this area?

Nothing higher than 3 storeys.

Absolutely no towers

residential over commercial(must have good commercial space) - and please develop a continuity of design or theme

Three to four storeys

Including dedicated rental homes


Very low rise please, no higher than freeport/whatever its called Muffler shop condos. Please listen to neighbours as view impacts are critical to all our shared property values and piece of mind for anyone making their home in White Rock for the view.

Midrisers should incorporate ground/lower levels with commercial or business uses

be creative possibly making 3 single family homes into a four unit townhouse.

Optional question (8 responses, 143 skipped)

Q46 West Side - West of Oxford Street



Question options

● Detached (i.e. "single family") and attached (duplex/townhouse) homes ● 1-2 storey commercial buildings ● Low-rise
● Mid-rise ● High-rise ● Additional comments (optional)

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q47 | Do you have any specific comments about your preferred location of building heights and types within this area?

The only building should be single housing units. Detached (i.e. "single family Only")

same as town centre comments

No more towers

keep the same buildings as is now, max 4 stories. possibly commercial developement on 16th only

The houses should have to be occupied. Building size should be proportional to the lot and allow for green areas around the lot

All allowing for commercial space and rental homes

Possibly some 3-4 storey low rise and townhomes only along North Bluff though.


Keep the high-rises up by North Bluff Road, so that the most people can have the most view.

around 5 to 7

low rise on north bluff at major intersections only (near transit) - can also be used for retail convenience stores, etc.

Optional question (10 responses, 141 skipped)

Q48 East Side - East of Centre/Best/Finlay Street, north of Marine Drive



Question options

- Detached (i.e. "single family") and attached (duplex/townhouse) homes ● 1-2 storey commercial buildings ● Low-rise
● Mid-rise ● High-rise ● Additional comments (optional)

Optional question (151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q49 | Do you have any specific comments about your preferred location of building heights and types within this area?

Detached ("single family Only")

same as town centre comments

No towers

keep the same buildings as is now, max 4 stories. commercial developement on Russell/ Stayte only

this area is quite large, so single family, duplex, townhouses north of marine, but closer to North Bluff & Stayte is would say you could do low rise 3-4 storey maybe 5-6 depending on project.
Dedicated rental homes

Some low rise ok but only along Stayte and along North Bluff


around 5 to 7

low rise along north bluff only and potentially on stayte

you have made the East Side from 16th to Marine Drive and worded this in reverse from all other questions. WHY?

Optional question (10 responses, 141 skipped)

Q55 What ideas do you think would be appropriate for making housing more affordable in White Rock?



Question options

- Allowing more forms of secondary housing on a single property, such as coach houses
- Allowing more forms of secondary housing on a single property, such as suites within duplexes and triplexes
- Allowing rental housing to be developed on institutional (i.e. church-owned) property
- Using City-owned land to help create new affordable/rental housing
- None of the above
- Encouraging more rental buildings in the Town Centre

▲ 1/2 ▼

(151 responses, 0 skipped)

Q56 | Do you have any other suggestions for making housing more affordable in White Rock?

Encouraging development will help keep prices lower. The development of Grandview has kept prices much lower in our area compared to how much nicer South Surrey and White Rock are compared with our surrounding area. Start somewhere. There have no affordable housing units approved in teh last 10 years.

Please we need to join Surry now. We will still have the same goverment employees and our council.

White rock is too small to be concerned about affordable housing ..

Due to the popularity of the distance from the ocean and views White Rock is not going to be affordable for the average family. We should not try to correct this.

Supply and demand we need more stock prices will come down

Again, my biggest fear is a developer knocking down my affordable rental apartment (1081 Martin St., Silvermoon), to build condos. Please protect our current renters, I don't want to be pushed out of the city.

provide progressive, flexible but strictly enforced regulation of AirBnB spaces in the Community. Increase taxes and/or encourage rental of unoccupied residences and commercial spaces in the community

Consider a streamlined and less expensive process for approving and facilitating the development of cost-efficient housing.

This is not a municipal responsibility and you are inviting downloading. Be careful what you wish for.

This is not a priority

No. Thank you for asking.

Stop offshore owner empty condos and offshore owners flipping. In Australia, and offshore owner CANNOT purchase a new residence.

No

My suggestion is community based construction, triplex, duplex, apartments that look like houses, no more concrete towers

Reduce permitting times

townhouses are a good solution to increase density. Most families do not have time to work on yards and gardens these days anyway and townhouse allows for home ownership without burdensome yardwork.

No

The number of run down rental house in WR has increased exponentially over the last few years. I believe improving and maintaining existing neighbourhoods should be the OCP's #1 priority, not housing affordability. Allow more hi-rises to be built and mandate a healthy % (25??) must be for affordable rental housing. We have a small land base and must go up, up, up!

No, I do not

not at this time

Tax vacant properties

Allow greater densities in the town center transition area instead of allowing highrises in the town center make them all low rise buildings up to 6 stories

Allow 6 storey buildings or higher in town center transition areas

give developers density bonuses for rental units

allow more variances to developers in Town Centre in exchange for affordable housing

Requiring all developers of certain value or size to include affordable housing units as part of the development, or contribute to a fund that can be used to subsidize affordable housing units in specific development areas.

Allow market rental housing projects mixed with affordable housing.

The houses on Semiahmoo Ave shown in the photo are not 'triplex'. They are attached strata townhouses. So, in such a questionnaire, 'duplex' and 'triplex' need to be defined.

Dedicated rental housing should be restricted to the east and west fringes of the city. Ocean view property should continue to reflect market values, as is the case all over the world. House sizes should be restricted to allow local residents to afford

No

give developers incentive for having more affordable housing

Educate the greedy developers about our city politics

It is currently affordable. Town houses.

Co op rental properties with off street parking

buy out older apartment buildings or old condos, and refurbish them for low rental accomadation.

12 to 15 story high rise buildings with affordable components built into it (5 to 15 % of building be affordable housing.

I do not think the city can do anything about affordable housing, todays real estate market doesn't allow for it. If we allow rental suites - where will they park? Parking is always an issue

Nope

No new development unless 1/3 is affordable rentals

Housing is primarily a matter of supply and demand and realistic expectations. Already we see movement towards lower prices and more affordable options. Rents have moved down in the last six months. People should be aware of facts - not their preferences
Add more new rental buildings.

trade density for affordable affordability problem is more a supply issue than anything else. Simply increase supply!! Keep in mind over 5 million square feet of living space is likely to be created when Semiahmoo Towncenter is builtout

Allow duplexes, townhomes and 3-4 storey apartments in single-family areas. Right now, there are huge, monster homes built on single lots in East Beach area that are almost as big as an apartment. A bit more density would make housing more affordable

It's not just about new affordable housing it's also about being able to afford to live here. Many live on a fixed retirement income but may not be able to stay here due to the escalating costs. My overall property taxes in 2019 went up 8.7%.

Give developers incentive

There is no need for the city to create 'affordable' housing in White Rock. The market will decide the prices, government does not need to step in to create affordable housing, it doesn't work and should not be a priority.

White Rock has not been affordable for years. Surrey is.

Join Surrey to reduce taxes

Please be very careful considering coach homes, 2 suites etc. We have homes with 2 illegal suites in our neighbourhood and it makes a parking mess as well as noise issues.

NO

Work with BC Housing, CMHC, and other players who are working to introduce affordable rental into our neighbourhoods

Grants from government.....for seniors in particular

In general this shows that you are listening to the community and open to suggestions.

Another great example in the photo above of what I like... rather than approving monster homes, I'd prefer to see multiple separate residences such as these townhouses

It is a beautiful city by the ocean, it is only normal that housing costs are higher due to the fact that many people want to live here.

Parking is key in any secondary suite situation--bylaw or Planning needs discretion here. Second suites in an owner occupied home should be OK too if parking availability exists.

Do not sell any city land. Buy it if you can and lease it. This gets rid of speculation and encourages real development.

The developers should build rental housing and provide some of those apartments to be subsidized housing or much lower rent.

Stop removing the existing rental housing to building large footprint projects where single family or older apartments once existed. I know that's not easy. People should not be removed like cattle.

Keep lands identified in section 11 as affordable housing zone

Improve the City's plan approval process. It needs to be shortened and less risky.

White Rock by nature is one of the most expensive cities to purchase a home. I would be careful on how much resources the City can actually contribute, as it would take much more than the City can handle to make a meaningful difference in affordability.

Taxes are very unaffordable. Increase density so the tax base is broader so that middle and lower class citizens can afford to live here.

I don't believe the city can have much influence here. Any policy will only subsidize a select few while the majority have to fend for themselves. I do agree with protecting current renters from demoviction by making the developer responsible.
stop development of condos for the rich and for investors.

No

increase supply and density


White Rock will never have affordable housing unless it is government funded. The demand is too high and the land supply limited. I do not believe in government subsidy for tenants, give tax breaks to investors.tors
Public acquisition of existing old low-rise properties in need of upgrading could possibly provide more affordable housing at less cost while improving neighbourhood character and amenities.
probably

There is a significant number of developments that advertise "lock and leave" condos. These are typically foreign buyers who don't live here and drive up the costs of living. We do not need new developments of condos most people can't afford.
No foreign buying. Canadian residence required to purchase property.

Keeping the old stock of Condos we have now and not allowing demovictions

Optional question (75 responses, 76 skipped)

Q57 Do you currently use transit on a regular (weekly or more frequent) basis?



Question options

● Yes ● No

Optional question (147 responses, 4 skipped)

Q58 Why do you not use transit more frequently?

Not available in areas where we travel.

Retired and poor service in East Beach.

doesn't go to Langley where I work

I drive

Drive mostly locally

Not enough frequency of community buses during daytime hours. Not enough frequency from Bridgeport to White Rock after 10 p.m. should run at least every 30 minutes until midnight especially when major events occur in Vancouver

Use my auto which is more convenient where I live.

Need of a vehicle for work purposes

I'm happy to drive my car.

Too difficult to get around the city. Do not commute to work. Like to walk.

I drive a car.

Yes

Not convenient. I would use the Community shuttle more if it ran to Marine Drive later, but it stops running while the restaurants are still open, so I drive.

Live and work in White Rock so either can walk or drive.

I don't need to travel out of White Rock and when I do I drive my car.

Translink cancelled the one bus I took into Vancouver

No need

I am still able to access shops and services by walking

Walking distance

It is not convenient for what I need

It basically takes too long, and often is not convenient for where I am going.
EG. Fraser heights or cloverdale rec centres.

I have no need. I walk almost everywhere, and take transit to Vancouver, on the rare occasions I go.

Don't find it convenient; timing and bus stops locations

takes too long to get around therefore I drive.

Bus doesn't run during time go to work.

retired

Takes too long

walk uptown or to waterfront, use car

Live and work in White Rock

I am retired and walk most places locally. I use transit when going to access services or friends in other municipalities.

Due to inconvenience.

No need

Retired and use transit occasionally to go to Vancouver

I prefer to walk or drive often with a dog

I prefer the convenient of using my own car

Car

Inadequate service along Marine Dr.

I walk everywhere

Walk to most shops and restaurants we go to.

Do not drive often, but go distances when I do.

Our walk score is awesome, so we don't usually require transit

Drive vehicle

I walk or drive

walk or drive to where I need to go. I work 5 minutes from home and the bus would probably take 30 minutes.

Drive car

The buses do not come very frequently.

Spouse has mobility issues. Mostly just drive locally

I am retired and shop close to where I live

The more convenient the more transit is used. Since retiring our needs for transit is reduced.

frequency of service and crowded busses

Most of my travel is to South Surrey and not convenient to transit

Long commute.

We walk

I drive to where I am going in White Rock and south of Vancouver

Still able to drive

No Transit in my area?

LACK OF CONVENIENCE. CAR IS EASIER. IF WE WANT TO GO TO 24 AVENUE SHOPPING AREA WE DON'T HAVE A CLUE AS TO THE ROUTES.

no need

Lack of mobility and accessibilty. Physical effort and time it take to get any where

Too expensive for the short trips that I would take. I can walk to most places or drive if I need to pick up groceries.

I used to commute downtown everyday but the buses were completely unreliable and problematic most of the time so I drove. Now I work from home because commuting is not feasible given the current system.

Way too expensive!! 6\$ a day to go around town, more than car insurance and gas per month.

Not convenient to where I go when I'm not walking

Rapid transit to the parknride. White Rock has been left in the cold and it has hurt us. Evergreen line should have been here, not Port Moody. Can't get kids to Universities from here, landlords can't get employed tenants as no jobs here/crap transit.

I walk, or drive. I feel insecure on buses.

Retired, I have a vehicle

No need to. I work full-time and drive to work. I only use transit if I have to go into Vancouver.

Family

Work location - bus travel takes too long. Once retired I plan to sell the car and take transit.

Usually just stay in White Rock, South Surrey

I drive everywhere.

I use car

Inconvenient. Stops not close enough to home, too few buses.

I need flexible travel outside of White Rock South Surrey to meet my personal needs

It's easier/faster to use my car for the trips I need to make

I am retired, no need to... I walk to most places

It's not rapid transit

Easier and more functional to my work and schedule to drive my car.

I can not take my dog on the bus.

My workplace is in Burnaby and take too long to transit 1.75 hours and 3 connection (bus, train, bus)

My job is local.

I can still drive and transit is not frequent enough to make it appealing. I have family members who use the 351

I walk where I can and cycle and use my car as is convenient

Not convenient for my needs

no need.... I live, work shop and socialize all within White Rock.

Not required

Not needed

NA for my Job

Traveling with small children

It would take me two buses and three times the amount of time to get to work as driving does. If transit stops running the 351 west of the town center, it would be even more cumbersome.

I work close to where I live

poor and lengthy routes to Skytrain

Does go anywhere near my work

Not convenient.

too much traffic. Faster to go by car.

I walk or drive

Not practical.

I telecommute / work from home

employment requires vehicle and connections to skytrain are too slow and cumbersome when I might want to take it for personal use

I use my car for business transportation in the local area

It has not been part of my lifestyle for the last 50 years.

Retired.

walk most places locally and do not travel outside of white rock very often

have to drive FOR work

Bike, walk. Not direct routes.

I am able to walk every ware in this city,and use transit to the airport. I drive to the other cities. ort

Optional question (106 responses, 45 skipped)

Q59 What would make you more likely to use transit?

I work in Surrey Central and share a car with my wife. I would increase my transit use if the busses were faster to the destination and I think more bus only lanes would do it.

Yes

Better service.

better routes

Nothing

Nothing

express bus access to Surrey Central from Park and Ride on King George.
Non-stop 351 service from Park and Ride to Bridgeport. Parking facility and
Direct bus service from 8th avenue and Hwy 99. Direct bus service to the
beaches from Park and Ride at KG
More frequent buses near where I live.

Better frequency, comprehensive routes

Better connections

A SkyTrain down King George to 8th avenue. That won't happen until you
approve more density for this.

Express service from Surrey Central to White Rock

Not having to stand up going into the city at rush hour. More capacity during
peak periods

Frequency

Make it more convenient: more stops, more access

If a continuous bus service ran from east to west and back again on Marine
Drive.

Not much

Bring back the non stop bus to Vancouver

Nothing

More routes, times, capacity

better access and improved routes

Nothing

Nothing

Skytrain out here

Use of our train tracks to have a train take us to Vancouver. More bus service to Vancouver, and one to Langley

N/A

Add bus stops

a reliable surface train service or LRT into Vancouver from White Rock/S.Surrey

Na

I use transit at times to travel to Vancouver.

If it was faster

free transit

Convenient routes to more municipalities.

More availability.

If I traveled to a set destination rather than to several destinations in a day.

Greater frequency of later evening buses

Nothing

Increase frequency of buses to town center

Gas prices continuing to rise

Direct bus to Vancouver, as it used to be.

No need at this time.

Availability and convenience of routes.

L.R.T from whiterock ,Free transit for seniors as in the uk and other countries.This gets the old folks out and it has been demonstrated in the uk that it actually stimulates the economy,by encouraging people to come out and spend their money.

Nothing

Not necessary at this time

if there was a direct bus to Vancouver

Nothing

I understand that Translink is already proposing changes which will impact some people. I find the current service quite adequate.

Buses coming every 15 minutes

I will be very upset if they stop the 351 from coming along Thrift from Oxford to Johnson!! There are so many seniors that live in this area, and walking is a problem as well as having to change busses!
make the smaller community buses cheaper. ie. for me to go to the beach via bus costs as much as going to Bridgeport. It's cheaper to take my car with

the parking pass. \$1 per ride within WR would be max
More extensive routes, SkyTrain to White Rock Centre

the unavailability of convenient shopping and services

As always, convenience and cost are the drivers of public transit for everyone.

routes that take me to places I want to go to and frequency and uncrowded busses.

For my use, nothing

SkyTrain.

We use transit to go to airport and into Vancouver

I do use it to go to Vancouver....so, when I have an appointment downtown I usually use transit.

Being unable to drive

Hospital which is the primary economic driver should be better served.

Bring transit to my area?

CONVENIENCE & BETTER KNOWLEDGE ON OUR PART. WE ARE OLD AND LAZY WHEN IT COMES TO PUBLIC TRANSIT.

electronic displays at bus stops stating when buses are due and where they are going

Fewer Transfers: bus to sky train to bus to get into Vancouver is more arduous than 15 yrs ago.

Easy access, frequency

Cheaper 1 zone fares

A train that connected to the skytrain or a bus service that was efficient and ran on schedule. Also, translink needs to use updated buses, a lot of time they use non-coach buses for the highways which is unacceptable.
Cheaper!!!!!! It's ridiculous to pay 3\$ each way to get around tiny WR

Rapid Transit to the ParknRide.

A shuttle bus from town centre to the promenade - like the one they run in the summer.

If they had high speed train or subway system. Buses are not functional

If there was a shuttle bus going down to the waterfront (more frequently in the summer)

Better access to Vancouver required

Frequent service

Less crowded busses. More comfortable buses like the old coach ones for long distance rides to Bridgeport.

when I stop driving, blessed to live in central WR and can walk everywhere

Greater frequency of smaller buses.

Closer bus stop, more parking near bus stop.

more routes; less wait times; lower cost

nothing

Skytrain or free parking at the bus loop

More frequency might help. Later hours. It's a cost/ridership question I guess. Would the ridership go up with these ideas??

Better transit to the beach.

Allow dogs on the buses and skytrains

A skytrain or light rail system

n/a

No longer having a license or if transit was more frequent.

If it was in the form of a rapid transit system I would support it

Occasionally

Only if my lifestyle changed.

Nothing. I love our transit as a parent. Frequent enough.

I do not know

Bathrooms at sky train stations. Public transit treats people like third class citizens

Would use for special events

Probably nothing on work days. For other trips, more frequent service and less lurch (hitting the brakes) bus driving.

If there were a bus available

Quicker connection to downtown would make me an occasional user

Frequency and seating

More frequent service.

Better service and better roads

Not practical.

If I had to work in an office I would use it

skytrain connection

I wouldn't locally, but definitely would use rapid transit to Vancouver

A convenient bus to my golf course.

Faster service.

more frequent service on local bus routes

nothing

Our transit options have deteriorated ever since we lost a direct rout to Vancouver on the 351. We need more frequent buses and longer hours that they are available

More direct route to downtown.

Nothing at this time.

Optional question (112 responses, 39 skipped)

Q60 | What new bus route(s) would you use if added to TransLink's bus service? (e.g. from White Rock Centre to Peace Arch Elementary)

If it was easy to get to Tsawwassen Ferry.

White Rock to Vancouver.

to langley

Don't use transit

A "beaches bus" from King George Park and Ride to Crescent Beach, West Beach, East Beach and returning via 8th Avenue along King George to the Park and Ride. Use a double decker bus in the summer season. Loop the 352 Southbound along 140th
Can't say

Express to airport

Express service from Surrey Central to White Rock

an occasional 351 bus on Marine Drive

White rock to grandview heights and Vancouver

If I want to go to downtown Vancouver, I can catch the bus across the street and it takes 2+ hours. Or, I can drive to the King George park and ride (10 Minutes) and transit takes an hour. I am not sure what you could ever do to fix this.
Marine drive back and forth.

Can't help you there.

Unsure

Grandview Heights

Bus system to Langley and more buses to Vancouver (Bridgeport). C-bus to take us to South Surrey areas including South Surrey shopping malls Granview Centre Malls

If people could park at the church and/or school lots and there were shuttles that would go from waterfront to those lots, it would be great for congestion AND could be used by those of us who live up the hill and need a quick lift to 5 Corners.

??

not applicable

none unless free

Bus to South Surrey recreation centre from Columbia. Bus from Columbia to Morgan crossing shopping area.

White Rock Centre to South Surrey Park and Ride.

White rock

Not aware

None

To surrey central or guildford

Oxford street to Vancouver

Beach shuttle if they take strollers

There are sufficient routes for my needs.

if the map was bigger I could tell you, it's too small to see the routes/street names.

Route from the West Side to the East Side that goes through the Lower Town Centre

None

N/a

NOT ENOUGH AWARENESS TO ANSWER

Express service which does not involve multiple transfers. Great if you are a fit and mobile 10-60 something, impossible if you have any type of disability

Translink's service has been inadequate for so long I can't imagine ever taking the bus again.

Existing if cheaper.

Langley connection

Many quick shuttles from White Rock neighbourhoods to ParknRide and then Rapid from there.

Not applicable

See above

Direct WR to Bridgeport

?

Probably not.

White Rock to other south of Fraser communities.

none

Direct from White Rock Centre to Morgan Crossing

Going to the beach.

n/a

Not sure

none

Shuttle services throughout the community

Centennial Park to Marine Drive

None

I do not know

Not sure

None. With so many empty buses running now, I suggest trialing a subsidized taxi/Uber flexible transportation model - cheaper than running empty buses

White Rock Centre to Grandview neighbourhood.

waterfront to semi mall using Columbia and Johnson

None

none

I don't know.

would have preferred my children taking bus to school but service always started too late.


I typically use the park and ride into Vancouver

From White Rock direct to Vancouver.

From White Rock to Ferry Service.

Optional question (66 responses, 85 skipped)

Q61 Which existing routes would you want more frequency on? See the image above for a map of the existing bus routes in the Whi...




Question options

321 345 351 352 354 360 361 362 363 375 394 531

Optional question (81 responses, 70 skipped)

Q62 What are some key considerations and priorities you think the City, the Province and Fraser Health should focus on in order...



Question options

- Hospital parking
- Traffic on adjacent streets
- On-site services and amenities
- Design for future expansion
- Other (please specify)
- Traffic within the hospital area

Optional question (144 responses, 7 skipped)

Q63 | What additional comments do you have regarding future expansion of Peace Arch Hospital?

Hospital Buildings is a priority. Underground parking can be made available to the public and staff.

This is not a municipal responsibility. Stay in your lane and focus on the few things that are your job and you might be able to do them better.

Consider building below or above ground parking facilities connected to the Hospital

People of White Rock should not have to have parking problems within their own homes, people should not have to pay for parking at hospitals, it is usually a stress filled situation, no feeding the meter, traffic flow away from community, directional flow
build higher with multi story parkade

Have a cardiac section in the hospital. All patients have to go elsewhere for heart related conditions

Expansion should be based on needs of community.

there should be free parking at hospitals. it is stressful to deal with having to pay at a hospital.

Innovation and enterprise ecosystem in close proximity. Support local employment and entrepreneurship

We never go there as it has a terrible reputation medically. That issue is beyond the scope of the OCP!

White Rock should try and attract the next medical professional buildings that get built in the area. The plan should be more of a green campus with public space, connection to the greenway, and all the services/specialists located on site. St. Paul 2.0
womens clinic

Emergency service wing and out patient services.

Optional question (13 responses, 138 skipped)

Q65 | What City-related matter, projects and goals would you be most interesting in tracking our progress on? (e.g. housing, water, environment, transportation improvements, etc.)

Parks and Transportation

Housing, major developments, clear cutting, planting of trees, the waterfront, affordable housing.

We need to join Surrey and all of the above.

Housing, community spaces

Water, transportation, parks.

housing

Housing, affordable housing, protecting renters.

Accommodation for visitors, more B&B's, hotel, bldg Heights, livability, waterfront storefront upgrades and filling the empty stores. Water the flowers, the pop up plants on Marine Drive are dead.
Housing, Transportation and Marine Drive Improvements

Need more time to think about this.

Waterfront improvements

Housing and environment

I want to see a voting summary page from every council meeting posted just like the agenda and video and minutes are. We should be able to see how you voted by agenda item, so we can reconcile.
Improving the viability of the waterfront

All of the above

Better building code enforcement

Water and transportation

Building heights on new developments

All of the above. They're all integrated.

All

Housing, transportation and hospital improvements

housing; dog management bylaw

Water quality, home ownership

Affordable housing

Improve environmental protection and management

development, water front enhancement

Water quality, environment, garbage pickup coordination/improvement

Building heights. Public spaces. Public entertainment spaces.

transportation improvements, water system quality improvements & economy

Environment, waterfront improvements

housing, environment

Housing

Housing and increasing densities

housing(including rental and affordable), waterfront developement, water

6/06/2019 12:51 AM

quality, business development

water

Every service, project and activity the city undertakes should fit within the OCP principles, and strategic plan priorities/goals and Council set priorities. Every activity should be measured in how it achieves or makes progress in those areas.

Rental housing stock and affordable housing.

Housing and waterfront

crime: theft in parks, streets, homes

Water, non-OCP approvals, green space/park improvements

Housing, environment and transportation, plus development approvals.

Water with Gvrd., planning town centre,

City clean up. Streets and boulevards are littered with trash and cigarette butts. Shop owners and residents don't clean up and no enforcement to do so

housing and water

More parks

transportation and improvements (building)

Water and general improvements

Building heights, water, environmentdensity

Housing, water, environment

housing,transportation

New Development in outskirts of white rock (north bluff and kent area

Water is a huge concern and we need to know when it is safe to drink

Limiting Building Heights, water quality, any other changes

Development commercial

densification and eco-approaches to building and other eco programs

Water quality and provision seem to me very important. Infrastructure commensurate with development seems to lag behind. Progress in this area is of great interest.

Transportation improvements (sidewalks, roads, walkways), water, environment, housing - all of it!

Building heights and handling of our infrastructure, transit, water

housing, water, environment, any work scheduled

Hospital expansion; height restrictions; water quality; housing; environment infrastructure; water q

Pretty much everything that was mentioned in the survey: transit, environment, housing, development, Waterfront, PAH, and I would not mind knowing about the Water Quality as well
housing, environment

water, housing and transportation

Housing, environment

Affordable housing and rental project.

Environment, transportation

All

Wellbeing is the most important. The City should have an annual well-being of the community assessment. Well-being and happiness are closely

correlated with social connections - find a way to measure that
Housing and Improvements

water, environment

water, environment and community cohesion and inclusiveness

Housing affordability.

housing; how many units, how affordable, occupied? Water: treatment
issues,

Water, housing

Developement, infrastrucure projects and water updates

Water for sure, as our water is terrible and undrinkable now. We need to
solve this ASAP

Housing, green spaces, more affordable public transport. Water I believe is
done.

How many amendments and exceptions are made to the existing OCP

High rise permits , water

Environmental Issues, Transport Improvements (can I say rapid transit one
more time to the parknride!)

Water.

Environment, Water

housing and improvements

Expanding the tax base by encouraging more residents

Housing

Green space and tree management

Our Cultural Identity, Building Community, Multigenerational Affordable Housing, Leading Edge water and housing projects, Accessibility for all, senior care
Housing and development of the art and theatre aspect of the city.

High rises and traffic

Housing, arts integration, transportation, arts commerce

Water quality, transportation improvements,

absentee owners; vacant properties (as in owned but left empty); average rent; ratio of green space per resident; no of people who can live without a car
housing, green spaces, hospital expansion

Major developments in the city

Updating, upgrading West Beach Marine Drive buildings...shabby and not at all 'historic'--just old! If our taxes on these are going to be so high then the "best use" concept should give businesses a fair chance.
Housing, the environment and business development.

no high rises, water, environment, more public and affordable transit

Housing, homelessness

all of the above examples. The town hall held last evening was helpful.

housing and high rises and infrastructure

Housing and affordability

The success and failure of these goals all need to be measured. An annual export card is appropriate

New Developments including rezoning and changes to OCP, building schedules. Notice of Johnston Road Revitalization work.

Transportation

Green space

Reducing city costs by contracting out services and having productivity standards for all workers

Housing

Housing in upper core, more attention and maintenance on public green spaces, not just around the tourist areas

Gross Revenue per waterfront visitor, number of trees bigger than X diameter, Number of new homes built with gardens/landscaping, acres of land acquired for greenway or park land

Housing

Construction and parks. Memorial Pak is a slab of concrete and no local resident can afford anything being currently built.

Building development, water, environment

health of local small business, tourism, housing

housing and transportation improvements

Development

water improvements, environment, planning

A would appreciate a biannual general update with tabs for in depth information.

housing and transportation

housing, environment

housing; water; propose developments for town centre

water, environment (newer houses are being razed and disposed of for

modernization) alot of clear cutting has been occurring on hillside diminishing water retention of banks and repairing antiquated infrastructure.

All proposed developments, housing, water, green spaces, plans for affordable housing, transportation.

improvements, environment, transportation

transportation and environment.

Optional question (124 responses, 27 skipped)

Q66 What type of data would you find useful for the City to gather and report on? (e.g. increase in housing supply or commercial space, value of capital investments in City infrastructure, water quality, etc.).

Operating costs for Memorial Park, Vidal Street Parkade and Arsenic/Manganese Plant. Revenue from New Parkade. Costs of Water Main replacements.

City infrastructure, city operating costs. Investment in public spaces and operating cost of public spaces

All of the above.

housing supply

Number of rental apartments in the city over the last 10 years, with detailed breakdown of rent costs in White Rock.

All of it and tourism. Very unfortunate you removed the beach kiosk. It was a great place to promote our town to visitors and locals. A gathering place to find out about events in town, and for locals to find out about things to do for their guests.

Tourism and business growth activity

Need more time to think about this.

Parkade usage, business retention

Attendance and voting record for committee work and council meetings.

Water quality, commercial vacancy rate

demographics, population, family size, age distribution, use of Marine Drive business, Hospital improvement , tourist numbers to White Rock etc.

All money from developers

Water quality

All of the above. They're all integrated.

All

hospital updates, increase in housing supply or commercial space, value of capital investments in City infrastructure, water quality etc.

Water quality is already gathered and reported on regularly, it is important to keep this going but I understand this is required by Fraser Health anyway;
We need good data on housing supply; monitor commercial spaces for vacancy & disrepair

The utilization of commercial buildings in Town Centre and Waterfront - way too many vacant and run down (parts are embarrassing).

Public compliance with Bylaw 1959

Water quality, what businesses would be most successful for waterfront and the new opportunities with all the building uptown.

Quality of water. Housing supply.

water rates in GVRD compared to City of WR Water rates

parks, trees, green space, affordable housing supply

Housing supply increase needed

Housing supply increase needed

water quality/supply, increase of commercial space/housing supply(including rental and affordable), business retention/development/diversity, green space development/retention, value of capital investments including pay parking revenues

how much money is being spent reviewing the OCP again

water quality, park and walkway maintenance standards

Increase density of housing on North Bluff Road.

Infrastructure

thefts in parks, streets, homes and perceived safety in those places

Marine Drive parking eg. peak days/times (noting weather), amount of park space as compared to other Metro Vancouver cities, foreign ownership (commercial and private).

Water quality

Water quality, reducing \$ pay parking for hospital visits, beach visits

increase housing supply that's all I hear people talking about that there is a housing shortage

Increase the housing supply seems like a lot of people are moving into White Rock now

general state of the City

housing and water

Water quality

Density areas, infrastructure

The more information the City can gather, the better.

crime and vandalism, general safety issues, RCMP crime statistics

High density on outskirts of White Rock

Re zoning, water, advance notice when building have are to be considered and built.

water quality

Water quality

densification and eco-approaches to building and other eco programs

All of the above.

Water quality,

water quality, how would/could WR handle infrastructure for all the highrises being built? water/sewer, electric/ fire fighting/parking

Infrastructure; water quality; housing

increase in housing supply or commercial space

WATER QUALITY!!!!

water quality

Increase in housing supply, projects presently being undertaken.

Create more new rental buildings.

outcomes of OCP recommendations

All

Increase in Housing or Commercial space.

value of capital investments in City infrastructure & water quality

Increase in housing supply, average rents.

all listed

Amount of money spent on infrastructure projects for different regions of the city. For example how much is spent on Marine drive improvements vs Buena Vista improvements.

Water quality reports, very detailed ones on a regular basis that show increases or decreases of harmful chemicals. Our water is worse than most other places in Metro Vancouver when it used to be the best 10 years ago.

Satisfaction of residents

Water quality

parsnips

Residential property tax base and increases. Types and Quantity of Requests for Service and Response Rates. Interested in volume of chloramine used as would like to see it dropped to the lowest possible level. Water quality. I want Chloramine out of the water. The water people are difficult to speak to, and sometimes behave as if they run their own fiefdom! Sorry, but there is a woman there on the front desk who is aggressively rude.. Financials - actual costs to budgets, project plans prior to approval

increase in housing supply

Number of empty homes and empty commercial.

all the above-great!

All of the above.

Traffic

Housing supply, water quality, arts spaces for production, sales and performance,

Water quality

water quality vis a vis International standards; number of new residents

Our water quality is now enviable. With the new towers coming in the housing availability is going to rise--good! What about all these third world banana republic wires and poles everywhere--surely these can be buried. Looks terrible!

All of the above, but the city should be reaching out in communicating these things. You are very guarded with information.

buy commercial property on Marine Drive. Many business go bust do to raising rents.

increase in housing

Again these good examples of information it is good to have. Thank you

Increasing rental and affordable housing stock

All of these need to be reported on annually

Number of rental versus owner occupied homes, vacant homes.

Water quality

More commercial space

Water quality

Crime traffic

Housing

Development fees received versus infrastructure additions and repairs paid

All of above

Empty houses and use of public facilities (library, rec centre etc..) by non-locals

building plans, water quality, green space development

all of the above

none

All of the above

You have listed 8 concerns. tracking progress or lack of progress in those areas would seem reasonable.

increase in housing supply

housing supply, ownership

new building development proposals; water quality; life expectancy of infrastructure and replacement costs

a clear mapping of pipe lines and subsequent organized road closures. FYI
underground streams have dried up. Empty residences condo or single
including businesses.

Housing supply or commercial space, water quality, planned developments

water quality, population growth, expansions

Value of Capital investment in city infrastructure.

Optional question (106 responses, 45 skipped)

Q67 | Do you have any other suggestions for how we guide the future of the City?

I think there are a lot of younger people that want development that do not go to Council meetings to have our views heard. I want the focus to be on making the Town Centre walkable and accessible by transit.
Cap the heights off in the Town Center before a developer makes an application for a high-rise.

Yes We need to join Surrey.

Speed zone around schools and walking areas. Road maintenance.

When doing surveys make sure they are available to White Rock residents only. Also take into account when changing a bylaw that all costs are considered.
plan for the future White Rock cannot stay a sleepy town like so many old people want with no development. The younger people are to busy working to take part in the OCP process but they see they want to see progress within our city
Increase protection for renters. If a tenant is "demovicted," make a bylaw so the tenant can move back into the suite after renovations FOR THE SAME RENTAL FEE. If they redevelop the Silvermoon, rent will go up by 100%. I commend the 1:1 rental replacemen
Visitor accommodation.

Relationship with First Nations and the BNSF railway. Opening up the Promenade and Pier to greater public access and International access via rail and marine traffic.

A key issue for the Waterfront area is to make it more vibrant and people/pedestrian friendly by keeping it as close to a "beach town" atmosphere. Most development should be focused in the Town Centre.
Whiterock is an amazing community. People are coming no matter what so having a plan and a process to implement the plan expeditiously is vital.

I'm doing the work of a previous council is petty. This ocp review is a waste of time and money. I participated fully in the previous lengthy process and felt it represented all the things I heard around the table. This council is getting it wrong.

Waterfront needs a cohesive theme and needs to be taken off life support.

Our city is not just the town centre. It should be our community centres, waterfront, hospital transit routes, highway access, walking the waterfront, seniors, etc. Every part of the city should be our focus including a new City

Hall Centre,

An investigation into how we got 13 high rises and the other side of North Bluff road got none.

Look forward and move with the times. White Rock seems to be "stuck" in the past, and unable to move forward. Make it a vibrant and welcoming city. Waterfront should be a draw for visitors and locals. It looks like it is dying a slow death.

Development of residential homes and how they impact neighbouring properties (ie height, lights, overlooking each other, backing up onto other properties, loss of privacy)

Important to connect green space so you can walk peacefully, uninterrupted.

There need to be ribbons of green space from the top of white rock to the beach, through business, to open into parks, along side apartments Hogg Park is a good example.

Increase density along 16th from Town Centre east to King George. Does not impact the view of the water and City of Surrey is on the opposite side not White Rock.

Please stop making decisions that lead to law suits.

Neighbourhood improvements (ie. sidewalks, parking, green space)

Improving the promenade and pier is great but ignoring the look, and ambience of businesses on the strip is negative. Bring in vacancy tax. The area west of Jan's is scuzzi for the most part. Winter rents s/b nominal - operating costs only.

No more high rises. Keep development low and view protected. Keep the beach front quaint and interesting and welcoming.

Not at the time. Look forward to OCP public presentations.

Police & Fire Services - should they be stand-alone or combined with Surrey? I vote stay the same as we are.

Improve bike lanes in uptown, create walking and biking trails

Even out densities allow more in town center transition areas and decrease heights in the town center to distribute everything evenly

hire an economic developement person; try to link the waterfront with uptown/5 corners

Under affordable housing there was no space for comments. I would encourage larger lots being subdivided into 2 and building 2 houses or duplexes

Make it a priority to maintain what we have before adding new things to the

list. When developing a park, building, etc. include the ongoing operational costs into the budget for future years.

No.

I hope the police will be vigilant in keeping vagrancy and associated crimes at a minimum

coordinate with Surrey, to make 16th and the town center more attractive.

A transparent reporting of how community input turns into the OCP backed up by documentation as to how the final report reflects all the various opinions presented.

Without sounding racist, many smaller homes are being demolished and replaced with monster homes that are affordable by off shore investors or non-immigrants. See the news feature on school children ordering lunch deliveries etc.

Please please fast track

Clean up what we've got ! Other communities can do it...why can't WR ???

Staying on type of minor issues like vagrancy and thefts to keep a feeling of safety and community.

Openness, we voted for those whom we thought would do their best for the good of all (the majority at least).

It is sad to know that this would be the 3rd OCP in a very short time, but I have faith in the current Mayor and Council to do it right this time and not pander to the developpers!

dont change our policing as surrey is doing.Retain the R.C.M.P.

Allow development

The traffic is getting very dangerous, is this being monitored? For example Best and Russell are so dangerous at times to cross. Merklin has no parking for residents due to construction workers. What is being done?

Would love to have a limit to residential tree/hedge heights that block neighbors views and light. If there is a limit for building height, there should be a limit to how high your hedge and trees get.

All about making sure restaurants and businesses along beach survive. Way too many shut down every year. Public events on beach are key. Bring people (tourists) in to spend money and enjoy our beautiful city

This is a good overall survey, causing thought and interest. Thank you.

So many older condos do not have visitor parking, the street parking can be full, worried with more high rises etc the parking will become more difficult. The city makes a ton of money from cars parked too close to driveways etc as parking is so sparse

Reducing our city's emissions - energy efficiency standards for new builds, embracing renewable energy, bike lines, better transit, preservation of trees and wildlife, sustainable developments
the OCP should not just be a "guideline". Once adopted the "official" part of the OCP should be adhered to.

Personally I found this survey rather challenging to actually get across my concerns with the city.

the future of White Rock in joining the City of Surrey. it makes sense.

Please let more new rental buildings in the town centre.

As we grow. Green space is important..you can never get to back once gone!

Have weekly garbage pickup for health reasons.

Hospital/Medical district needs a more focused review especially in view of the fact that a medical district is being planned on the Surrey side of North Bluff

Have free parking not parking meters everywhere. Like at the Hospital should be Free like Ladner Hospital?

community inclusion / engagement is an important measure

yes, when the OCP has been adopted; notification of any application to change it outside of the renewal cycle and who has the right to ask. Citizens should have priority over developers

I'll be attending the OCP meetings to express some of my opinions

Make preserving trees a priority and enforce bylaws on current construction sites. I've had construction next door to my house for 2 years with multiple violations and it has been difficult many times to get the city to respond. Learn from past mistakes. Be thoughtful/mindful .

I feel that it is important to stick to the OCP and not bend it very often. Also, although we have strict bldg rules with regard to maintaining views and site-lines, residents can grow trees to completely obscure the views of others. YES. We need to start undergrounding wires when roadworks/sidewalk improvements made. It is so darned ugly and way too much weight. Look at

Oxford (and major roads) overhead wires - with more and more fiber added, wires are pulling on the poles.

Thanks for asking. I am happy with the way the new Mayor and Council are working together.

Seriously consider merging with Surrey - cannot survive on W/R tax base

Parking, parking, parking - not just at the waterfront. With all these high density buildings going up come more cars. They will need to be able to park somewhere!

Please ensure there is a mechanism to ensure affordable home ownership and affordable rental

Dont allow all the commercial space if it is never occupied - could be living space instead.

Thank you for all the new council and City Team are doing.....still have a concern about health and safety for people regarding dogs on the beach.....more activities to celebrate, honour the diversity of population Keep all the channels of communication open as you are doing now. Well done.

Residents opinions should have weight in decision making. The last council was defeated because they would survey residents but then ignore their wishes

White Rock needs to become an "all arts" destination, by recreating a unique atmosphere and massively creative environment.

I would like to see if there are any plans to extend the promenade to crescent beach and create a real sea wall similar to Vancouver

Don't be afraid to modernize and move with the times. Old and shabby is just old and shabby. Let the uptown go higher, it will be good for the City and the community up there. Don't fear development, make it beautiful and pleasant. Thanks!

Right now there is a great deal of distrust between City Hall and the residents of White Rock because we have been ignored and City Hall has destroyed our city. I doubt the people destroying our city live here. I wish they had to live with their decisions

What do you value about your community? I value having places that I am proud of ex., LGBTQ+ sidewalk, good restaurants, good meeting places like Islands cafe and Laura's, beautiful community center, Generation's park, concerts on the beach

Look at the ratio of building sizes to the footprint of the property. The mega houses with no green space and often unoccupied is a problem. Stop spot zoning, if that is the correct phrase. No More Highrises Please!

More mid to high density on north Bluff road

Our city is looking very dated and tiered

Top Priority: People Mover (i.e.Funicular) between 5 Corners and Beach.
This single project would do the most to bolster the economy, ease parking, help businesses and create an international attraction that would bring visitors and tourist \$\$ into WR.

None

Safer crosswalks at Johnson and North Bluff (Pedestrian scramble crosswalks) traffic calming in the entire town center. More crosswalks across North bluff in town center east.

Monthly as a group council members and the Mayor could go to a predetermined area of White Rock and complete a 30 minute walking tour to see what is going on and better connect with our community

Make public art spaces

Please try to retain some character. Also, please set limits as to house size on residential property. 5000 square foot houses are not green, do not provide affordable housing and do not fit within the character of a neighborhood.

White Rock should have a firm policy on power lines, poles, and cables. It should be part of every new development to take these services underground. In SF residential areas, utilities should be required to remove excess poles/wires each new connection

Waste of time and tax dollars as OCP was just completed after very thorough and inclusive process.

Stop the insanity of out of control bad urban planning. What made White Rock popular in the past was its charm and small town feel. It's being turned into a poorly planned suburb for the the rich. No place for kids to play . Bylaw enforcement is pathetic

encourage development in the downtown core to give it more energy while maintaining identity. The surface lots are an eye sore and make the street feel a lot less vibrant. 3 Dogs and Blenz help but there's a long way to go. KFC is an eyesore.

Get rid of the inclination to listen to the NIMBY people. White Rock clearly needs more income and will not get it by halting development

In the opening comments it was stated that we want to make space for more residents. I think this is a faulty premis.

my observations are that seniors 65-90 are driving the review. They only rep 34% of W.R. population. Find a way to connect with the 15-65years who rep 57% of W.R. population. Get them involved early with social media and you get a more sustainable ocp

Give most weight to the opinions of the people who live in the various areas

of the City than to those who do not, since there appears to be a significant "no growth, no change" group . The latter is a general position needing separate debate.

keep residents updated on all current and future development proposals well in advance of any approvals being made by City.

THIS WAS DIFFICULT TO LOCATE. Survey should be published in PAN and/or delivered to all residences. Not everyone owns a computer even so maps are hard to see, do not print extents & schedule OCP not in summer during absence of residents.

Development is necessary when done prudently and taking into account the wishes of the majority of citizens. The people of White Rock clearly indicated in the last election we do not want any more high rises!

Yes, this is a local seaside community which is expanding. I have concerns of the number of foreign buyers, businesses. I want to support and buy local and my city should encourage that. Stop selling out to foreign buyers, both residential & business.

All services should move towards being underground with every new development and street enhancement. The city should pay for this and not expect all residents to agree to do it or it will never be done and we will never be a first class city.

Youth activities

Link the City Hall and City center to the water front with walkways.

Optional question (100 responses, 51 skipped)

Welcome to the - OCP REVIEW -

What is an OCP?

An Official Community Plan (“OCP”) is a City bylaw that guides the way land is to be used and developed in a City over a 20-30 year timeframe.

Aside from providing policy direction for new development, the OCP addresses other important matters such as economic development, transportation, housing, environmental protection, and infrastructure, in order to guide decisions in a way that helps to achieve the community’s long-term vision.

What is the OCP Review?

A new White Rock OCP was completed and adopted in October 2017. In 2018, Council directed that the OCP be reviewed to receive further community input, and update policies related to:



BUILDING HEIGHTS OUTSIDE THE TOWN CENTRE



GREENING THE CITY



STRENGTHENING TRANSIT



REVIEWING THE TOWN CENTRE



AFFORDABLE HOUSING



PEACE ARCH HOSPITAL EXPANSION



MONITORING OCP GOALS



ENHANCING THE WATERFRONT *

** The Waterfront Enhancement strategy focuses on Marine Drive and is proceeding independently of the other OCP Review components.*

.....
“...City Planning cannot be a ‘once and for all’ matter. Any plan needs constant modification to meet the community’s changing needs.”
- White Rock’s first OCP (1968)
.....



What is - PLANNING? -

What is Community Planning?

Community Planning is the City’s process to engage with the public and other organizations in order to establish a vision, goal, and policies for guiding land use and growth and achieving social, economic, and environmental sustainability.

Community Planning also includes research and implementation of policies relating to land use, economic development, social development, housing, parks, environmental protection, and other important matters related to the community’s health and well-being.

Who are we?

White Rock’s City Planners are primarily responsible for providing professional advice to City Council regarding future land use and growth management in the City.

City Planners are also responsible for...



Coordinating public consultation events, summarizing information, and educating the public.



Reviewing and processing many different types of development applications.



Developing land use plans and strategies intended to encompass various aspects of community life.



Helping the community achieve its short and long term goals.



.....

“...City Planning cannot be a ‘once and for all’ matter. Any plan needs constant modification to meet the community’s changing needs.”


.....

- White Rock’s first OCP from 1968




What is the - PROCESS? -

The OCP Review involves 3 key phases:



Our promise to the public:



“....City Planning cannot be a ‘once and for all’ matter. Any plan needs constant modification to meet the community’s changing needs.”
- White Rock’s first OCP from 1968




BUILDING HEIGHTS OUTSIDE TOWN CENTRE

Reviewing Building Heights:


Allowing a range of building heights can allow our community to accommodate a growing population with limited land area by focusing denser, taller buildings in a compact central area with services and employment, while maintaining existing single family neighbourhoods.

Taller buildings can also have an impact on existing views and sunlight access, which means they require sensitive design to minimize issues.



By the numbers...

There are over 30 existing buildings in the City that are 5 storeys or taller, either occupied or currently under construction, with 20 in the Town Centre.



By the numbers...

85% of Rental Buildings were built between 1960 and 1980.

Current policies in the OCP:




Growth is focused in high activity areas that are already characterized by medium to high intensities, primarily in the Town Centre and secondarily in adjacent areas and the Lower Town Centre (Policy 6.1.1). The tallest and densest development is focused at the intersection of Johnston and North Bluff Roads, with heights and densities decreasing gradually to the south, east, and west (Policy 7.2.1).


Residential densities are focused in the Town Centre, but housing choices are distributed throughout the City in all neighbourhoods, with duplexes and triplexes allowed throughout Mature Neighbourhoods (Policy 11.1.3).

The City's Land Use Plan allows for a range of heights, with large areas of Single Family Homes and taller apartments closer to the Town Centre.


How many homes can fit in an acre?




SINGLE FAMILY
4 to 8 homes



TOWNHOUSE
15 to 30 homes




LOW/MID-RISE
40 to 60 homes




HIGH-RISE
75+ homes


Potential ideas:



Focus taller buildings only in the Town Centre Area.



A maximum of 4-storeys for all buildings or properties along Thrift Avenue.



Develop a City-wide building height map.

Did you know... The first building in the City of White Rock to exceed 4 storeys in height was the 6 storey Bayview Garden (previously known as the Bayview Chateau) constructed in 1966, at Blackwood Street just south of Thrift Avenue.



BUILDING HEIGHTS OUTSIDE TOWN CENTRE

What we’ve heard so far:

The **TOP 10** principles you think should guide the growth of the City. New developments should...

1. Be where residents can walk to shops and services *(77 respondents)*
2. Be required to upgrade the adjoining streets and sidewalks *(72 respondents)*
3. Result in new public spaces for the whole community *(66 respondents)*
4. Be located close to existing bus routes *(64 respondents)*
5. Be phased with growth in hospital services *(56 respondents)*
6. Not impact existing mature neighbourhoods *(47 respondents)*
7. Add employment space to the community *(45 respondents)*
8. Be focused on rental housing or other affordable forms of housing *(40 respondents)*
9. Be focused on other principles - e.g. see comments to the right *(22 respondents)*
10. Not occur in White Rock *(6 respondents)*

101 total respondents

What other principles do you think should guide the growth of the City?

“Higher density housing to eliminate sprawl (such as allowing lane homes, encouraging rental suites, etc.)”

“Allow the Town Centre Transition Area to remain under the current OCP density and heights and lower the heights in the Town Centre.”

“Residential housing within a block of North Bluff Road should be restricted to multi-family to reduce the number of driveway accesses.”


“Absolutely no building should be approved if the height of the new building exceeds the height guidelines of the OCP.”

“New development should include some form of mixed income housing and affordable rental housing.”


“New development should, wherever possible, maintain existing view corridors and sun access.”

Give us some feedback!

Do you have any further thoughts on Building Heights?
Write your ideas on a sticky note!



BUILDING HEIGHTS OUTSIDE THE TOWN CENTRE





Building Height & Neighbourhood Map

We want your feedback!

CASE STUDY: HEIGHT TRANSITIONS EAST OF PEACE ARCH HOSPITAL

On the site beside the 13 storey Altus building under construction and the mature neighbourhood to the east of Maple Street, building heights should be:
Please place your dot beside the option you agree most with...

Townhouses (3 storeys) (Current OCP policy)	
Townhouses and Apartments (4 – 5 storeys) (Proposed by applicant in image to the right)	
Apartments (6 – 10 storeys)	
Remain Single Family	



Rendering of 13-storey Altus building east of Peace Arch Hospital
*** For more information, supplementary drawings are available on the table


Terraced height transition from Altus building proposed by applicant

BUILDING HEIGHTS OUTSIDE THE TOWN CENTRE

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN HEIGHT TRANSITIONS

Land use designations allow for the management of future development in the City. Future growth is presently focused in the Town Centre, adjacent Town Centre Transition areas and the Lower Town Centre. areas are outlined in the below Figure on the right.

Allowable densities (Gross Floor Area Ratio or FAR) for future development for these three land use designations are highlighted in the Figure below on the left. Potential heights (in storeys) for the same areas are outlined in the below Figure on the right.




OCP maximum FAR in the Town Centre, Town Centre Transition, and Lower Town Centre Areas (*indicates 2.0 FAR)



OCP Conceptual Height Transitions in the Town Centre, Town Centre Transition, and Lower Town Centre Areas

OCP Land Use Designation Map



GREENING THE CITY

Benefits of Greening the City:

Trees, whether growing singly, in groups, or in significant stands, produce a variety of benefits for both residents and visitors of White Rock.

Adding more trees will result in numerous benefits, including: improved air quality; additional support for ecological systems and biodiversity; and, shading and cooling for streets and buildings.

The importance of urban forests will continue to increase in the future, as trees are cost effective ways to mitigate the effects of climate change and build more resilient cities.



Current policies in the OCP:

The selection of area-appropriate tree species for street planting is important to limit conflicts between the protection of views and the retention of trees (Policy 6.2.2). The strategic management of new building setbacks in multi-family and mixed-use areas is being enforced to create sufficient space and soil volume for trees while maintaining an intimate, urban relationship with the street (Policy 15.2.5).

In order to protect and expand habitat and natural areas, the City intends to adopt an Urban Forest Management Plan, and have development projects designed to preserve mature, healthy trees (Policy 12.2.2).



Potential ideas:



Establish a “Neighbourwoods” subsidy program to support private realm tree planting.



Plant more street trees.



Develop a young tree management program to address structural pruning/ watering/nutrition guidelines.

Did you know... One way to measure the extent of the urban forest is through quantifying the urban tree canopy - including the layer of leaves, branches, and tree stems - when viewed from above. White Rock’s urban forest canopy today stands at 20%, as compared to North American cities average of 27%.



GREENING THE CITY

What we’ve heard so far:.....

- How would you like the City to increase our connection and access to nature?
- “Improve public awareness and education about our existing natural assets such as the Semiahmoo foreshore.”
 - “Creating new public green spaces in town centre where new buildings will be constructed.”
 - “Creating new off-leash dog park that is maintained and is a model of dog parks in North America.”
 - “More trees, flower baskets, trees on road islands and many more new trees in new construction. Trees should not impede views.”
 - “I like the plan for the new public square at Russell & Johnston. This will be a great addition to the Town centre.”
 - “More trees along sidewalks, public green spaces in our Town Centres with comfortable seating to reflect and watch the world go by.”

What is your favourite green space in the City?

Centennial Park

Ruth Johnson Park

Bryant Park

Davey Park

Hodgson Park

Coldicutt Ravine

Emerson Park

Road End Parks

All Green Space

The Promenade

Memorial Park

RJ Allan Hogg Park

The Ravines

Give us some feedback!

Where would you like to see the City prioritize planting more trees? *Place a dot!*

Boulevards (i.e. Street Trees)

Existing Parks (i.e. Bryant Park)

New Parks (i.e. New Green Space)

Natural Areas (i.e. the Ravines)

.....

What types of parks would you like to see more of in the City? (i.e. dog parks, open spaces, parklets, playgrounds, etc.) *Write your ideas on a sticky note!*



STRENGTHENING TRANSIT

Benefits of Strengthening Transit:

A well-connected transit system allows people to drive less and walk, cycle, and take transit more, resulting in healthier people and more livable places that are sustainable, resilient, and economically thriving.

Benefits of a strengthened transit system include: more commuting options; personal mobility for all; reductions in road congestion; decreased greenhouse gas emissions; and, decreased household expenses.



TransLink's New Double-Decker Bus (Source: Daily Hive)

Current policies in the OCP:

Working with TransLink to:

- Enhance local service frequencies;
- Enhance local circulator service;
- Improve local service periods in operation;
- Ensure a universally accessible transit system;
- Improve the White Rock centre exchange;
- Enhance the transit customer experience; and
- Support regional transit improvements (Policy 13.3.1).

The Town Centre is also being identified as a key regional and local transit service ‘anchor point’, to ensure additional frequent and local transit routes and infrastructure investments are directed to the area and to recognize the Town Centre’s role as a high-density, mixed-use growth focus area in White Rock and the Semiahmoo Peninsula (Policy 13.3.6).



South Surrey / White Rock Regional Transit Map (Source: TransLink)

Potential ideas:



A B-Line Bus Route that services the City of White Rock and better connects the community regionally.



A fixed transit link between the Waterfront and Town Centre, such as a Funicular or Escalator.

.....
Did you know... A B-Line Bus Route is a transit system that involves improved travel time, reliability, frequency, and availability. Travel times are improved because of stops spaced 1 km apart, with all-door boarding, and high-capacity articulate buses travelling along streets designed to improve travel time. During rush hour, bus frequency is every 5-10 minutes!
.....



STRENGTHENING TRANSIT

What we’ve heard so far:

Do you currently use transit on a regular (weekly or more frequent) basis?

Which existing routes would you want more frequency on?



Why do you not use transit more frequently?

What would make you more likely to use transit?

“I walk everywhere.” “It is not convenient for what I need.”

“Live and work in White Rock so either can walk or drive.” “No need.”

“I am still able to access shops and services by walking.” “I drive a car.”

“Don’t find it convenient; timing and bus stops locations.”

“Bring back the non-stop bus to Vancouver.” “Skytrain out here.”

“Express service from Surrey Central to White Rock.” “Free transit.”

“Nothing.” “Convenient routes to more municipalities.”

“More frequent buses where I live.”

Give us some feedback!

Would you like a B-Line Bus Route that services the City of White Rock? *Place a dot!*

YES

NO

Do you have any additional thoughts about transit? *Write your ideas on a sticky note!*

TOWN CENTRE REVIEW

Town Centre Review:

The 2011 *Town Centre Urban Design Plan* had its key ideas incorporated into the OCP and the Zoning Bylaw in 2013. There have been many changes since, including new buildings and some streetscape upgrades.

This review is an opportunity to get input on what features are still needed to ensure the area remains an attractive, lively, pedestrian-friendly, and highly livable neighbourhood. It includes looking at the height and density of future buildings in order to achieve open/green space and parks for socializing, shopping, and enjoying urban life.



3D Model of 2011 Urban Design Plan (shown to the right)




Illustrative Plan of 2011 Urban Design Plan

Current policies in the OCP:

The Town Centre is the hub of cultural, economic, and public life in the City, with a diverse mix of uses, and it is the focus the majority of future growth. This focus will assist in maximizing the residents who can access transit and meet daily needs within walking distance of home (Objective 7.3).

Related policies include: encouraging the development of office, event, and hotel space, along with other employment generating uses (9.1.1); creating public space at the corner of Johnston Road and Russell Avenue and in the block bounded by North Bluff Road, Russell Avenue, Johnston Road, and Foster Street (9.2.1); and enhancing the network of parks and public open spaces (9.3.2).

*The City of Surrey is also doing a review of its Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan, with a draft land use plan expected in July 2019.




3D Model Showing Approved & Constructed Buildings



Rendering of 1500-block Johnston Road streetscape upgrades

Potential ideas:



Require a portion of floor area in new buildings to be either rental or job space, to balance the amount of condos in the area.



Limit lot coverage of underground parkades on large sites to allow for better soil conditions for trees.


Did you know... The 2008 OCP also described the Town Centre in the following way: “The Town Centre is anticipated to have the highest densities in White Rock ... Mixed-use development will evolve in the form of residential towers with street level retail. The number of people expected to live, work and shop in the Town Centre will reinforce its role as a vibrant focal point for the community.”



TOWN CENTRE REVIEW

What we’ve heard so far:

Do you agree with the guiding principle for the Town Centre in the OCP?



The OCP’s guiding principle for the Town Centre states:

“If the waterfront is the soul of White Rock, then the Town Centre is the heart. This area is the economic and cultural centre of the community, with the greatest concentration of homes, jobs, shops, and amenities. This OCP will support reinforcement of the Town Centre as a mixed-use anchor, and will encourage the creation of delightful public places for socializing, dining, resting, people-watching, shopping, and taking in the view.”

The OCP also calls for more green space, including a one-acre park and Town Square in the Town Centre.

Give us some feedback!

What would improve the Town Centre? *Write your ideas on a sticky note!*

ACTIVITY	EXAMPLES	WHAT WOULD MAKE THE TOWN CENTRE A COMPLETE COMMUNITY?
LIVE	Condos, Rental, Seniors’ Living	
WORK	Offices, Shops, Clinics	
LEARN/PLAY	Community Centre, Gyms, Parks, Childcare	
SHOP	Clothing, Food	
EAT/DRINK	Restaurants, Cafes, Breweries	
APPLAUD	Theatre, Performance Space	

There will be Town Centre Design Workshops here on July 6, 1:00-5:00pm or July 9, 5:00-9:00pm. Some activities require registration, see talkwhiterock.ca for details.



IMPROVING HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

What is Housing Affordability:

Housing Affordability involves providing a mix of housing choices that are appropriate and affordable for residents with various incomes and at various stages of their lives, allowing residents to move out on their own, live in the same community, and age in place.

Current policies in the OCP:

The OCP supports Non-Market and Rental Housing, especially in transit accessible locations (Policy 11.2.1).

“Gentle Infill” is promoted, enabling moderate residential growth in Mature Neighbourhoods, primarily in the form of secondary suites, duplexes, and triplexes (Policy 7.4.1).


The retention of low-rise rental building stock in the Urban areas south of Thrift Avenue is a priority to preserve affordable and rental housing (Policy 11.2.2).

A minimum 1:1 replacement of existing rental dwelling units is required when an existing rental building is proposed for redevelopment (Policy 11.2.1).



Chorus, an inclusive and affordable 71 unit apartment in South Surrey, was opened in August of 2016 with 20 rental homes for people who have intellectual disabilities and 51 rental homes for the general public at affordable rates. The project was supported by UNITI, a partnership of three not-for-profit organizations: Semiahmoo House Society, Peninsula Housing Society, and the Semiahmoo Foundation. (Source: Landlord BC)

Secondary Suite



Coach House



Accessory dwelling units means a variety of housing types that are attached or detached from the principle residence on a property and registered as legal accessory units.

This includes: **Accessory registered secondary suites**; **Coach houses**; and, **Lock-off suites** (seperate suites with cooking facilities contained inside a larger duplex, apartment or townhome)


Potential ideas:



Allow coach houses in mature neighbourhood areas.



Create more opportunities for duplexes and triplexes.



Encourage rental housing with increased density provisions in the Town Centre and TCT areas.

.....
Did you know... In 2018, the Provincial government changed the Local Government Act to allow cities to zone for tenure (i.e. zones can specify that dwellings must be rental).
.....



IMPROVING HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

What we've heard so far:

What ideas do you think would be appropriate for making housing more affordable in White Rock?

Idea	Number of respondents (101 total)
None of the above	12
More forms of secondary housing on single property (suites within duplexes/triplexes)	40
Rental housing on institutional (i.e. church-owned) land	50
Using City-owned land to help create new affordable / rental housing	40
More rental buildings in the Town Centre	55
Creating an Affordable Housing Fund through CAC's	37
More forms of secondary housing on single property (coach houses)	45

Your suggestions for making housing more affordable in White Rock:

- "Give developers density bonuses for rental units."
- "Tax vacant properties."
- "Consider a streamlined and less expensive process for approving and facilitating the development of cost-efficient housing."
- "Provide progressive, flexible but strictly enforced regulation of AirBnB spaces in the Community."
- "Allow more variances to developers in Town Centre in exchange for affordable housing."

Give us some feedback!

Your housing needs - Present vs Future: *Place your dots!*

Place a **RED** dot in line with *YOUR CURRENT AGE* and *YOUR CURRENT HOUSING TYPE*

Place a **GREEN** dot in line with *YOUR AGE IN 10 YEARS* and *YOUR FUTURE HOUSING TYPE NEED*

Single Family Home / Duplex

Basement Suite

Townhouse

Low-Rise Apartment

High-Rise Apartment

Seniors Housing

HOUSING TYPE

WHITE ROCK

City by the Sea!

LU & P AGENDA

PAGE 170

EXPANDING PEACE ARCH HOSPITAL

Benefits of Expanding the Hospital:

Access to health services has a direct impact on the quality of life and health of residents.

Expanding the Peace Arch Hospital and associated health care facilities will ensure these services will meet the needs of the community for years to come.

The Peace Arch Hospital is also the single largest employer in White Rock, and its expansion will support continued job growth and economic development in City.


While the City does not directly fund health services, our bylaws regulate the ability of the hospital to expand.



Peace Arch Hospital - White Rock Site.
Over 3 acres of available land for potential new hospital and parking facilities.
(Source: Fraser Health Authority)


Current policies in the OCP:

The City supports the expansion of the Peace Arch Hospital and associated health care facilities and services (Policy 18.1.5). Institutional uses in primarily mid-rise and low-rise buildings are allowed (Policy 8.10.1) and the scale and height of the buildings are determined based on compatibility with surrounding development (Policy 8.10.2). The zoning for the hospital was the first comprehensive development (CD) zone in the city and has not been updated in almost 25 years.




Existing Peace Arch Hospital Master Site Concept Plan (*note this Master Plan will be updated) (Source: Fraser Health Authority)

Potential ideas:



Require a parkade to help with the increasing demand for parking around Peace Arch Hospital.



Update zoning for the Hospital to allow for taller buildings.


Did you know... Construction on the 45-bed White Rock District Hospital began in 1951 on land donated by a nearby resident. The hospital's name was eventually changed to Peace Arch Hospital.



EXPANDING PEACE ARCH HOSPITAL

What we’ve heard so far:

Key considerations and priorities you think the City, the Province, and Fraser Health should focus on:



Comments you had regarding future expansion of Peace Arch Hospital:

“Hospital Buildings is a priority. Underground parking can be made available to the public and staff.”

“Expansion should be based on the needs of the community.”

“Have a cardiac section in the hospital. All patients have to go elsewhere for heart related conditions.”

“Build higher with multi-storey parkade.”

“Consider building below or above ground parking facilities connected to the Hospital.”

Give us some feedback!

Do you have any additional comments? *Write your ideas on a sticky note!*



MONITORING OCP GOALS

Benefits of Monitoring OCP:

Ensuring the successful implementation of the OCP not only requires updates to plans and strategies, but also requires ongoing monitoring and evaluation. The development of an OCP Scorecard ensures that the vision and goals of the OCP are being achieved.

What policies are in place?

The OCP currently directs that an annual report be prepared that provides an update on the following actions and indicators:

Short Term (1-2 Years):
Develop a new Zoning Bylaw (Policies 11.1.2, 11.2.1, 13.5.5, 15.2.5)
Develop a new Urban Forest Management Plan (Policies 6.2.2, 12.2.2, 15.2.4)
Develop new GHG emission reduction targets (Policy 12.5.1)
Adopt the Province’s Energy Step Code (Policy 12.5.4)
Develop a new Water Management Plan (Policy 16.1.2)
Develop a new Stormwater Management Plan (Policies 16.1.2, 16.2.4)
Develop a new Sanitary Sewer Management Plan (Policy 16.1.2)
Develop road standards (Policy 16.3.1)
Medium Term (3-4 Years):
Develop an expanded wayfinding system (Policies 10.1.1, 10.2.1, 10.3.2, 13.1.10, 13.5.3)
Implement a people movement system between the Waterfront and the Town Centre (Policies 10.1.1, 13.3.5)
Develop public realm design guidelines for Marine Drive (Policy 10.4.3)
Establish outdoor amenity space requirements for multi-unit developments (Policy 11.1.1)
Develop design criteria and establish minimum unit counts for accessible units in new developments (Policy 11.1.2)
Establish an Affordable Housing Reserve Fund (Policy 11.2.1)
Develop a Tenant Relocation Policy (Policy 11.2.3)
Assess municipal infrastructure to determine the level of risk associated with sea level rise (Policy 12.4.1)
Develop a Green Building Strategy (Policy 12.5.3)
Long Term (5+ Years):
Relocate the rail line away from the Waterfront (Policies 10.2.3, 13.4.3)
Conduct a feasibility study for a multi-use recreation facility that includes public art space (Policy 17.2.4)
Ongoing:
Construct parking structures to provide additional capacity away from the surface lots on the Waterfront (Policies 10.2.2, 10.3.2)
Monitor the net increase in total secured market rental units and affordable rental units (Policy 11.2.1)
Monitor the area of additional public space in the City (Policies 9.2.1, 9.3.1, 9.3.2, 13.1.1, 13.1.8, 15.1.1/2/3/4/5, 15.2.2, 18.3.2)
Monitor significant improvements to the pedestrian realm (Policies 13.1.1/2/3/4/6/7/8/9, 17.2.3/5/6/8/9)
Monitor significant improvements to the cycling network (Policies 13.2.1/2/3/4/5)
Monitor significant improvements to transit infrastructure (Policy 13.3.1/2/3)

Potential ideas:



Develop quantifiable targets to monitor OCP goals.



Develop and update an OCP Progress Tracker.

Did you know... Statistics Canada provides a statistical portrait of Canada’s population and the places where we live every five years. This high-quality information is a valuable tool to help plan services and development in the City of White Rock.



MONITORING OCP GOALS

What we’ve heard so far:

What City-related matter, projects and goals, would you be most interest in tracking our progress on?

PARKS/TREES

ENVIRONMENT

WATERFRONT

WATER QUALITY

HOUSING

BUILDING HEIGHTS

OTHER

TRANSPORTATION

What type of data would you find useful for the City to gather and report on?

“Number of rental apartments in the City over the last 10 years, with detailed breakdown of rent costs in White Rock.”

“Crime and vandalism, general safety issues, RCMP crime statistics.”

“Parks, trees, green space, affordable housing supply.”

“City Infrastructure, city operating costs. Investment in public spaces and operating costs of public spaces.”

“Demographics, population, family size, age distribution, use of Marine Drive business, Hospital Improvement, tourist numbers to White Rock...”

Give us some feedback!

How would you want us to communicate our progress to you? *Place a dot!*

Public Event (i.e. Open House)

Online (i.e. City website, social media)

Newspaper

Other

.....

Do you have any additional comments about Monitoring OCP Goals?
Write your ideas on a sticky note!



APPENDIX C

OCP Review Open House (June 24, 2019) Public Feedback Report

Monitoring OCP Goals

Question: How would you like us to communicate our progress to you?

Public Event (i.e. Open House): 8

Online (i.e. City website, social media): 8

Newspaper: 6

Other: 0

Question: Do you have any additional comments about Monitoring OCP Goals?

"All 3 work great." [methods of communicating progress in the question above]

"All 3." [methods of communicating progress in the question above]

Greening the City

Question: Where would you like to see the City prioritize planting more trees?

Boulevards (i.e. Street Trees): 4

Existing Parks (i.e. Bryant Park): 4

New Parks (i.e. New Green Space): 5

Natural Areas (i.e. the Ravines): 4

Question: What types of parks would you like to see more of in the City?

"Arbutus on the Waterfront (native species), remove Empress and Oak Trees."

"Plant trees on the hump."

"Compliment all seasons with mix of murals & green walls on renewal/new sites."

"Love the Parklet idea."

Building Heights Outside the Town Centre

Question: Do you have any further thoughts on Building Heights?

"Allow higher densities in the Everall neighbourhood west transition area."

"There are potential land assemblies in the Everall neighbourhood so we should increase densities to encourage those developers to buy the land."

"No."

"Go high on North Bluff survey is across the road blocking no citizens views."

"More incentives for developers especially the way the economy and market is going."

"West Transition building heights should be higher."

"Give developers some incentive to have more rental units and increase density in West Transition."

"Focus building height + density along North Bluff Rd."

"Increase heights / densities on Everall Street neighbourhood."

"Higher Density on North Bluff 15600-15800, Affordable housing is supported."

"A reasonable transition from Altus as far as heights is a must. Altus isn't going away!"

"Allow more densities above Thrift Ave."

"Please simply adhere to the existing OCP."

"Lower Heights in Town Centre + Town Centre Transition Area. 8 storey max in Town Centre."

"ND. Include mixed housing + affordable housing including affordable rental housing."

"No more high rise, major reductions in density throughout City."

"Building heights in the West transition Everall area should match that of the Town Centre."

"A maximum of 6 storeys inside and outside the Town Centre PLEASE! I want a cute small town look."

"Reduce heights in all areas."

"Higher density and Height along North Bluff from Johnston to Kent St. park 12 storeys to match Surrey's proposal."

"Allow developers to build apartments on smaller lots."

"Allow mid rise in west transition area."

"Support high density 6-10 storeys on North Bluff Road."

Case Study Question: On the site beside the 13 storey Altus building under construction and the mature neighbourhood to the east of Maple Street, building heights should be:

Townhouses (3 storeys) (Current OCP Policy): 7

Townhouses and Apartments (4-5 storeys) (Proposed by applicant): 16

Apartments (6-10 storeys): 31

Remain Single Family: 4

Note: Some individuals were noted to have placed multiple dots

Affordable Housing

Your housing needs - Current vs. Future:

Current:

AGE 25-50 - **Single Family/Duplex:** 3

Future:

AGE 25-50 - **Single Family/Duplex:** 2

AGE 25-50 - **Low-Rise Apartment:** 1

Current:

AGE 50-75 - **Single Family/Duplex:** 1

AGE 50-75 - **Basement Suite:** 2

AGE 50-75 - **Low-Rise Apartment:** 7

Future:

AGE 50-75 - **Single Family/Duplex:** 1

AGE 50-75 - **Townhouse:** 1

AGE 50-75 - **Low-Rise Apartment:** 7

Current:

AGE 75-100 - **Single Family/Duplex:** 1

AGE 75-100 - **Townhouse:** 1

Future:

AGE 75-100 - **Single Family/Duplex:** 2

AGE 75-100 - **Townhouse:** 1

AGE 75-100 - **Low-Rise Apartment:** 1

AGE 75-100 - **Seniors Housing:** 2

Further thoughts on Affordable Housing:

"OCP - Clarify that FAR for affordable housing developments in Figure 11 is net FAR not Gross FAR (10 affordable units lost from gross to net)."

"Overview - Affordable Housing Section 11. City should focus on the outcome of affordable rental units and not the operator type (remove the requirements for non-profit groups)."

Expanding Peace Arch Hospital

Question: Do you have any additional comments?

"Change zoning to increase building height for hospital at least to match the Altus."

"Leave hospital zoning as is. Let future citizens have a say in what is proposed."

"Can we get a copy of the story boards via email?"

"On-site services and amenities & future expansion - most important."

"Hospital parking is good now, more facilities are more important."

Strengthening Transit

Question: Would you like a B-Line Bus Route that services the City of White Rock?

Yes: 12

No: 0

Question: Do you have any additional thoughts about transit?

"What will the cost be to run (and how will that cost affect taxes)?"

"Love the 351 service downtown."

"No Funicular Please."

"Yes we should look at getting a Funicular."

Town Centre Review

Question: What could improve the Town Centre?"

LIVE:

"No high rises."

"No more high rises."

"Affordable Seniors Housing."

"No high rises."

"Affordable Housing for All."

WORK:

"More work space."

"The main town on 152 should have a theme - a town-by-the-sea-theme!"

"Consultants, Engineers, Architects."

"Unique shops, not Nail Salons."

LEARN/PLAY:

"Parks."

"Bike lock stations/posts."

SHOP:

"Food."

"Patio restaurants."

"Grocery variety stores, ethnic stores."

EAT/DRINK:

"Outdoor eating/patios along Johnston."

"Coffee shops open on Sunday."

APPLAUD:

"Event space for all our local events fundraisers."

"Art Walk venue in Downtown Area."



White Rock Official Community Plan Review Process

Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm

Phase 1 Engagement Summary



WHITE ROCK
City by the Sea!



This document was prepared by
DIALOG for the City of White Rock.

September 2019

Page 246 of 507

**LU & P AGENDA
PAGE 179**

Contents

Introduction	2
Overview	2
Process.....	2
Workshop Format and Activities	3
Key Themes Overall	4
Participant Demographics.....	5
Participants by Municipality	5
White Rock Participants by Neighbourhood	5
Housing Ownership	6
School Aged Children	6
Household Size	7
Gender	7
Age	8
Participant Demographics - Online Survey	9
Build Town Centre	13
Activity Overview	13
Key Themes.....	13
Summaries by Group.....	14
Design Town Centre	26
Activity Overview	26
Key Themes.....	26
Group Drawings.....	27
Phase 1 Workshop Outcomes	32
One Word Vision	32
Town Centre in the OCP	34
Future Growth in White Rock	35
Forms of Density: Trade-offs	36
Land Use.....	40
Future Open Spaces	42
Mayor for the Day: Open Space Priorities	43
Outdoor Activities	44
Johnston Road and Retail Streets	46
Maximum Heights.....	48
Regulating Height	49
Height Transition.....	49
Building Step Backs	50
Building Heights: North Bluff Road.....	51
Building Heights: Johnston Road	52
Building Heights: Russell Avenue.....	53
Building Heights: Thrift Avenue.....	54
Building Heights: Martin and George Street	55
Appendix.....	57
Design Town Centre: Verbatim Comments.....	58
Build Town Centre: Verbatim Comments	65
Interactive Panels: Verbatim Comments	70

This page was left blank for double sided printing.



Introduction

Overview

This document summarizes the activities, events and outcomes of Phase 1 of the Town Centre Official Community Plan Urban Design Review process; as well as relevant outcomes from the City of White Rock OCP Review Survey.


This process is one of a series of Official Community Plan (OCP) Review processes that are currently underway or anticipated in the City of White Rock.

The purpose of the Town Centre Urban Design Review process is to understand the community's priorities for Town Centre policies on building heights, density, lot coverage, land use and open space; and, to provide recommendations for refinements to OCP policies as needed.

Process

The Town Centre Urban Design Review process includes two phases. In Phase 1 community workshops were held on July 6th and 9th, 2019 to review and comment on Town Centre Policy from the OCP and the Urban Design Plan (2011). The input that was gathered as a part of these workshops will inform the development of draft recommendations for policy updates to the OCP in Phase 2.

In Phase 2, draft policy recommendations will be shared at a public Open House for comment. Policy recommendations will then be updated based on resident feedback and summarized in a policy recommendations report.



Workshop Format and Activities

Each workshop was held for four hours in the White Rock Community Centre and included Drop-in Activities as well as Registered Activities.

Workshops were advertised by the following means:

- On the City website news alert and calendar
- On the City's project engagement website
- Through several posts on City's Facebook and Twitter account
- On the City's 'CityConnects' newsletter
- Through advertisements in six editions of the Peace Arch News (June 7, 12, 14, 19, 21 and 28, 2019)
- Through OCP Review posters at businesses and civic facilities in the Town Centre and Lower Town Centre
- By direct email invite to previous participants in the 2011 Urban Design Charrette; and,
- By direct email invite to property owners in the Town Centre

Drop-in Activities

Drop-in activities allowed participants to provide input and get to know the project and process at any time during the workshop. Activities included:

- **Informational and interactive display panels** where participants could learn about Town Centre OCP policies and provide feedback;
- A **Mayor for the Day** station where participants could share their priorities about Open Space in Town Centre;
- **Visualize Town Centre** station, where participants could see a 3D model of Town Centre and learn about approved developments in Town Centre and constructions projects which are underway; and,
- **What's Your Vision?** A photos station where participants share their 'one word vision' for the future of Town Centre.

Registered Activities

Registered Activities allowed participants to work in small groups along with DIALOG planning and engagement specialists, as well as City of White Rock staff who were available as subject matter experts. Registered activities lasted for 1 hour each. A total of six sessions of each were held over the two days. Activities included:

- **Build Town Centre!** At this station participants worked as a group to model future development and open spaces using wooden blocks and paper cut outs; and,
- **Design Town Centre!** At this station, a graphic facilitator documented participant ideas through plan view drawings.

Key Themes Overall

While many of the Town Centre OCP policies appear to align with resident aspirations for the future of White Rock, there are a number of policies which can be refined or more strictly enforced to better reflect participants' vision. Some of the key themes which emerged during Phase 1 engagement are:

- Walkability, accessibility and connectivity (for walkers, bikers and people on scooters);
- Sustainability and generous green open spaces;
- Design for comfortable micro-climates (wind and solar comfort); and,
- More strict regulation of building height.

Many of the participants who took part in the Phase 1 Engagement Activities are long time residents of White Rock and have been involved in White Rock planning and engagement processes in the past. It should be noted that some of these participants feel that there is a disconnect between the vision of the OCP and how development is occurring in Town Centre. In particular, these participants feel that the recent developments in Town Centre do not contribute to the 'village by the sea' feel that they identify with the City of White Rock.

Council's OCP review processes are an important step in providing a way for White Rock residents to reflect on their community and to let Council know not only how well the long term planning vision aligns with their values but also what aspects of this vision require more strict enforcement. However, as noted in the demographic analysis that follows, workshop participants reflect a select portion of the White Rock community as a whole. Therefore, the outcomes of the workshop should be considered in conjunction with the input which is being gathered through other OCP Review engagement process, including the online survey.

Participant Demographics - Workshops

Participants provided demographic information at sign-in to help with the analysis of the activities. A total of 88 participants attended the workshops. 43 people took part on July 6th and 45 people took part on July 9th.


The demographic analysis reveals whose voices were captured as well as those that were missing. In Phase 2 of the Town Centre Urban Design Review, DIALOG will work with City Staff to find ways to improve the equity of voices represents, including greater representation from: renters, people under the age of 51 and people with school aged children.

In order to share relevant input from a broader range of demographics (including people of working age and with children living at home) outcomes from the City of White Rock OCP Review survey have been included throughout the document.

According to the 2016 Census, there were 19,955 people living in White Rock. The 88 participants represent 0.04% of the population of White Rock.


Participants by Municipality

The majority of participants were from White Rock.




White Rock Participants by Neighbourhood

The majority of participants were from Mature Neighbourhood.



Housing Ownership


Compared to 2016 Census data for the City of White Rock, workshop participants represented a higher proportion of home owners than renters.



*Percentages are based on the 62 workshop participants who disclosed whether or not they rent or own their home.

School Aged Children


The majority of participants were from White Rock.



*Percentages are based on the 79 workshop participants disclosed whether or not they have school-aged children at home.

Household Size


The average household size of workshop participants is 1.9 people per household. This is representative of the City of White Rock, based on 2016 Census Data. However, there was a higher proportion of people living in 2, 3 and 5 person households and fewer proportion of people living alone or in 4 person households than the 2016 Census Data.



*Percentages are based on the 78 workshop participants who disclosed their household size.

Gender


The ratio of workshop participants who identify as male and female is representative of the City of White Rock, based on 2016 Census Data.



*Percentages are based on the 88 workshop participants who disclosed their gender.

Age

Among workshop participants, residents who fall within the 65+ age category are over represented compared to 2016 Census Data. Participants within the 51-65 age group are somewhat fairly represented and participants below the age of 51 are greatly under represented.



*Percentages are based on the 84 workshop participants who disclosed their age.

Participant Demographics - Online Survey

The City of White Rock OCP Review online survey ran from 22 May, 2019 to 15 July, 2019 and reached 151 participants. 52.7% of these participants reported that they have not previously participated in a City planning exercise versus 47.3% who had. Of the 63 people who provided reasons for not previously taking part, 19% of them quoted time constraints or family commitments as barriers to engaging. This suggests that, compared to the workshops, the survey reached more community members who are under the age of retirement; and, more who have children living at home.

A comprehensive on-line survey engagement summary report, including summary of verbatim comments, will be published separately by the City of White Rock. For the purposes of this document, only responses to questions as relevant to the Town Centre have been included.

This page was left blank for double sided printing.



Build Town Centre!

REGISTERED ACTIVITY

This page was left blank for double sided printing.

Build Town Centre

Activity Overview

At the Build Town Centre station participants worked in small groups to model future development and open spaces using wooden blocks and paper cut outs. An aerial base map as well as foam buildings showing existing context was provided. The foam buildings representing buildings which are currently being constructed or approved in Town Centre, as well as buildings which are unlikely to redevelop by 2045 (the planning horizon for the OCP). A total of six sessions were held during the July 6th and 9th workshops.

Key Themes

The following key themes which were shared among all groups:

- Improved connectivity,
- More green space,
- Generous, comfortable and accessible pedestrian realm; and,
- Lower buildings along Johnston Road (than what is currently permitted).

The following were common themes, however they were not shared by all groups:

- Housing options (rental, affordable, co-op, etc.),
- Sustainability (rainwater management, green buildings),
- Improved access to transit,
- Distinct architectural expression and materials,
- A central green space, activated by vibrant ground floor uses (market, retail etc.),
- Design for micro-climate (wind, sun and shade etc.),
- A gateway at Johnston Road and North Bluff Road (whether a building or open space),
- New civic or cultural uses in Town Centre; and,
- Tallest buildings along North Bluff Road.

Summaries by Group

Day 1 Group 1

Participants expressed **concerns about the types of development that have occurred in White Rock Town Centre**. There is a general feeling that Town Centre is too dense, too tall and these developments don't 'feel like White Rock.' In general the participants of this group did not want to see any more tall buildings, however there was some support for slightly more development along North Bluff Road, as long as it expanded civic amenities such as a large park.

Values and considerations which participants would like to see in the future include:

- Maintaining a 'small town feel',
- Keeping existing views open,
- Better design for micro-climate comfort (particularly with regard to wind),
- The preservation of small businesses and owner/operator spaces,
- Maintaining and strengthening the 'high street' feel of Johnston Road, and;
- Better transit/connections to the beach and region.

Whether or not Town Centre is a place for affordable housing was raised as a question. Overall, participants **desired to see green spaces, walkability and the quality of the public realm and generous setbacks for comfortable pedestrian oriented streets**.





Note:

- Buildings with a blue dot represent buildings which are currently under construction or have already been approved, buildings with an orange dot are unlikely to redevelop between now and 2045 (the planning time frame of the OCP).
- Wooden blocks in yellow represent 4 storeys of residential, and buildings in red represent 3 storeys of mixed-use. White blocks are sometimes used, and their use is defined by each group and noted in the description.
- The conversation summary sheet is included in the appendix.

Day 1 Group 2

This group sought to show how buildings in Town Centre could provide a significant amount of public amenities. White blocks were used to represent affordable housing, yellow represented strata residential and red represented ground floor commercial. Buildings were kept lower on Johnston Road (8 storeys), while slightly more height was permitted on the buildings to the west to Foster Street (12 storeys). An even split between **commercial, strata residential and rental** units is desired, along with **sustainable design** features (like solar panels).

Two sites (with pink diamond symbols) represent key sites where density bonuses could be allowed in order to capture Community Amenity Contributions for use towards building a new city hall in Town Centre.

Open space and connectivity were another focus of this activity. This was reflected in the desire for wide sidewalks, pedestrian and cycling pathways, boulevards and the identification of new park spaces. Additionally, a large green park was located at the corner of Johnston Road and North Bluff Road to act as the gateway to White Rock from Surrey.

Other ideas included a variety of **new land uses**, to support creative spaces, civic spaces (museum, archive), co-operative housing and/or a hotel. **Transit connections** to the wider region are also desired.





Note:

- Buildings with a blue dot represent buildings which are currently under construction or have already been approved, buildings with an orange dot are unlikely to redevelop between now and 2045 (the planning time frame of the OCP).
- The conversation summary sheet is included in the appendix.

Day 1 Group 3

Recognizing that the corner of North Bluff Road and Johnson Road have a lot of traffic, this group decided to focus green space more inwardly on the block bounded by Johnston Road, Russell Avenue, North Bluff Road and Foster Street. This **central green space** is framed by building forms which break away from the conventional rectilinear shapes and axis to showing how **architectural expression** could be used to define a unique public space for White Rock. The green Space is then envisioned to be activated through **strong at-grade relationships** (townhouses, coffee shops, etc.).

A new civic building overlooking the park space – whether a hotel or museum – was also envisioned. In this scenario **tall buildings are focused on North Bluff Road while Johnston Road remained lower in scale.**

In addition to the central green Space, **green pedestrian connections** are envisioned to create accessibility and to increase walkability.





Note:

- Buildings with a blue dot represent buildings which are currently under construction or have already been approved, buildings with an orange dot are unlikely to redevelop between now and 2045 (the planning time frame of the OCP).
- Wooden blocks in yellow represent 4 storeys of residential, and buildings in red represent 3 storeys of mixed-use.
- The conversation summary sheet is included in the appendix.

Day 2 Group 1

While each participant had a distinct vision for the future of Town Centre a few unanimous focus areas emerged.

Enhanced Open Space

The group had a collective desire for **enhanced open spaces** including: green spaces, plazas and pedestrian-priority streets. The group proposed **extending Bryant Park** across Russell Avenue and towards North Bluff Road. Between Russell Avenue and North Bluff Road the park would expand and act as a **central courtyard** to the buildings that would surround it. They proposed a **plaza at the corner of Russell Avenue and Johnston Road** -- similar to what is proposed in the Town Centre Urban Design Plan. It was agreed that both these large open spaces should accommodate **flexible programming and adjacent commercial uses to foster a vibrant social environment**. For example, the group proposed a civic building with hands-on educational programs related to White Rock's waterfront history. To connect a network of open spaces, the group proposed **pedestrian-priority roads with street-front small commercial spaces** that would bring character to the street.

Identity and Gateways

The group expressed that the City Centre lacks a cohesive identity. They suggested that future **architectural design should reference White Rock's marine history** in a contemporary manner to bring a sense-of-place to the area. As a **gateway to the city**, the group suggested an architecturally significant tower or twin towers at the intersection of Johnston Road and North Bluff Road to signify entrance to White Rock.

Towers with Caveats but Mid-Rise Preferred

After much discussion, participants agreed that any **towers should be stepped back on a podium** to retain a positive street experience and avoid 'canyon-ing'. When talking about building height, a participant voiced a strong concern for wind, both its impacts to comfort for pedestrians and its impacts to balcony furnishings. **Environmental comfort at the street-level was a priority for participants**. To that point, underground parking was favoured over surface parking.



Note:

- Buildings with a blue dot represent buildings which are currently under construction or have already been approved, buildings with an orange dot are unlikely to redevelop between now and 2045 (the planning time frame of the OCP).
- Wooden blocks in yellow represent 4 storeys of residential, and buildings in red represent 3 storeys of mixed-use, and sometimes townhouses.
- The conversation summary sheet is included in the appendix.

Day 2 Group 2

Broadly speaking, Group 2 explored innovation, sustainability, and economic growth as they Built Town Centre. Their ideas can be summarized in the following themes.

Architectural Expression

Participants generally disliked podium and tower architectural design. To them, podiums favoured big box stores over small-scale commercial and impede on green space and permeability. They preferred having large setbacks whenever possible. “**Towers in the Park**” was a reoccurring theme.

Participants would like to see **innovative architecture** and referenced buildings in Shanghai and Sussex, living green walls and non-linear street relationships (ie. skewed buildings, curved facades) as inspiration. Diversity of architectural expression was desired. Some buildings could be just a few stories, others higher than 9 storeys. There was a concern for affordability, particularly for the average income earner. The white blocks on the proposed towers along North Bluff Road depict **affordable housing units**.

Green Space

Increased green space was a priority for this group. They included a **Bryant Park extension** across Russell Avenue. At the corner of Russell Avenue and Johnston Road they proposed making **a green park space rather than a Town Square** as shown in the Town Centre Urban Design Plan. They would also like to see **large street trees**. There was substantial concern about storm water management and the group’s green spaces were proposed with integrated stormwater management in mind. They also suggested changing the Zoning Bylaw to **address storm water runoff and soil infiltration**. In general, there was concern about the proliferation of hardscape in the Town Centre, including both on the surface through paving and underground in parking structures with parks above. ‘True green spaces’ with no parkades below and large trees, are preferred.

Improved Pedestrian Experience

Participants wish to see an **improved connectivity** in Town Centre for walkers, cyclists, skateboarders, scooters, etc. They suggested that if there are tower podiums, that they be kept to 2 storeys for street light. They also suggested that the Bryant Park extension should be **a large central gathering place**, perhaps adjacent to a large market (akin to Granville Island Market) or another vibrant commercial space.



Note:

- Buildings with a blue dot represent buildings which are currently under construction or have already been approved, buildings with an orange dot are unlikely to redevelop between now and 2045 (the planning time frame of the OCP).
- Wooden blocks in yellow represent 4 storeys of residential, and buildings in red represent 3 storeys of mixed-use. White blocks represent affordable housing.
- The conversation summary sheet is included in the appendix.

Day 2 Group 3

The third Build Town Centre session on July 9th is the voice of a White Rock youth, a demographic that was otherwise under represented at the workshops.

Similar to many other groups, the concept for this session showed taller buildings along North Bluff Road. Buildings were mixed use, and **transition in height from Johnston Road to Forster Street**. A series of pathways connect pedestrians from North Bluff Road south to a central green space. Emphasis was placed on the use of **unique and high quality pathway materials**. Additionally, the building at Johnston Road and North Bluff Road was placed at an angle to **create a sense of entry to White Rock** through distinct architecture and the placement of a plaza.





Design Town Centre!

REGISTERED ACTIVITY

Design Town Centre

Activity Overview

The Design Town Centre activity gave participants an opportunity to share their vision for the White Rock Town Centre while a graphic facilitator recorded their ideas. A total of four 1 hour Design Town Centre sessions occurred and a number of key themes emerged.

Key Themes

Building Heights and Density

Participants expressed a wide range of opinions on the amount of density and heights of buildings. Some participants expressed their desire to keep White Rock the way it is and others want to see a significant amount of density developed in the Town Centre. This range in opinion made it challenging to build consensus on density and building heights, however, many participants agreed that, if density is coming, **building heights should step down from the Town Centre, to smaller buildings that are sensitive to the neighbouring context.** A common **concern expressed about density was solar access and shading,** particularly of green, open spaces. Another sentiment shared was that luxury condos “don’t build community” and participants agreed that **emphasis should be on community building rather than density.**

Open Space

There was an overarching agreement that **a “green heart” in the Town Centre is desirable** and will help create a sense of community. This manifested itself repeatedly as an extension of the existing Bryant Park, with pedestrian connection across Russell Avenue, and spilling into the centre of the block between Foster Street and Johnston Road. This approach mirrored the Town Centre Urban Design Plan (2011). Bryant Park is a beloved green space in White Rock, and participants expressed a need for **more spaces like Bryant Park that are green, quiet and tranquil, as well as a need for park amenities** like small playgrounds, benches, gathering spaces, patios, and outdoor adult exercise equipment. People would also like to see more trails for walking, biking, and wheeling/scooters with an **emphasis on safety and accessibility**, as one participant said “White Rock is a town connected by pathways.” There was also a discussion about transit and participants liked the idea of **a regional transit hub located within walking distance of White Rock** (across North Bluff Rd in Surrey) with only local buses in White Rock.

“White Rock is a town connected by pathways.”

Land Uses


Another common theme was a discussion about the inclusion of commercial retail and office spaces in the Town Centre. Commercial spaces are key for attracting people to the Town Centre and building a sense of community.

Participants agreed that commercial should be focused along Johnston Road. There was also a theme of creating commercial spaces that face inwards towards the proposed **central green space with restaurants and patios** to create a unique character for the Town Centre. This space could feel like a “mini Granville Island” with a festival space, market, vendors, buskers, and food carts to draw people into the Town Centre. There was also an idea shared to create a small college campus in the Town Centre to attract people. Overall, participants recognized that there is an opportunity to reanimate the commercial core in White Rock.

Group Drawings




This group explored open space connectivity throughout Town Centre, as well as building heights.



This group explored two different concepts for the block that is bounded by Russell Avenue, North Bluff Road, Johnston Road and Foster Street.




This group explored connectivity options for pedestrians, cyclist and transit throughout Town Centre. New green spaces are animated by an adjacent market. Participants did not agree on building heights along North Bluff Road.



This group explored a north-south park connection, with open spaces animated by a market and theatre and event space. Building heights along North Bluff Road are 10-12 storeys and along Russell Avenue are 4 storeys.

Note:

- Verbatim summaries of each group were provided by participants and are included in the appendix.



Values

DROP-IN ACTIVITIES

Phase 1 Workshop Outcomes

One Word Vision




Participants were asked: “What is one word which reflects your vision for the future of Town Centre?”

The words and phrases that were shared reflect the key topics and values that were uncovered through the engagement activities, however there were also some surprising outcomes. A dense Town Centre, modern, authentic, inclusiveness and housing for the homeless were less common themes.



Note:

- A larger font indicates that word received support from other participants through the use of sticky dots. Quality of Life received the most sticky dots.



Town Centre in the OCP

"If the waterfront is the soul of White Rock, then the Town Centre is the heart. This area is the economic and cultural centre of the community, with the greatest concentration of homes, jobs, shops, and amenities. This OCP will support reinforcement of the Town Centre as a mixed-use anchor, and will encourage the creation of delightful public places for socializing, dining, resting, people-watching, shopping, and taking in the view."

-OCP Guiding Principle "Enjoy Town Centre"


Participants used a sticky-dot to share if the guiding principle Enjoy Town Centre reflects what they value about Town Centre. This is what they said:



Participants added that the role of connected green space, character through architectural materials, a place for shopping for daily needs (grocery etc) and the mixed uses in combination with the generous public realm are also considerations which are valued in Town Centre.

While 76% of participants report that this principle reflects their values, some reported that the principle is not being achieved in the form of development that is being built. For these participants, there is a disconnect between the vision of the OCP and how development is occurring in Town Centre. It should be noted that only one of the developments which are currently under construction were approved under the current OCP (The Soleil at 1588 Johnston Road).

There were also opposing comments about more versus less towers; and, recommendations for height maximums (12 and 8 storeys).




Note:


- Verbatim comments from the workshop are provided in the appendix.
- Percentages are based on a total of 37 dots which were placed.
- Online survey is based on 151 responses.

Future Growth in White Rock

In the OCP, the general approach to growth management in the City is to reinforce the existing pattern of growth and continue to focus density in the Town Centre. Participants were asked to use sticky dots to share if they thought growth should be focused in the Town Centre. The majority agree with this approach.



If participants thought that growth should be focused elsewhere, they were asked to specify where. They could choose as many neighbourhoods as they liked. Here's what they said:



While this indicates that there is some interest in growth in outside of Town Centre (particularly in Urban Neighbourhoods), generally interest in growth beyond Town Centre is not desired.

Note:

- No comments were provided
- Agree / disagree percentages are based on a total of 61 dots which were placed.
- Percentages for neighbourhood are based on a total of 33 dots which were placed.

Forms of Density: Trade-offs


A series of diagrams illustrated the trade offs of different forms of development. Each illustration represented 3.0 FAR, however each prioritized different considerations (public realm, views, building height and space for integrating green infrastructure).

Participants were asked to identify their trade-off priorities by selecting which form and amenities they prefer:




Pedestrian Plazas

49% of people selected this option, which prioritizes large open spaces, environmental features and the creation of new views, and the tallest building. Note: See comment summary for additional context.




Plazas, Green Space + Patios

25% of people selected this option, which gives slightly more priority to environmental features and public amenities over low building heights and protection of existing views.



Patios + Green Space


20% of people selected the option which weighted all trade-offs equally (public realm, environmental features, views and building height).






Sidewalk + Furnishing Area

6% of people selected the option which prioritized low building heights over all other considerations.



Setback Animated By Stores

Low buildings with some additional set back were the least selected option.



Some participants commented that, **while they said that they preferred the Pedestrian Plazas typology, they did not support tall buildings.**

Note:

- Verbatim comments are included in the appendix.
- Percentages are based on a total of 139 dots which were placed.

This page was left blank for double sided printing.





Uses + Public Space

DROP-IN ACTIVITIES

Land Use

Overall, the response to the question about land use indicates that participants generally like the current mix in Town Centre with the most highly selected new land uses being a grocery store and restaurants. Participants indicated some interest in seeing other amenities like a theatre, arts centre, library, night life, office and recreational facilities. Daycares, a cinema, co-working space, and a museum were not highly rated.





In addition to rating the above land uses, participants provided ideas on sticky-notes. Participants would like to see education/research or satellite universities, social housing, outdoor artisan market and food trucks, water storage and green spaces (green space was also a popular topic at the registered activity stations).

Note:

- Verbatim comments are included in the appendix.
- Percentages are based on a total of 215 dots which were placed.

Future Open Spaces

Town Centre Urban Design Plan

Both completed and yet to be completed open spaces which are outlined in the Urban Design Plan were presented to participants. Participants were then asked to indicate which of the yet to be completed open spaces they would especially like to see in Town Centre.



The top rated public space improvements identified by participants was a pedestrian street with patios. This reflects the theme of walkability and accessibility which was consistently raised during the registered group activities. The neighbourhood park received the least support. This is surprising considering that the idea of a neighbourhood park and more green space was a significant element/theme throughout the workshop.

In addition to rating the above Urban Design Plan Open Spaces, participants provided comments and ideas on sticky-notes. Overall participants would like to see that existing green spaces are maintained and improved, that more green space is provided and that pedestrian experience is enhanced with active edges. It should be noted that two participants felt that this question was leading and specifically did not want to endorse the revitalization of Johnston Road.

Note:


- Verbatim comments are included in the appendix.
- Percentages are based on a total of 151 dots which were placed.

Mayor for the Day: Open Space Priorities

While participant preference on the Open Spaces presented in the Urban Design Plan helped to identify specific projects that are supported, the Mayor for the Day activity explored participant values about open space. Participants distributed their 'budget' to identify their open space priorities.



Participant priorities included A Green Town Centre, New Pedestrian Connections and Vibrant Urban Public Spaces. There is a slight priority that Town Centre open spaces be places for Town Centre residents, rather than city-wide park destinations.



Note:

- No additional comments were received (at the workshop).
- Percentages are based on a total of 424 beads/dots which were placed.
- Some participants used sticky dots instead of beads.
- Online survey is based on 15 responses.

Outdoor Activities

Responses to Outdoor Activities suggest that in general, participants want future outdoor activities to build upon the existing character of Town Centre; eating, socializing and people watching were the highest rated activities. Music and access to nature were also rated fairly highly, supporting the idea that Town Centre has not only a vibrant civic life but also quiet green places to enjoy.

25%

Eat + Socialize



15%

Access Nature



20%

People Watch



9%

Attend Festivals



16%

Listen To Music



5%

Play





In addition to rating the above Outdoor Activities, participants provided ideas on sticky-notes. Participants would like to see more green space, green roofs/ wall, and a monitoring device which reports environmental qualities (air, wind, humidity etc.).

Note:

- Verbatim comments are included in the appendix.
- Percentages are based on a total of 160 dots which were placed.

Johnston Road and Retail Streets in Town Centre

A few key development guidelines for retail streets were shared with participants, as well as the intent of OCP policies: “to protect and enhance the vibrant village-like setting that retail streets offer today”. Participants were invited to provide comments on the guidelines, as well as other ideas for retail streets.

Participant Comments on the Guidelines

There was general support for the guidelines which were shared. Additional comments on the guidelines were related to increasing walkability, through an increase in the number of crosswalks and in the fine-grained pedestrian network. Other notes included that there should be youth supportive space, including social and support space; and, that new rental housing should be required in all development. There was also concern that new buildings will not be lived in and that it is necessary to ensure that new buildings provide the people needed to support retail.

Participant Ideas for Retail Streets

Walkability and accessibility were common themes. Similar to the comments above, there is a desire for more crosswalks and curb cuts. Pedestrian priority through the closing of Johnston Road to traffic was another theme.

Limiting Johnston Road to 4 storeys, incorporating a transit hub near five corners, space for non-profits, expanded tourism and safety were other ideas which were shared.




Image from the OCP Development Permit Area Guidelines.

Note:


- Verbatim comments are included in the appendix.



DROP-IN ACTIVITIES

Maximum Heights

Future growth in White Rock is focused in Town Centre, and building heights reflect this growth management strategy. Participants used a sticky-dot to share whether or not they support this approach.



Participants provided additional comments with suggestions for maximum building heights. These include recommendations for Town Centre maximum heights (10-12, 6, and 15 storeys). Comments were also received which show support for higher buildings along North Bluff Road, particularly if they deliver green space. Even heights throughout Town Centre and Town Centre Transition was offered as another idea. The idea of a podium style building and set back was also recommended.

Online Survey

Participants were asked which types of buildings they would prefer in Town Centre; participants could select multiple options. People generally selected the types of buildings which reflect the current mix:




Note:

- Verbatim comments from the workshop are included in the appendix.
- Percentages are based on a total of 60 dots which were placed.
- Online survey is based on 151 responses.

Regulating Height

The OCP provides height guidelines rather than specific height limits. Participants were asked if they support the use of guidelines to allow for flexibility or if they would prefer to have specific limits on height. The majority of participants would like to see the specific limits for regulating height.



Height Transition

In the OCP the tallest and densest developments are to be located at the intersection of Johnston and North Bluff Roads, with heights and densities decreasing to the south, east and west towards adjacent neighbourhoods. Participants were asked to use sticky dots share if they support this approach and to provide comment on why. The majority of people expressed support.



Participants who do not support this approach provided two opposing comments: that they would prefer to see a limit of height to 8 storeys and heights to match single family housing in transition zones; and, conversely that they would like to see a height increase in Town Centre Transition to match the Town Centre. One person noted that there is already a development in the transition zone which does not fit with this guideline.

Note:

- Verbatim comments from the workshop on Height Transition are included in the appendix, no comments were received on regulating height at the workshop.
- Percentages are based on a total of 55 dots which were received on the Regulating Height board, and 52 which were placed on the Height Transition board.
- Online survey is based on 147 responses

Building Step Backs

The OCP provides guidelines which help to shape the form of buildings in Town Centre, including guidelines for building step-backs. Participants were asked if they support the building step-backs guideline or not and then asked to provide comments on why they answered that way. This is what they said:



Comments from those who do not support this policy

There were two comments provided. One suggested that the set back occur after the 6th storey, rather than the 3rd or 4th. The other said no more high rises.

Comments from those who somewhat support this policy

Comments included that there should be no high-rises, that the step back creates more covered area, that each building should have it's own design consideration, and that step backs are only desirable if the rooftops are green and contribute to sustainability.

Comments from those who support this policy

People who support this policy said that they don't want high rises.


Note:

- Verbatim comments are included in the appendix.
- Percentages are based on a total of 41 dots which were placed.

Building Heights: North Bluff Road

North Bluff Road marks the boundary between White Rock and Surrey. Growth in Surrey influences the City of White Rock due to their close proximity. This is where **the OCP concentrates the highest heights and densities adjacent to the Town Centre along North Bluff Road.**


The majority of participants support this policy:



Participants used sticky dots to tag the diagram to the right to share what maximum building height they thought was appropriate for North Bluff Road in Town Centre.

25 Storeys and 12 Storeys were nearly tied, with 20 and 8 Storeys also being highly rated.

- Note:
- No comments were received.
 - Percentages on policy support are based on a total of 19 dots which were placed.
 - Percentages on building heights are based on a total of 58 dots which were placed.




Building Heights: Johnston Road

Commercial development is focused along Johnston Road in Town Centre. Johnston Road has been historically characterized by diverse and small-scale retail.

Participants used sticky dots to tag the diagram to the right to share what maximum building height they thought was appropriate for Johnston Road in Town Centre.

8 Storeys was the most highly rated, with 25, 20, 12 and 4 storeys also being fairly highly rated.



Note:


- No comments were received.
- Percentages are based on a total of 64 dots which were placed.

Building Heights: Russell Avenue

The vision for Russell Avenue is to enhance its role as a green street and east-west connection between Town Centre and Centennial Park.

Participants used sticky dots to tag the diagram to the right to share what maximum building height they thought was appropriate for Russell Avenue in Town Centre.

8 storeys was selected most (40% of respondents). Nearly tied for second most selected heights were 25, 12 and 4 storeys.



Note:


- No comments were received.
- Percentages are based on a total of 65 dots which were placed.

Building Heights: Thrift Avenue

Thrift Avenue marks the boundary between Town Centre and Lower Town Centre. The Lower Town Centre, while also mixed use, is smaller in scale than the Town Centre.

Participants used sticky dots to tag the diagram to the right to share what maximum building height they thought was appropriate for Thrift Avenue in Town Centre.

8 Storeys was the most highly rated (32% of respondents) with 6 storeys coming in second (17%) and 16 and 12 storeys tied for third.



Note:


- No comments were received.
- Percentages are based on a total of 69 dots which were placed.

Building Heights: Martin and George Street

Martin and George Streets are the eastern and western extents of the Town Centre. The buildings facing Martin and George Street are generally 3-4 storeys tall and primarily residential.

Participants used sticky dots to tag the diagram to the right to share what maximum building height they thought was appropriate for Martin and George Streets in Town Centre.

Similar to Thrift Avenue, 8 storeys was selected most often (32% of respondents) with 6 storeys coming in second (16%). 25 and 4 storeys were tied for 3rd most selected.



Note:

- No comments were received.
- Percentages are based on a total of 69 dots which were placed.

This page was left blank for double sided printing.

Appendix

Design Town Centre: Verbatim Comments

Design Town Centre: Verbatim Comments Group 1 Day 1

Town Centre Urban Design Review

WHITE ROCK
City by the Sea!

Group 1 / Day 1

Now that you've redesigned the Town Centre, summarize your core ideas below!

- MORE GREEN SPACE.
- QUIET SPACES.
- NO LOUD MUSIC.
- JOHNSTON RD - NARROWED
MAKES IT LESS BIKE
FRIENDLY. -
JOHNSTON
- NEED MORE TREES.
TREE CANOPY. 20%.
- GREENING THE CITY.
- DON'T NEED HEIGHT HERE.
- DISAGREE - TOWN CENTRE
SHOULD HAVE DENSITY -
STEPPED DOWN.
- ~~2B~~ - HEIGHTS - IMPACT ON
TRANSITION ZONES. -
ADJACENT NEIGHBOURHOODS
- DEVELOPMENT FOR WHAT?
- I THINK DENSITY HERE
MAKES SENSE -
- TOWERS DON'T BUILD COMMUNITY.
- I THINK TOWERS ARE FABULOUS.
- NEED PEOPLE AT STREET LEVEL.
- THIS AREA IS DONE.
- I DISLIKE TOWERS

Now that you've redesigned the Town Centre, summarize your core ideas below!

- MINIMIZE SHADOWS ON GREEN SPACE
 - NEED DEVELOPERS TO AGREE TO BUILD THE PARK.
 - TOWN IS CONNECTED BY WALKWAYS
 - PLAYFUL ARCHITECTURE.
 - HIGHER BUILDINGS STEPPING DOWN - GOOD CONCEPT
 - HOW DOES GREEN SPACE LOOK
 - LIKE BRYANT PARK
 - ADULT FITNESS FACILITIES
 - COMMERCIAL + OFFICE SPACE.
 - IF GREEN SPACE NEEDED may need more height \$(15??) (ON N. BLUFF)
- BENCHES
TREES?
BIKES?
SCOOTERS?
CANOPY TREES
SMALL PLAYGROUND
OUTDOOR EXERCISE
ADULT EQUIPMENT

- TURNING WHITE ROCK INTO.
TOWER TOWN. -
- STEP BACK FROM THE
STREET -
- 12 STOREY MAX ON NORTH
BLUFF.
- 20 STOREY ON NORTH
BLUFF

Town Centre Urban Design Review

WHITE ROCK

DESIGN

Group 1 / Day

July 9

Now that you've built the Town Centre, summarize your core themes below and draw out your big ideas on the Town Centre diagram.

- BUS TERMINAL WITH CONDOS
- TRANSIT ALONG JOHNSTON
- RETAIL ALONG JOHNSTON
- COMMUNITY/BUSES + REGIONAL - 351 TO RICHMOND
- POSSIBLE REGIONAL TRANSIT LOOP IN SURREY.
- SLOWER ROAD SPEEDS - NOT A GOOD IDEA
- MORE COMMERCIAL (JOHNSTON)
- REQUIREMENTS FOR SAFE BIKE ROUTES
- NO BIKES ON JOHNSTON. WANT TO WALK ON JOHNSTON.
- HIGHEST - TRANSITIONING TO LOWER ADJACENT - PEOPLE LIKE THAT.
- WE DON'T WANT DEVELOPERS TO BE ALLOWED TO BUY ADDITIONAL HEIGHT. [ONLY IN TOWN CENTRE]
- HEIGHT ALONG NORTH BLUFF IS OK. ≤ 25 HOUSING. VISIT AFFORDABLE OPTIONS FOR DENSITY VARIATION
- MINI GRANVILLE ISLAND.

- KEEP DENSITY WITHIN TOWN CENTRE
- TRANSITION IN BUILDING HEIGHTS FROM JOHNSTON.
- TALLER BUILDINGS BLOCKING SUNLIGHT.
- ENSURE OPEN SPACE IS NOT IN SHADOW.
- JOHNSTON - COMMERCIAL HEART.
-

Now that you've redesigned the Town Centre, summarize your core ideas below!

- KEEP SHADOW OFF OF PARK SPACE.
- FUTURE PARKLAND @ CORNER OF MARTIN + THRIFT
- VARIOUS OPINIONS ABOUT HEIGHT
 - ↳ FOCUS HEIGHT ALONG NBR (NORTH BLUFF RD).
- REDUCING HEIGHT ON OTHER CORNER OF JOHNSTON RD (SW)
- FEELING OF COMMUNITY MISSING.
- COMMERCIAL MEETING PLACES (COFFEE, PATIO MEETING SPACES).
- SPACES THAT DRAW PEOPLE IN
- FOOD CARTS, FARMERS MARKETS, MUSIC
- 'MINI GRANVILLE ISLAND'
- ALTERNATE USES FOR PARKADE.
- COLLEGE / UNIVERSITY - BRING MORE YOUNG PEOPLE INTO THE TOWN CENTRE.
- FOCUS ON PEDESTRIAN ROUTE THROUGH TOWN CENTRE.
- ATTRACT TYPES OF BUSINESSES THAT ATTRACT YOUNGER PEOPLE
- MORE EVENTS IN TOWN CENTRE
 - BUSKERS, ETHNIC FESTIVALS
- MORE EVENTS IN MIRAMAR PUBLIC SPACE
- MARKET / EVENT AREA - PERMANENT SPACE

Now that you've built the Town Centre, summarize your core themes below and draw out your big ideas on the Town Centre diagram!


✓ COMMERCIAL SPACE SURROUNDING PARK AREA.

- NO 'TWIN TOWERS' @ THE ENTRANCE TO WHITE ROCK - LOWER BUILDING HEIGHT ON SW CORNER.

1

Build Town Centre: Verbatim Comments

Group 1 Day 1



GROUP 2

30

Now that you've built the Town Centre, summarize your core themes below and draw out your big ideas on the Town Centre diagram!

- LIKE WIDE SIDEWALKS
- WALKABILITY + CYCLING
- LOSS OF SKYLINE
- BOULEVARDS FOR AESTHETICS
- SEPARATED CYCLE PATHS
- LIKE THE SMALL TOWN FEEL
- MIXED RESIDENTIAL
- AFFORDABLE - MIXED INCOME
- CPED
- CREATIVE SPACES
- HUB FOR TRANS LINK
- ↳ CONNECTIONS TO WIDER REGION
- ↳ HUBS TO NORTH
- NOT PROPER "HUB"
- SOME SORT OF CIVIC CENTRE FOCUS - MUSEUM, ARCHIVE, ...?
- HUB FURTHER SOUTH ON JOHNSON
- WHAT IS OUR GATEWAY?
- ↳ PARK + CIVIC AMENITY, NOT A TOWER
- BRYANT PARK
- WHAT IS ENTRY TO COMMUNITY?
- MORE RENTAL THAN STRATA?
- STEP HEIGHT
- LOW AT N. BLUFF RD. TO HIGHER IN CENTRE AT EXISTING TOWERS
- MAX 12 STOREIES, EVENLY SPLIT B/W COMMERCIAL, RES., RENT
- PAY FOR CITY HALL W/ DENSITY FROM CENTRAL OR DEVELOPMENT
- DAY CARES?
- CO-OP HOUSING
- LAND VALUE VS. LAND COST

Group 3

30

Now that you've built the Town Centre, summarize your core themes below and draw out your big ideas on the Town Centre diagram!

- NE CORNER PARK MAYBE NOT IDEAL DUE TO TRAFFIC
- CENTRAL PARK IN MIDDLE
- AT GRADE RELATIONSHIPS FOR RESIDENTIAL, ie. TOWNHOUSES
- KEEP LOW ON JOHNSON
- CIVIC BUILDINGS- AMENITY; OR HOTEL?
- LOTS OF GREEN CONNECTIONS AT GRADE
- TALLER TOWERS ON NORTH BLUFF

Now that you've redesigned the Town Centre, summarize your core ideas below!

- Towers to be tastefully designed to allow for a great urban centre ~~to be~~ max stepped back on podium
- green space with nice breezeways.
- affordable housing/rental/market rate in return for more density. Maybe by some others to
- city by sea design guidelines in OCP
- Gateway into city with side by side or twin towers along Johnson St.
- ^{public} underground parking w/ enough for residents.
- Lots of green space, a couple active, program/social
- plaza space for multipurpose uses
- wind issues & design issue to be addressed
- clarity of opinions Johnson and Russell are
- community amenity space.
- Steps back help height variation
- town houses/mixed use along grade.
- be cognizant of views.
- connections/pedestrian across Russell
- Bryant park continuation.
-

Now that you've built the Town Centre, summarize your core themes below and draw out your big ideas on the Town Centre diagram!

- smaller pedestals or none - for commercial - 2 stories for street light
- setbacks from streets -
- better architectural design - like Shanghai! - innovative architectural
- better sidewalks for cycling, skateboarders, scooters -
- larger trees - true green spaces - setbacks on underground parkades
- change zoning bylaws to address storm water runoff + soil
- * infiltration
- * Sussex as example for architectural exterior features, height
- lower - Granville Market - rural in between high rises pedestrian
- tower to park -
- lower heights - a few projects are strictly commercial
- a few projects - higher 9 stories - residential
- developers encourage to have ^{thru} architectural
- mixed design planning attracts institutional groups -
- living walls or vertical plan
- large park - central park - Beyond Park Extension
- rotab and reposition Building at Johnson + north bluff

Interactive Panels: Verbatim Comments

Note: a (x#) indicates that support was shown by other participants for the comment by adding a sticky dot. If a comments received one sticky dot then the comment will have a (x2) to represent the original poster as well as the person who indicated support. If two dots were place then the (x3) will be shown and so on.

Land Use

- Drawing knowledge, economy, satellite universities and research
- Find a space for people to view the oceans from/near Town Centre + incorporate library, museum +funicular to beach --- parking underneath
- Incentive to integrate social housing units
- Education/learning centre college/research
- Green spaces
- Cohesive theme “look” for city to minimize so many towers
- Open space market/food trucks farmers Artisan markets
- Zero water to leave any property. Harbourside Green in Victoria (Eco Buildings, Solar, Wind generator)
- Water storage tanks
- Urban Design review does not mean high density!

Future Open Space: Urban Design Plan

- Try to work with at least some of the existing trees below thrift if proposed work goes that far
- More green space would be great
- More green space is desperately needed
- An extension of Bryant park, include water feature in the open square
- Include in passages/lane ways, little coffee shops, restaurants, and a bike pass stairs leading to 1st Floor coffee Shops
- No more hideous concrete sidewalks
- This is not an endorsement of further development on Johnson. The wording is leading (x2)

Outdoor Activities

- Have an environment monitoring clock (Air Quality, Wind speed, Humidity, Camera)
- More green space wood BC great
- How can we increase green roofs + walls in our city?

Johnston Road and Retail Streets in Town Centre

Comments on Johnston Road and Retail Street Design Guidelines:

- OCP Policies are intended to protect + enhance whatever setting we choose (x2)
- “Yes” to creating more visibility into stores and use a variety of materials*
- Right idea
- Good Plan – limit building height (Patios +Green Space)*
- Youth Space, conversation, hang out, info/referral, support
- More pedestrian cross walks
- Facilitate rental housing units in all new development + condo in town centre
- Love the guidelines. Would like to see more pedestrian walkways*
- All the retail is good assuming that these 15 hi-rises are occupied by residents ‘residing’ and using our businesses so they don’t keep shutting down

Participants were asked to share their other ideas for retail streets. Here's what they said:

- Community & Tourism, Policing + resources, Storefront, drop-in place (sources, come share, non-profits)
- Transit Hub near 5 corners
- Yes – but limit height of building to 4 storeys max – more pedestrian cross walks
- Agreed with all the information on the board about Johnston road

Forms of Density: Trade-offs

- 19 storeys?
- Max 8 storeys on this
- Plaza design ok with Max 5 storeys to support infrastructure
- Narrow sidewalks = crowded with walkers for seniors, baby buggies, dogs, and breathing car fumes
- Pedestrian Plaza BUT lower buildings (x2)
- Green Space with pedestrian plazas + lower rise buildings (x2)
- Better with tower half size or less

Building Step Backs

Support Building Step-backs

- For the reasons above
- Hi Rises towering over you is not my idea of pleasant environment (eg – Vancouver)
- No more high-rises please!

Somewhat support building step-backs

- No high-rises
- I would not want the “Step Back” idea to justify high-rises
- Covered Area
- The step back should be refined for each individual construction in order to insure a certain balance
- Perhaps if you planted grasses + wild flower on all the roof tops to help with carbon emissions

Do not support building step-backs

- Have a step back to start after 6 storeys
- No more high-rises (x2)

Town Centre in the OCP: Guiding Principle

Does not reflect my values:

- A core niche style/accent (eg. Colors to keep diversity vs clone of all other cities)
- More towers to allow more people to live here (x2)
- No more high rises please! (x 3)
- The heart is becoming unaffordable and lacks a draw – no ordinary shops like hardware, groceries, general merchandise

Somewhat reflects my values:

- Be sure there is connected green space throughout

Reflects my values

- 8 storeys max – people-oriented streetscapes with low-rise retail and office space above – set back from street
- No more high-rises above 10-12 storeys – more stores like grocery store for locals
- Of course this principle reflects my values but what has been done to the town centre does not reflect this guiding principle

Maximum Building Heights

Do not agree:

- Maximum height should be 6 storeys

Somewhat agree:

- Even heights throughout the town center and town center transition areas
- Podium Street friendly set back & Above also set back
- Walkway Cover
- 1 support 10-12 storeys maximum in town centre & 6-8 storeys on Martin St. and George Street
- If all the buildings have the same maximum height, the light and sun doesn't go through and it creates wind tunnel (x4)
- Tall builds on North Bluff Trade off for housing and green space – Max 25

Agree:

- Tall heights at North Bluff - Step Down to Thrift Ave
- Why more than 15 floors when the top will be out of reach of Canadians, bought by foreign money using schemes to keep them empty. No benefit for businesses (x3)

Height Transition

Do not support

- Height should be limited to 8 storey on future developments in Town centre – restrict heights in transition zones to set zone height matching single family house
- Allow height increase in town center transition to match the town center

Somewhat Support

- The saltire is already in the transition

Support

- Proven Best Practice
- That was the plan many years ago but I don't think it will be achieved in regards to the latest random heights being built

Open Spaces

- Never seen anyone use this park to date! (Hodgson Park)
- No more corner Bump outs
- Pedestrian connections should all connect & not be hard to find

APPENDIX E

Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan – Stage 1 Plan Summary (from July 2019)

Semiahmoo Town Centre I Plan Update July 2019

Updating the Plan

An update to the original Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan was initiated in 2004 to address rapid growth and changing market conditions. When Council approved the interim plan in 2012 they directed staff to expand the plan boundaries to include a future transit improvement area along 152 Street and a potential medical precinct near Peace Arch Hospital. Since then expansion plans for the hospital have been confirmed.

In July, 2018 planning staff held workshops with extension area residents to develop a vision and explore potential land uses. In February, 2019 staff hosted a public open house and conducted a survey for all the stakeholders in the plan area to gather input on how to accommodate growth in the town centre. Following this staff developed a draft land use concept that reflected the work done and the input provided.



Your Ideas to Tackle Semiahmoo's Challenges

As one of Surrey's designated Town Centres, Semiahmoo is growing. The population is aging and average household sizes are shrinking. With this growth and change comes big challenges.

In 2018 we started asking residents and stakeholders how they would accommodate growth, improve transportation and enhance community amenities in the Semiahmoo Town Centre. Over 1,100 responses were provided at workshops, open houses and through online surveys. Below were the top 3 ideas for addressing each issue based on the feedback provided.



How would you accommodate growth?

1. Increase housing diversity
2. Improve services, amenities, infrastructure
3. Promote all ages communities



How would you improve transportation?

1. Improve walkability
2. Improve bus service
3. Improve cycling infrastructure



How would you enhance amenities?

1. More parks & open space
2. More recreation/community centres
3. More shopping and restaurants

Working With You

In 2018 we started to revisit the Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan. Since then we've held:

- 2 WORKSHOPS
- 2 OPEN HOUSES
- 3 SURVEYS

Where We are in the Process

We are currently in Stage 1 of the plan development process. We are hoping to bring a preferred land use plan back to the community later this year prior to bringing forward a draft land use plan to Council for approval. Once approved we will move into Stage 2 and *Developing the Plan*.



Semiahmoo Town Centre | Plan Update

Concentrated Density

What we heard:

Residents wanted more shops and local medical services but were concerned about the extent and proximity of high rise developments proposed in the plan.

How we addressed your feedback:

We limited high-rise development to the core area around the Semiahmoo Mall site, Frequent Transit Network corridor.

We introduced new low-rise mixed-use along 152 Street and 24 Avenue and a mixed-use mid-rise district along 16 Avenue to provide much needed space for supportive medical services.

Supporting rationale:

As Surrey responds to the challenges of urban growth, climate change and demographic shifts, it is increasingly important to concentrate density in Town Centres. Creating compact, complete urban neighbourhoods with mixed-uses supports transit service, walkability, as well as economic and cultural vitality.



Housing Diversity

What we heard:

Many residents wanted more affordable, family and senior-friendly housing types (e.g. townhouses, apartments). At the same time, many extension area residents expressed concern about the loss of existing single family neighbourhoods.

How we addressed your feedback:

We've included a wider range of residential land uses to support the diverse and changing needs of residents. We've also retained many of the existing single family neighbourhoods in the plan area.

Supporting rationale:

The average single family home in South Surrey costs \$1.5 million, yet the average Surrey family makes \$63,000 to \$120,000/year, which means many families will likely never own a single-family home here.

In addition, many seniors are choosing to age in place by downsizing over moving into designated senior housing or care facilities.

Surrey needs more apartments and townhouses to suit everyone's needs and incomes.



Semiahmoo Town Centre | Plan Update

Improved Connectivity

What we heard:

Many residents were concerned about existing and future traffic congestion and were opposed to a road being constructed through Bakerview Park.

How we addressed your feedback:

We've added new roads, enhanced bike lanes, sidewalks and pathways to link neighbourhoods, relieve congestion and improve pedestrian safety and walkability. We've removed the proposed road through Bakerview Park.

Supporting rationale:

152 Street is a Frequent Transit Network (FTN) corridor and provides service every 15 minutes during peak times. Transit service on 16 Avenue is approaching FTN service levels.

TransLink and the City have identified a conceptual unfunded future B-line express bus service to connect Semiahmoo with Newton and Surrey City Centre. The City is proposing a B-Line alignment that could run down 152 Street and along 16 Avenue to the Peace Arch Hospital. The B-Line would provide frequent and rapid transit service for local residents.



More Community Spaces

What we heard:

Residents wanted more community and cultural spaces and places to socialize and interact.

How we addressed your feedback:

We've added four new neighbourhood parks to the plan and are exploring partnership opportunities with developers to construct community amenity spaces for recreation, arts and culture, as part of major development projects.

Supporting rationale:


As the town centre becomes more compact, the need for parks and community amenities increases. The City is committed to ensuring residents live within walking distances of a park. Large developments are required to provide community amenities for neighbourhood residents.




Semiahmoo Town Centre | Plan Update

Proposed Land Use Strategy

The map shows where and how the proposed land uses fit together to create a coordinated plan for future growth. The legend provides a brief description of each land use.



THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK
 CORPORATE REPORT



DATE: March 9, 2020

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Carl Isaak, Director of Planning and Development Services

SUBJECT: Official Community Plan Review – Waterfront Enhancement Strategy and Town Centre Public Engagement Update

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council receive for information the corporate report dated March 9, 2020 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled “Official Community Plan Review – Waterfront Enhancement Strategy and Town Centre Public Engagement Update.”

INTRODUCTION

In November and December, 2019, City staff hosted a series of public engagement events to solicit feedback relating to the OCP Review and, more specifically, options to support the implementation of a Waterfront Enhancement Strategy (WES) and a revised planning framework for the future use and development of the City’s Town Centre. This corporate report provides Council with a summary of the methods of engagement undertaken by staff and the feedback received through the execution of these efforts. Further, the report highlights areas of shared public interest as identified through the completion of in-person consultation activities, described further below, and the hosting of an on-line survey.

ANALYSIS

Waterfront Enhancement Strategy

A corporate report received by the Land Use and Planning Committee (LUPC) on October 7, 2019 provides an overview of feedback received from the public regarding options to support the enhancement of the waterfront; the report also includes the first draft of the WES document. The feedback outlined in the report was received through the hosting of a waterfront community forum (June 27, 2019), an online community survey (May to July, 2019), and waterfront design workshops (July 23, 2019). Further, members of the White Rock business community were directly contacted following the July workshops to determine if they agreed with five key issues related to the enhancement of the waterfront. These issues were identified as a result of the preceding public consultation efforts and included the following:


1. Improve Accessibility;
2. Create All-Season Programing and Activities;
3. Strengthen Waterfront Business and Character;
4. Enhance the Waterfront Environment and Culture; and
5. Expand Activities for All Ages

The draft WES and proposed actions within it are structured around these five pillars / issues.

Building on this early consultation, the City hosted two interactive open houses with the draft WES in hand, to obtain input from the community on the relative weight, or importance, they would place on each of the five pillars if they had a limited amount of resources to apply in the waterfront area. The open houses were held on November 24 and 26, 2019; each had between 20 and 30 attendees. Open house participants were asked to play the role of “Mayor for a Day” and, acting in this role, each was given \$100 dollars of play money which could then be allocated towards one or more of the five issues. Poster boards outlining each issue, and options to address the issue (i.e. options to support specific waterfront enhancements), were presented alongside a physical basket within which the play monies could be deposited for “spending” on that issue. Copies of the poster boards used during the open houses are provided as Appendix A.

An on-line survey was also hosted on the “TalkWhiteRock.ca” web platform as a complement to the in-person engagement activities. As with the “Mayor for a Day” exercise at the open houses, the survey asked participants to allocate \$100 dollars in play money towards one or more of the five issues. The survey ran from November 26, 2019 to January 2, 2020 and was completed by 24 persons. References to the survey were provided during the open house and through social media postings. Further, a community pop-up event was held on December 6, 2019 at the White Rock Museum. The pop-up event allowed staff to engage directly with passersby regarding the WES and the five noted issues while directing people to the project webpage and on-line survey. During both of the open houses, the pop-up event, and within the on-line survey, participants were afforded an opportunity to offer additional written ideas or suggestions for waterfront enhancement. A summary of this written correspondence is provided as Appendix B. Figure 1 below presents the results of the “Mayor for a Day” activity.

Figure 1: Results of “Mayor for a Day” Engagement Activity – Proportion of Monies to Each Enhancement Issue



As illustrated in Figure 1, the respondents in this exercise consistently allocated the majority of their overall resources to the pillar issues of “Improve Accessibility” and “Strengthen Waterfront Business & Character.” Specific strategies related to these two issue areas, as highlighted in the poster boards (Appendix A), include:

Improve Accessibility:

- *Refine parking program and traffic management;*
- *Reconsider Marine Drive as a “Pedestrian First Zone”;*
- *Improve the pedestrian connection to Uptown;*
- *Improve wayfinding signage;*
- *Expand access to East Beach;*
- *Widen the sidewalks in west section of West Beach; and*
- *Develop a rail-free waterfront in the mid-to-long term.*

Strengthen Waterfront Business & Character:

- *Reintroduction of a “façade facelift” incentive program;*
- *Completion of character design guidelines for East and West Beaches;*
- *Creation of a “Vacancy No More” campaign;*
- *Support a richer mix of uses and expand promotion; and*
- *Improve policies and regulations.*

City staff are currently in the process of reviewing the above strategies and those related to the other three issues, with the Marine Drive Task Force (MDTF). The MDTF has recently offered suggestions to Council regarding the advancement of components of the WES, such as the exploration of options to support enclosed patios along Marine Drive, the use of wayfinding signage along the promenade, and the introduction of storytelling signage in both English and Sencoten along the waterfront. Following the completion of the MDTF’s review of the WES, City staff anticipate bringing a report to Council which identifies and prioritizes short-term opportunities to improve the waterfront and recommends the use of the WES as a long-term road map for coordinating future improvements. The prioritization of opportunities will be based on the work of the Task Force in addition to the findings of broader public consultation as summarized in this report. Further, consideration will be given to factors such as the availability of budget monies and related resources (e.g., staff capacity, provincial and federal funding, public lands, etc.) necessary to implement specific strategies.

Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm Review

On March 11, 2019, Council supported a broadening of the scope of the Official Community Plan (OCP) review to include an evaluation of the physical form, function and character of City’s Town Centre; an additional \$50,000 dollars in funding was approved by Council to support this component of the OCP review. DIALOG Design (consulting firm) was retained by the City for the purposes of assisting with the Town Centre review.

Between May and July, 2019, two community engagement workshops and an online survey were hosted by the project team to solicit broad feedback from the public regarding urban design, building massing, and public spaces in the Town Centre. The preliminary results of this initial engagement, which formed Phase 1 of the Town Centre review, were summarized in a corporate report to the Land Use and Planning Committee (LUPC) dated November 4, 2019.

Phase 2 of the Town Centre review has involved the preparation of options / recommendations for the future use and development of lands in the Town Centre, including specific regard for the massing (height) of buildings, the establishment of public spaces, and opportunities to protect

and enhance the natural environment. On December 10, 2019, a public open house was held to discuss 12 draft recommendations emerging as a result of the consultation undertaken in Phase 1. Further, an on-line survey was made available on the “TalkWhiteRock.ca” webpage. The survey, similar to the poster boards presented during the open house, asked participants to score each of the 12 recommendations based on their level of support, or non-support, for the initiative. The recommendations were grouped into three different categories and are summarized as follows:

A Green Town Centre

1. Grow the Tree Canopy and Species Mix
2. Manage Rainwater Sustainably
3. Improve Soil Connectivity
4. Prioritize Green Buildings

A Strong and Connected Community

5. Create Social and Affordable Housing
6. Increase the Mix of Uses
7. Identify Transit Exchange Options

A Vibrant Sense of Place

8. Refine the Community amendment Contribution Density Bonus Policy
9. Building Heights (as recommended within an accompanying map)
10. Promotion of Plazas, Patios and Green Space
11. Build the Open Space Network
12. Identify Town Centre Priorities

In addition to the opportunity to score or rank each of the 12 recommendations, participants were able to provide the consultant and City planning team with written (open-ended) suggestions tied to each. The open ended responses and results of the scoring are currently under review. It is anticipated that the consultant’s final report will be presented to Council on March 30, 2020.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

The consultant work tied to the OCP Review is within the approved budget. There are no budget implications stemming from this work or other components of the OCP review.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

The OCP Review includes efforts to support land use activities that will lessen impacts to the environment, including those that will help address the effects of climate change (e.g. support for a mix of uses in close proximity to one another to reduce vehicle kilometres travelled, efforts to promote the use of alternative modes of transportation, etc.).

CONCLUSION

This report provides Council with an update on recent public feedback pertaining to the OCP Review and, more specifically, White Rock’s Waterfront Enhancement Strategy and OCP policies affecting the City’s Town Centre. Future public engagement activities are planned for the late spring / early summer of 2020. These Phase 2 activities will be geared towards other areas of the OCP Review including efforts to support affordable housing, strengthening the use of public transit, and “green the City”, among other matters.

Respectfully submitted,



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

Comments from the Chief Administrative Officer:

This corporate report is provided for information purposes.



Dan Bottrill
Chief Administrative Officer

Appendix A: Waterfront Enhancement Strategy – Poster Boards

Appendix B: Summary of Public Comments related to the Waterfront Enhancement Strategy

EXPAND ACTIVITIES FOR ALL AGES

APPENDIX A

Why is this important?.....

There is a need to expand activities for youth and children and the families that come to explore the many aspects of the waterfront.

What can we do to make this better?.....

The following ideas were created with public input received so far:

5.1 Develop children’s all-abilities playground in East Beach

One of the important themes that continues to emerge is the need for at least one children’s playground on the waterfront. There is a need for a children’s playground in East Beach and potentially West Beach. The Firefighters’ Foundation has already expressed interest in funding an all-ages and abilities playground somewhere in East Beach (site to be determined).

5.2 Expand seating in all areas through “Family Pods”

Many visitors come to visit the waterfront as a family or a group of friends. Often times they purchase take-out food or bring a picnic lunch, snack or dinner. The challenge is that even the existing picnic tables are not big enough for the group. It would make sense to create “Family Pods” with larger unique community tables along the Waterfront Promenade. These areas could replace the picnic table areas or create new ones on concrete or interlock paving pads to minimize grass damage.

5.3 Create social media hotspots

The City of White Rock has an opportunity to provide free WiFi at specific locations to support public gathering and meeting. There are many public areas in other communities that provide free WiFi and charging connections, especially in shopping areas with activity, lighting, and signage indicating wireless internet zone.

5.4 Create “Pop-Up Parks” along Marine Drive

A simple addition of movable seating, tables, and umbrellas in areas along the waterfront (e.g., in front of the Museum) could encourage more informal meeting and interaction. The movable elements could be stored every night to avoid vandalism. Similarly, the vacant lot on the north side of Marine Drive in West Beach could be converted to a temporary Pop-Up Park with the addition of vivid paint, chairs, tables, umbrellas, overhead lighting, and landscaping.




Cadboro Gyro Park (Saanich, BC) Children’s Playground District with oceanfront theme



Community Table / Family Pod concept outside cafe in Squamish, BC.



A vacant lot in Oakland, California transformed into the 4th Annual Beer Garden.



This use of vacant space provides opportunities for improvements. The opportunities are with the two 22 feet wide (6.65m) sidewalk areas east of Moby Dick’s restaurant. Each of these areas could be developed into “Pop-Up Parks” with seating, umbrellas, and landscaping for take-out food purchasers or shoppers a place to eat their food and relax.

.....
Did you know... there is free public wifi at Memorial Park, and a ‘selfie’ mural on one of the storefronts between the Boathouse Restaurant and Uli’s Restaurant.
.....



CREATE ALL-SEASON PROGRAMMING & ACTIVITIES

Why is this important?.....

Marine Drive and the waterfront are vibrant on sunny days but require further improvements to bridge the seasons and extend vibrancy year-round.

What can we do to make this better?.....

The following ideas were created with public input received so far:

2.1 Enable all-season patios

The City of White Rock should enable all-season patios where there is adequate space along the sidewalk area. These outdoor patios will be enclosed structures with accompanying supplemental heaters where necessary to permit the outdoor experience during off-season weather. Building requirements including design, materials, weatherproofing, minimum areas, and encroachment. Legal agreements and permitting have to be considered in liaison with the businesses.

2.2 Expand all-season programming

The special programming by the City of White Rock and White Rock BIA on the waterfront during the summer months is full and very well-executed. The challenge is to extend this programming over the shoulder and winter months so visitors can continue to visit the waterfront as a preferred destination. Combined with expanded current programming, the White Rock waterfront will be more active and engaging for all ages.

2.3 Create everyday activities ‘stage’ sets

The new Memorial Park Plaza is used during special events but is underutilized at other times. This is an opportunity to increase its use using movable furniture and play equipment that can be conveniently stored at the adjoining White Rock Museum and Archives (by shifting the Archives elsewhere). The different stage sets can include simple brightly coloured tables, chairs, and umbrellas, giant chess sets, giant checker boards, children’s play equipment, ping pong tables, and other games. A few tents could also be set up on rainy days even supplemented by heaters. Management of the temporary stage sets and storage will be a continuing challenge.

2.4 Further improve Pier

The White Rock Pier is an iconic destination in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia and elsewhere. Its value as a historic landmark should not be underestimated. There is an opportunity to develop a design overlay that can be implemented over the concrete deck modules that could include three orientation, viewing, and rest areas along its length. At the terminus, consider an active program of public boating, fishing, and a major tower landmark.

2.5 Light up the Festive Season with the “Festival of Lights”

The “Festival of Lights” proposal is a spectacle of lighting and could to draw visitors over the festive Christmas season during the long evenings. It is an excellent opportunity and can be reviewed for improvements in future years.

2.6 Reinforce the “wellness” waterfront with “fit-bit” (workout) stations


There are many simple ways to improve the “wellness” programming with distance markers and “fit bits” (small programmed workout spaces) with simple aids such as chin-up bars, leg-lift benches, and push-up areas.

2.7 Create a public realm furniture “tool kit”


The City of White Rock has inconsistent lighting and street furnishing on the waterfront. Parks and Engineering should coordinate a standard “Public Realm” Tool Kit that specifies the kind of furniture and lighting in specific locations so there is continuity and coordination. At the same time, this coordinated effort will reduce excess replacement inventory and maintenance as well as improve safety, convenience, and enjoyment.



Coquitlam Light Festival at Lafarge Lake from late November to January (inspiration for Festival of Lights event)



Example of all-season (weather protected) patio on private property. There may be possibilities to allow weather protection structures on sidewalks where there is not room on private property.



There is potential to activate Pier with an orientation, viewing, rest, and interpretative program as well as activities such as boating, fishing, and water tourism at the end of the Pier

Did you know... the first White Rock Festival of Lights will be held from December 6, 2019 to January 5, 2020, focused around White Rock Museum and Archives and Memorial Park.



STRENGTHEN WATERFRONT BUSINESS & CHARACTER

Why is this important?.....

At the core of Marine Drive are businesses that require support to ensure that services and attractive activities are provided to residents and visitors.

What can we do to make this better?.....

The following ideas were created with public input received so far:

3.1 Reintroduce a “Façade Facelift” Incentive Program

The City of White previously had a program to upgrade façades to make the buildings look more attractive and inviting but the program was not successful in attracting participation. The District of Mission has implemented a successful façade improvement program in partnership with local business through a cost-sharing initiative. A similar “Facade Facelift” program could be used for West Beach and East Beach businesses. The City could also combine a “Storefront Gardens” program with this Façade Facelift program that would introduce more attractive landscaping in front of businesses.

3.2 Complete character design guidelines for East and West Beaches

There appears to be a need for distinct design guidelines for West Beach and East Beach, recognizing their unique styles and expressions. Improving the façade treatments will reinforce these unique characters.

3.3 Create a “Vacancy No More” campaign



There are vacant businesses and inactive street fronts as well as vacant lots along Marine Drive that detract from creating a seamless pedestrian experience. The condition of these storefronts/lots and associated vacancy affects the overall waterfront image and other businesses. There should be a concerted effort to minimize or reduce these vacancies and improve their façade or land condition. This condition also applies to businesses that shutter their doors during the off or shoulder seasons. These situations should not be permitted to occur.

3.4 Support a richer mix of uses and expand promotion

The City of White Rock should work actively with the BIA to improve the richness and mix of businesses on Marine Drive. Promotion can also be expanded with a “Best in White Rock” campaign for example. La Conner (the Sister City of White Rock) in the State of Washington provides a localized offering of shops ranging from fine arts to crafts, one-of-a-kind clothing, woodworking, home décor, collectibles, personal care products, antiques, jewelry and Italian pottery. In addition, there is a vibrant mix and diversity of food and beverage ranging from seafood to barbecue, Mexican to farmhouse, and craft breweries to wine bars.

3.5 Improve policies and regulations

There are issues with land use regulations and permitting that should be considered for improvements as they are limiting business and creating difficulties for new development applications. There should also be consideration for creating incentives and a design review for year-round outdoor patio shelters. The Town of Wolfville (Nova Scotia) and the City of Saskatoon provide a policy for parking patio licencing that allow for the temporary use of parking spaces to accommodate outdoor dining.



Images of West Beach (contemporary West Coast) and East (working village) Beach architectural styles



Currently vacant lot in West Beach



Example of temporary use of vacant lot in Port Coquitlam, BC

.....

Did you know... in West Beach over 60% of businesses are related to food and beverage, and in East Beach it is over 50%. Other waterfront communities (La Conner, WA and Cannon Beach, OR) have ratios between 35-45%.

.....



ENHANCE THE WATERFRONT ENVIRONMENT & CULTURE

Why is this important?.....

The natural waterfront landscape is essential and the foundation for the enhancement strategies.

What can we do to make this better?.....

The following ideas were created with public input received so far:

4.1 Create an education, interpretation, and awareness program

The City of White Rock should work with partners, including the Ministry of Environment and other non-profit organizations, to develop a comprehensive nature and wildlife interpretation program to inform visitors of the sensitivities and desired behaviours in this delicate ecosystem. The associated information and signage/installations will provide interest and more awareness to residents and tourists as part of the Pacific Flyway and Salish Sea Ecological System.

4.2 Support a First Nations storytelling and art program

The Semiahmoo First Nation should be invited to participate in a naming and public art program along the waterfront. Its heritage and contributions to culture and area development are invaluable to the unique sense of place and history on the White Rock waterfront. There can be more meeting places with First Nations public art along the waterfront.

4.3 Enhance the trees and green

The City of White Rock could develop a “Wave Garden” on at least the bottom of the slope that is currently being stabilized in the Hump area between East and West Beach. This initiative could be part of a larger initiative to green the waterfront with native and other appropriate plant material and improve the landscaping along Marine Drive.

4.4 Provide a dog management program

The dog management issue continues on the waterfront. There have been some interim measures taken with a pilot project to allow dogs on the waterfront Promenade in the low season. Concerns for environment and wildlife continue to be challenges for permitting dogs in the beach area, which is part of the Boundary Bay Wildlife Management Area. The ability for the limited width of the Promenade sidewalk to accommodate dogs on leash during high pedestrian volume times has also been raised as a concern. A dog management program could be implemented to address these concerns.



The stunning and invaluable nature along the Waterfront should be interpreted for visitors



The existing plaza in East Beach with a Semiahmoo First Nation house pole and Haida First Nation totem

.....
Did you know... Boundary Bay Wildlife Management Area was created in 1995 to conserve critical, internationally significant habitat for year-round, migrating and wintering waterfowl populations, along with fish and marine mammal habitat.
.....



APPENDIX B

Summary of Public Comments related to the Waterfront Enhancement Strategy

Expand Activities for All Ages

- Definitely playgrounds.
- Much needed.
- Bayview Park was a favourite place for the larger families to picnic. Dog waste on the ground is horrible for the kids to play on.
- This is fine but parking is expensive and limited.
- Definitely need a kid's park. Definitely need expanded wifi on the promenade!
- More concerts on each beach.
- Somehow must include activities...?; Stuff for East Beach.
- Agreed - Seniors and families, but also single / mid-age people.
- Same as my # 2. Creating events that bring the community together :-)
- Take back the waterfront. Make it as natural as possible. Remove the railway tracks for safety and open the beaches for public access without fear or noise, etc.
- Change promenade from pier to East Beach to a seasonal only bike lane to allow west - east access.
- Youth is important, you seem to be focusing on children with this outline. An outdoor swimming pool like at kits beach would be amazing. That would certainly be an activity for all ages.
- Outdoor work out jungle gym for all ages.
- Anyone who attended the children's' playground at Semiahmoo Park all remember how great it was. I was a real ADVENTURE for children and adults.
- A nice playground on east beach would be really nice.
- My primary concern is children's playground.
- Social media hot spots would be nice.
- The beach is no place for Wi-Fi hotspots.
- There is very little grass area at the end of east beach. Unless you can reclaim an area that is currently unusable, do not put a playground on the existing grass area, there is so little after the rebuild of East beach.
- Attractions like water fall, Marina or water sports should be introduced to attract people to visit White rock.
- Families already come down when the weather is good,. even if you create a playground and all that stuff, they still won't come down to the beach when it's cold.
- Make more passages to the beach; cut scruff only in small paths so people can get down to the beach....the reason they come here.

Improve Accessibility

- Free shuttle from Johnston Rd Central financed by merchants on Marine Drive.
- Funicular please. Uptown access needed. Pedestrian First Zone - yes pls. Reduce traffic!
- It is almost impossible to take a kayak safely down to the water, please improve the ramps, less steep, less slipping.
- 1.7 - The City (with Surrey) should start the initial stages of a feasibility study for moving the track.
- Better bike lanes. Biking on promenade!

- Upgrading the ravine access on the hillside would help. The existing parks/pathways are entirely neglected. They could provide a rich variety of landscaping for all seasons.
- I don't believe the railway issue can be solved in this way. Depend on political forces for the resources it moves. Funicular is an excellent option.
- Signage: Please gather input on designs. Many "art, signage" installations are not viewed favourably by many residents.
- Access to beach/lighting for older people walking. Get rid of cars on special events.
- I like expanded patios and zoning for covers in off season.
- All people deserve the right to go to the beach/wheelchairs, people who limp, etc. Access points!!!!
- Paddle board access. More access to walk to water.
- Boat launch and small boat / kayak access, paddle board holders and access.
- If people can't get to the water / tidal flats then no one will come. If people can't get on the beach then people won't come to the rest of it and it will fall apart.
- Looking at the proposed drawings and improvements of access "down the hill" it still appears like it is still "stairs only or slope" access and my concern is for those who walk but have some mobility issues.
- Providing inclusive beach access points is imperative to creating an inclusive and inviting community. They will be a sense of pride for our community.
- More beach wheelchair access points at White Rock beach.
- Like all these ideas - greater accessibility in general is important.
- No commercialization of the south side of Marine Drive. Remove the ???and create a "soft" berm style shoreline to reduce erosion. + see over.
- 1.1 and 1.2 are non starters but the rest is good.
- Funicular for tourism and connecting the town centre with the waterfront. A wider promenade.
- Rail free is vital.
- Initiate dialogue with the Semiahmoo Band to public access to the parkland as existed in the past.
- Restaurant patios (ancillary areas) should be reduced to enable pedestrians a comfortable walking area. Maybe more people would stop in to eat instead of walking the promenade past the establishments.
- I'm not to concerned about the railroad (I actually think it's kind of charming) but I would like to see marine drive set up to be a pedestrian-first zone and I like the idea of creating a better connection to uptown.
- Absolutely pedestrian first zone, would love to see limited one way traffic, and improved bicycle access and a funicular.
- Not every one can walk Uptown. The shuttle service that was provided in 2018 was a very good idea.
- The trains are part of White Rock. I would like to see all the sidewalks widen with a bike lane, this can be done by having one lane of traffic in one direction. Similar to Fraser hwy going through Langley Center.
- Connection to uptown is critical and missing completely. Support connection of the two business areas. Also, support extending the waterfront walkway that was abandoned for "environmental" reasons. I think we need it to keep folks off the tracks.

- I select \$70 purely for 1.3 connecting uptown to waterfront. We need to build the funicular. This solves the waterfront parking issue, it will grow business, enhance tourism and the arts. this should be a PRIORITY.
- Pedestrian free zone, connection to uptown very important.
- Get a funicular and definitely make Marine Drive a pedestrian-first zone.
- Improving pedestrian access via some automated people mover might eliminate a great many of the traffic issues.
- Leave the waterfront alone, it's processed more than enough and focus on the infrastructure of the city. I've been flooded 3 times by sewer back-up. We need systematic replacement of sewer and water pipes.

Create All-Season Programming and Activities

- This would be good as winter months are dead.
- Point 2.7 seems like a better fit for the "Strengthening Waterfront Business & Character " pillar.
- Festival of Lights please. Fit bit - no thanks.
- I disagree strongly with #2.4 re. adding any activities at the end of the pier such as fishing or boating. Boundary Bay is fragile enough without adding more marina like activities.
- Expand festival of lights. Winter festival. Spring festival!!
- West Vancouver has a program of Christmas trees sponsored and provided (mostly) by local businesses. It attracts a lot of people in December and could be part of the Festival of Lights.
- Light up the festive season is a great idea.
- Light up ocean, more lights on Prom + Business areas.
- Concerts on the east beach was great.
- Yes, you are on the right track with all the points presented!
- Tall Ship event! Allow mooring - for a fee.
- #2 More of a personal thing as I love doing "Special Events" and have ideas to bring events and activities to the waterfront.
- The pier needs to be finished with a new (small) marina, a restaurant where the old one was. Also raised at least 3 feet.
- All season patios are a great idea as well as festival of lights.
- Create a Christmas market strung along East and West Beach and the promotion of other types of events like sand castle sculpting, skim boarding, kite sailing and children environmental learning activities.
- Bring back the sandcastle competition. I sure gave White Rock and identity.
- I think having some nice winter activities along the waterfront would be nice and might help bring people down during that time of year.
- Larger look out point at the end of the pier. Midway lookout point on the pier. And a expanded boat dock area that was there before last Dec's storm.. the rock buffer would need to be extended.
- For goodness sake, stop the toolkit creating money wasting and just do stuff instead. The xmas lights are really great. More tangibles, less reports!
- People are not on the patios in the winter anyway and creating all this other stuff not going to bring more people down in the off season. The only thing that has merit here is the festival of lights, keep that one.
- All season patios would likely have an inadvisable environmental impact. Definitely expand the Festival of Lights. No need for peer improvements but other ideas are good.

- People come here to see the view and use the beach, not to work out, apart from walking.

Strengthen Waterfront Business and Character

- Should be taken care to create and keep ambiance.
- Why is it businesses have trouble staying in WR. Definitely should have an incentive for people to come down - Free Parking if you use the business.
- Redesign WR side of Marine Drive with pedestrian and people area! Initiate Municipal Tax Exemption program!
- Enforce a façade facelift via a carrot a stick approach.
- Currently in Vancouver a number of artists are being evicted from their studios to make way for redevelopment. They can't find economically priced space. Perhaps WR could address this need.
- Character design guidelines, does not necessarily require "modernizing". Let's preserve the character not try to improve it!
- Flowers and flower pots / trees are blocking view.
- Yes.
- This section is not as important as making accessible option for everyone.
- Bury power lines and improve views - trees to big.
- Clean it up / Business tax relied to do so / flowers. Stop blocking the view with stuff / trees / signs. Bury the power wires!!
- The drawings of potential improvements are great but will necessitate loss of parking spaces which is always a great concern for White Rock, Especially during peak season.
- So important to get a variety of businesses not just restaurants.
- Rent incentives / ideas.
- #1 So much potential to give character to the waterfront. As it is now especially in the winter, it's sad...so sad, vacancy signs, building looking like tear downs. Businesses struggling.
- Pier concession would be great to have to give it a flavour like Long Beach.
- Variety of businesses that cater to locals and day-trippers.
- This pillar needs to be re-examined...beautifying commercial area is essential but businesses need to be allowed to create a facade appropriate to their individual business.
- Have the business owners take initiative to promote their shops/restaurants. Is this not a BIA responsibility and not the City?
- Reduction in vacant properties along the waterfront would be a huge improvement. As well as diversified businesses.
- Most important issue on waterfront. We should definitely address vacant properties, shabby restaurant and storefronts, I am rarely inspired to eat in most restaurants as dirty and poorly maintained frontages, and important to encourage diversity in business.
- Public money should not be used to support private businesses.
- For 5 or so years offer tax breaks for the business's on Marine drive to improve the outside of their businesses as long as they stay open year around.
- Get really serious about cheap to fix stuff, like clean windows, removing garbage, cigarette butt collectors, painting siding. Drive the alley behind our waterfront businesses - yuck, ticketing may need to happen as it's nasty and likely non-compliant now!
- Marine Drive being the focal point of all the major activities, needs to be further beautified by ensuring that all year along, million dollar view of the ocean remains unobstructed. Regular pruning of unwanted shrubs, weeds and trees should be a priority.

- it does look like a run down street with all the old dirty buildings and vacancy issues. Get the landlords to at least power wash the buildings and put on a new coat of paint! Also the vacancy signs are terrible for other businesses.
- All suggestions very important, the mix, the look...(currently very run down) use the Train station as an inspiration for facades etc.
- Fundamentally, recognize the difference between property ownership and business ownership. Incentives go to businesses, property owners. What character design? The lack of one is the problem. Think La Conner. We are definitely the ugly cemented sister.
- Lower the rents so that businesses can afford to open here.
- Canopy to include light display similar to Fremont Street in Las Vegas.

Enhance the Waterfront Environment and Culture

- Highlight first nation's culture at the White Rock site.
- More trees. No dogs. 4.3 good.
- 4.4. There is no dog management programme. Dogs run free on the beach chasing birds and polluting. The beach walk promenade has been completely spoilt, long leashes and dirt do not make for a pleasant experience.
- Suggest a mixture of businesses, clean up the beach. Add more sand. Revamp street design and greenery. Some sort of architectural controls on buildings.
- Any dog program should be financed via dog license.
- Presently, F. N. cultural activities, whatever they are, are mostly, if not entirely segregated from the rest of W.R. and Greater integration is desirable. Get rid of the blackberry vines and replant.
- Places to sit out of rain / light.
- Love the idea of fit bit stations with chin up bars and workout station. Maybe add workout in ravine.
- Bury the power lines and add lighting / more flower and less view blocking trees. Facade cleanup + redesign.
- We would rally like to see a dog park with access to water.
- The idea of adding First Nation culture is great!
- Only 4.3 and 4.4 are worth perusing.
- More historical photo displays referencing the evolution of the area.
- Open up Semiahmoo Park once again for public use.
- I fully support any First Nations programs we can add to the waterfront. And I've been enjoying having the dogs on the promenade.
- I support all recommended initiatives.
- This may fall under Federal Regulations.
- Allow dogs year around on the Promenade, this is a huge segment of consumers you do not allow to enjoy the beach. And I have see no problems with dogs over the last 2 months..and by the way I don't have a dog..
- Just more trees, plants and appropriate maintenance of them. Don't bother with the rest, seems like a bunch of reports and inaction. Focus on the trees and plants.
- Better landscaping by uprooting weeds and shrubs and planting small shrubs all along Marine drive and the railway track along the hump be introduced.
- We should keep the dogs on the promenade during off season as it has brought down way more people to the beach and has helped with pedestrian traffic thus helping businesses.
- This could come after the other improvements.

- Cooperation with the Indigenous people could provide a joint initiative to display native art and culture.
- Walk the dogs on the grass next to the promenade where their little feet would be much happier anyway.

Additional thoughts?


- I think it would be fantastic if a true traffic free zone could be created. By that I mean a 'true' 'Pedestrian Zone' only, only open for suppliers for businesses at set time and emergency vehicle. This is done in Europe for many years and is successful in many ways, much healthier and more enjoyable for many and all visitors.
- Utilize small parking lot beside Memorial Park as a gathering place overlooking the ocean.
- Good luck!
- Yes, a walkway from White Rock to Crescent Beach would be awesome. The trail along the beach promenade is well used all year long. Now wouldn't be great to continue it along to Crescent Beach, maybe beyond.
- Need to fix what we have. Budget the costs so priorities can be set. More cultural attraction - participatory displays and events? How much are the consultants for each new phase cost.
- Funicular vs succession of covered escalators. Examples; Sienna, Italy and Medellin, Columbia.
- Unlike the beaches around English Bay, there are no large areas of sand above the high water mark. Although the beaches at the Kitsilano, English Bay, Spanish Banks, etc. were probably artificially created, they allow for sunbathing and other activities at high tide. Should expanding the area of sand be considered? There may be some environmentally based objections, but in proportion to the vast length of coastline, W.R. beach is a small area.
- Make sure that the Bar does not have loud people in parking lot after they close.
- Reduce size (width especially) of trees on waterfront. Blocking views! Especially in summer. Rebuild marina to allow for more temporary mooring AND permanent mooring. There are numerous vibrant marinas in the Gulf Island. This would bring in a lot of money - think long term especially. White Rock is a way better destination! Restaurant on pier? More sculptures!
- Point lights toward water / now they shine in our eyes.
- Most item displayed are for West Beach / there seem to be a West Beach bias and it is felt from the East Beach residents. Equal attention to both. The size of the tree are too much along the promenade / In summer they completely block views, smaller trees, weeping willows, the views are diminished trees / large silver boxes / barricades. Our view has been almost removed. Smaller trees!!! East Beach platform - 15441 Marine .
- Well done! Thank you so much for including the community in these decisions!
- I am very pleased with the Mayor & Council. They are excellent representatives of the community. They are doing an excellent job!
- I am very happy that you are making more wheelchair access points at White Rock beach.
- Love the linear park idea!
- Maintain resident parking decal. Not all the demographics is seniors, majority yes, but it is changing with all the development so please continue to appeal and plan for all ages. Love the waterfront ideas - large map schematic. Wonderful job! Creative ideas - lots of fun. Thank you to the City for being progressive.
- Investments in waterfront enhancement will help grow tourism and business in White Rock.

- Go ahead with the new pier report recommendations and build a funicular!
- We don't often go to White Rock beaches because it feels as though there are too many rules and parking for the day is expensive, however adding family friendly things as at Vancouver beaches like bike trails, outdoor pool, picnic areas, dog friendly areas, volleyball courts, etc. would be certainly be more enticing.
- Winter months are critical for most beach front businesses and attracting residents and visitors alike will always be a challenge..however one enhancement I have observed in many beach side communities (even in the more hostile climates of Europe) is the installation of hardy palm trees along promenades..something that could be done gradually..replacing the existing trees that were donated by one of the guest countries after Expo 86...thank you.
- Any further enhancements to the pier should only be done through fundraising. If it ain't broke don't fix it. City tax dollars should be used for more important problems, many which need addressing before the luxury. The pier has realistically lasted until the boats got loose. Many storms have hit this Bay over the years with damage only to the promenade.
- I just think the focus should be on improving the businesses along the waterfront and improving pedestrian access. It's such a nice area to walk around in already but with how busy it gets in the summer I think it could use some improvement.
- We should not look at White Rock as 2 separate parts but find a way to connect the uptown and beach as a single destination where both business communities provide a draw to creative independent businesses and restaurants. If they are connected by a funicular and it is an exciting place to walk, shop, eat and explore people will come to enjoy as in places like Steveston, Fort Langley. Businesses will also thrive and more will open. A funicular will also address some of the parking and access issues at the beach as long as adequate parking is available uptown.
- We have been to Valparaiso, Chile; Como, Italy; Lisbon, Portugal and Quebec City, Canada where they have funiculars. Riding these was such a beautiful experience! I think that would really put White Rock on the map.
- Additional granularity on the survey would be nice.
- I would like to see Marine Drive be one lane /one direction of car travel. With the extra room this would create, put in a wider sidewalk on the hump with a large viewing area at the Center of the hump..(please make sure the bushes are trim down so you can enjoy the view, not like now) This would also allow for expanded outside business seating areas on the larger sidewalk. Also a dedicated bike lane.
- Glad there is an opportunity for input. I really stress the need for not spending tax dollars and wasting staff time on writing more reports and god help us, not reports by consultants for big money when staff usually know what is needed and should be listened to. Focus on a few key things obvious things and get on it 1) Clean up the waterfront with the basics - windows, sidewalks, back alley grossness, cigarette butts everywhere. Derelict properties are a problem throughout the city including waterfront and bylaw enforcement is a HUGE part of what needs to happen. Maybe we need more money to increase bylaw enforcement - so be it if so. ALSO, Waterfront experience can be greatly enhanced by dealing enforcing noise bylaws for vehicles. This really really really needs to happen with the rise of so many coming to White Rock with modified exhaust and cruising the strip, wrecking the dining experience and environmental enjoyment for everyone else. We have "quiet zone" signs on Marine Drive now, but it's a total joke. THX!!
- Keeping in view the small lots along Marine Drive, By laws should be more practical to

be adhered to on ground by property owners. They should not be created to impose financial drain on property owners thus giving them a feeling that, they are being subject to Extortion. By laws before being formulated by City Hall should be addressed in public meetings and concerned property owners should be sent a written letter while bringing any change. Right now, although, the changes are posted on the City website, keeping in view the busy life style, most of the people do not get time to read them.

- During the offseason, how do you bring people down to the beach..with a reason!!! the dogs allowed is good, the funicular will be a huge tourist attraction all year round that solves so many issues for our city. Build the bloody thing already!
- Remove the wires, expand sidewalks. Currently Marine Drive is a car oriented, cruising street which distracts from the pedestrian experience.
- Further developing a historical/cultural awareness will give people more reason to come to White Rock - let's focus on the beach as a tourism destination for building education around cultural and historical awareness rather than recreational pursuits which the beach already provides.
- There is tremendous potential here for the cooperative effort with the Indigenous peoples to provide joint projects that benefit them and the City. The White Rock is a symbol of their culture and could be central to discussions on the future of the waterfront area.
- It's SO overkill what you are trying to do to make the waterfront a managed commodity. Pretty soon we won't even be able to hear the waves or smell the air. DON'T TURN PARADISE INTO ANOTHER PARKING LOT!
- 1)Funicular 2)Allow some development in the beachside parking lots so visitors can shop both sides. Then develop lane access to the beach between these developments as other major seaside towns have.

**THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK
CORPORATE REPORT**



DATE: July 27, 2020

TO: Land Use and Planning Committee

FROM: Carl Isaak, Director of Planning & Development Services

SUBJECT: Official Community Plan Review – Summary of Town Centre Urban Design & Public Realm Review Phase 2 Public Engagement and Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee recommend that Council consider the Town Centre Phase 2 Engagement Summary and Recommendations Report prepared by DIALOG Design, attached to this corporate report as Appendix A, and direct staff to proceed with preparing the proposed implementing mechanisms as described in staff's evaluation of the DIALOG Design's recommendations in Appendix B.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this corporate report is to present the Land Use and Planning Committee (LUPC) with the next steps in the Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm Review ("Town Centre Review") component of the Official Community Plan (OCP) Review. This includes providing the Phase 2 Engagement Summary and Recommendations Report (the "Phase 2 Report") from the consultant working with staff on this topic (DIALOG Design), attached as Appendix A, and an overview of the mechanisms that could be used to implement the recommendations of the Phase 2 Report, provided in Appendix B.

Within Appendix B, staff have provided additional evaluation and commentary on the Phase 2 Report, which is intended to help inform Council of underlying factors and issues and highlight where there is a difference between the policy or implementation mechanism specified in the Phase 2 Report and staff's proposed implementation of the policy direction. While staff's proposed approach is largely in accordance with the recommendations in the Phase 2 Report, there are some nuances in how the policy changes would be effected and in particular, how the proposed maximum height and density provisions (Recommendations 8 and 9) would be applied and visually represented in policy documents.

Staff propose that implementation mechanisms (primarily draft OCP and Zoning amendment bylaws) be prepared as outlined in Appendix B, and that property owners of potential redevelopment properties be invited to provide written feedback to staff and Council on the proposed policy changes. After the draft amendment bylaws are prepared and presented to LUPC in Fall 2020, staff would host an electronic Public Information Meeting to obtain further public input on the policy changes before Council considers giving bylaw readings and subsequently holding the associated Public Hearings.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DIRECTION

Table 1 below summarizes the previous direction provided by Council as it relates to the advancement of the Town Centre Review.

Table 1: Previous Council Motions regarding the Town Centre Review

Motion # & Meeting Date	Motion Details
2019-067 February 25, 2019	<i>Council received for information the corporate report dated February 11, 2019, from the Director of Planning & Development Services, titled “Implications for Including a Town Centre Area Height and Density Review in the 2019 Official Community Plan (OCP) Review”.</i>
2019-108 April 8, 2019	<i>Council:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Received for information the corporate report dated March 11, 2019, from the Director of Planning & Development Services, titled “Updated OCP Review and Process;” 2. Endorsed the proposed updated scope and process for the OCP Review, as described in this corporate report; and 3. Authorized an additional \$50,000 in funding to conduct the Town Centre Review component of the OCP Review.
2019-LU/P-038 November 18, 2019	<i>The Land Use and Planning Committee received for information the corporate report dated November 4, 2019 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled “Official Community Plan Review - Summary of Phase 1 Public Engagement”.</i>
2020-110 March 9, 2020	<i>Council received for information the corporate report dated March 9, 2020 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled “Official Community Plan Review – Waterfront Enhancement Strategy and Town Centre Public Engagement Update.</i>

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

This corporate report presents LUPC with the final consultant recommendations coming out of the Town Centre Review, as well as staff’s evaluation of these recommendations and proposed next steps. On March 9, 2020, staff provided Council with a report outlining the public engagement undertaken in Phase 2 of this project (Fall/Winter 2019), which obtained public feedback on proposed policy changes for the Town Centre that had been developed building on public input and aspirations from the public design workshops in Phase 1 (Summer 2019).

In total, the Phase 2 Report by DIALOG Design has 12 policy recommendations for Council’s consideration, included as Appendix A. The Phase 2 Report provides the context and rationale for each recommendation along with some “quick facts” that help substantiate the direction offered by the consultant. Further, the Phase 2 Report acknowledges the level of public support, or non-support, for each recommendation. This measure of support was collected through a community survey made available between December 9, 2019 and January 19, 2020. Hard copies of the survey were also made available during a public open house held December 10, 2019; a total of 34 copies of the survey were completed.

Table 2 summarizes the recommendations presented by DIALOG and the level of community support, or non-support, for each. The 12 recommendations are grouped into three categories

including: “A Green Town Centre,” “A Strong and Connected Community,” and “A Vibrant Sense of Place.”

Table 2: Level of Public Support for each Recommendation

Recommendation	Unsure	Support / Somewhat Support	Neutral	Somewhat Do Not Support / Do Not Support
A Green Town Centre				
1. Grow the Tree Canopy & Species Mix	N/A	79%	6%	15%
2. Manage Rainwater Sustainably	3%	82%	6%	9%
3. Improve Soil Connectivity	9%	74%	6%	12%
4. Prioritize Green Buildings	3%	79%	6%	12%
A Strong and Connected Community				
5. Create Social and Affordable Housing	6%	65%	6%	24%
6. Increase the Mix of Uses	3%	44%	9%	44%
7. Identify Transit Exchange Options	N/A	79%	6%	15%
A Vibrant Sense of Place				
8. Refine the Density Bonus Policy	9%	62%	9%	21%
9. Building Heights (per accompanying map)	N/A	62%	3%	35%
10. Promotion of Plazas, Patios and Green Space	9%	77%	3%	12%
11. Build the Open Space Network	6%	65%	12%	18%
12. Identify Town Centre Priorities	6%	83%	6%	6%

As summarized in Table 2, all but one of the 12 recommendations received a majority of support from those who completed the survey. The only recommendation with balanced support / non-support was the recommendation pertaining to efforts to increase the mix of uses in the Town Centre. This recommendation specifically states “The City should set a target for some of the density entitlement in the Town Centre (e.g. 1.0 FAR) for use as new civic facilities, including a hotel or conference centre”; a similar ambivalence for the expenditure of community amenity contribution (CAC) funds on civic facilities was expressed through a recent public engagement exercise (as outlined in a corporate report to Council on March 30, 2020).

Staff have reviewed the 12 recommendations from the Phase 2 Report and, in doing so, identified potential implementation mechanisms for each. Implementation mechanisms include, but are not limited to, OCP and Zoning Bylaw amendments, updates to existing department policies (e.g., Density Bonus / Amenity Contributions Policy No. 511), the introduction of, or refinement to, development permit area guidelines in the OCP, and the establishment of partnerships with local organizations and agencies (e.g., non-profit housing organizations, TransLink, etc.). Appendix B to this report includes a summary table which links each recommendation to an implementing mechanism(s), and also acknowledges where staff’s proposed approach differs from the approach specified in the Phase 2 Report, based on staff’s experience with the applicable regulatory tool in the White Rock context and considerations which staff believe are, or will be, important to recognize in the advancement of any implementing mechanism.

Phase 3 of the Town Centre Review involves finalizing the policy options developed in Phase 2 for presentation to Council as bylaw amendments. If Council directs staff to pursue the implementing mechanisms outlined in Appendix B, property owners of potential redevelopment properties would be invited to provide written feedback to staff and Council on the proposed policy changes, and after the draft amendment bylaws are prepared and presented to LUPC in Fall 2020, staff would host an electronic Public Information Meeting to obtain further public input on the policy changes before Council considers giving bylaw readings and subsequently holding the associated Public Hearings.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The implementation of the measures outlined in Appendix B will come with costs including, but not limited to, advertising costs in support of statutory public hearings, costs that may be associated with hosting public engagement activities, and other related expenses. This work would be carried out within the existing departmental operating budget.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The recommendations in the Phase 2 Report, in some instances, propose a reduction in the maximum permitted density (Gross Floor Area Ratio, or FAR) and height available to properties in the Town Centre. The implementation of these recommendations through OCP and Zoning Bylaw amendments, may be challenged by landowners who perceive a reduction in development potential as impacting the value of their property.

COMMUNICATION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The future implementation of measures to realize the recommendations of the Phase 2 Report will require community engagement activities in accordance with the *Local Government Act*. Efforts to go beyond the minimum requirements of the Act, particularly with respect to giving notice of future public hearings, will be undertaken to ensure the work is transparently communicated to the public and that all those with an interest in the changes have an opportunity to be heard by Council.

If Council directs staff to pursue the implementing mechanisms outlined in Appendix B, property owners of potential redevelopment properties would be invited to provide written feedback to staff and Council on the proposed policy changes, and after the draft amendment bylaws are prepared and presented to LUPC in Fall 2020, staff would host an electronic Public Information Meeting to present and explain the proposed changes and obtain further public input before Council considers giving bylaw readings and subsequently holding Public Hearings.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL INVOLVEMENT/IMPLICATIONS

The recommendations from DIALOG Design have been reviewed by staff from within the Planning and Building sections of the Planning and Development Services Department, and by staff within the Engineering and Municipal Operations Department. Future implementation activities will involve consultation with department representatives as well as external agencies as appropriate.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

The Phase 2 Report recommendations present efforts to improve the composition within the Town Centre such that additional plantings may be realized thereby helping in the uptake of

greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and a reduction in the urban heat island effect. The recommendations also, however, lessen the amount of development that may be realized in the Town Centre. This, over time, could place pressure on the municipality to support growth in areas that are not as well-served by public transit facilities and the mix of uses which are known to reduce the overall need for private automobile use, being recognized as a key contributor to climate change.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

The OCP Review is identified as an “immediate priority” of Council. The Town Centre Review is a key component of the overall OCP Review. The implementation of the recommendations outlined in this report would help to address one of Council’s Strategic Priorities.

OPTIONS / RISKS / ALTERNATIVES

The LUPC may direct staff to prepare draft OCP and Zoning amendment bylaws that adhere strictly to the recommendations in the Phase 2 Report, rather than the approach recommended by staff in Appendix B.

Alternatively, the LUPC may direct staff to undertake further public consultation on this subject prior to preparing draft bylaws.

CONCLUSION

This corporate report presents Land Use and Planning Committee (LUPC) with the next steps in the Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm Review (“Town Centre Review”) component of the Official Community Plan (OCP) Review. A Phase 2 Engagement Summary and Recommendations Report (the “Phase 2 Report”) from the consultant working with staff on this topic (DIALOG Design) is attached as Appendix A, and an overview of staff’s proposals for the mechanisms that could be used to implement the recommendations of the Phase 2 Report are provided in Appendix B. Staff recommend that Council direct staff to bring forward amendment bylaws as outlined in Appendix B.

Respectfully submitted,



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

Comments from the Chief Administrative Officer

I concur with the recommendation(s) of this corporate report.



Guillermo Ferrero
Chief Administrative Officer

Appendix A: Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm, Phase 2 Engagement Summary and Recommendations Report

Appendix B: Review of Implementation Mechanisms and “Considerations” tied to DIALOG Recommendations pertaining to the Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm Review

APPENDIX A


Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm, Phase 2 Engagement Summary and
Recommendations Report



White Rock Official Community Plan Review Process

Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm

Phase 2 Engagement Summary and Recommendations Report



WHITE ROCK
City by the Sea!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Process	3
Phase 2 Engagement Outcomes and Town Centre Recommendations	5
Recommendation #1	8
Recommendation #2	11
Recommendation #3	14
Recommendation #4	16
Recommendation #5	19
Recommendation #6	22
Recommendation #7	26
Recommendation #8	28
Recommendation #9	32
Recommendation #10	36
Recommendation #11	38
Recommendation #12	40
Appendix: Open House #2 Online and In-Person Survey Responses	42

Process Context: Illustration showing the recent and anticipated changes in Town Centre.



1. Foster Martin, 1484 Martin Street, 2018 - 2022*
2. Miramar 2 15177 Thrift Avenue, 2018 - 2020*
3. Verve, 1456 Johnstone Road, 2020 - 2022*
4. Semiah, 15241 Thrift Avenue, 2018 - 2020*
5. Soleil, 1588 Johnstone Road, 2020 - 2022*
6. Oceana Parc, 1575 George Street, 2017-2019*

*Estimated Construction Period (Start-End)


Introduction

In 2019 White Rock City Council directed staff to undertake an Official Community Plan (OCP) Review to ensure that the policies that are set out in the OCP reflect the vision and values of residents. The Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm Review is one component of the overall OCP Review Process.

The Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm engagement and review process took place within the context of a rapidly changing Town Centre. Over the past few years significant changes have been underway within Town Centre, including five active construction sites, and two sites which have submitted building permits following issuance of Development Permit. To date, one amendment has been completed during the OCP Review, in order to lower the heights of buildings in the Lower Town Centre (south of the Town Centre) from 10-12 storeys to 4-6 storeys.

Within this context, the purpose of this process was to engage the public on issues related to future buildings and greenspace within the Town Centre including: building height, density, lot coverage; and, the types of public open spaces and activities that enrich public life within the Town Centre. As part of the engagement process, it was important to help participants understand the trade-offs of different built forms and the public open spaces which can be achieved. It was also important to help participants understand the existing policy context and to provide them a variety of accessible and easy to understand tools to express their vision and aspirations.

This document summarizes the activities, events, and outcomes of Phase 2 of the Town Centre Official Community Plan Urban Design Review process; and provides a series of recommendations for policy updates.



Phase 1 diagrams illustrating the trade-offs between building height and public open space. Each diagram illustrates 3.0FAR.



Phase 1 Workshop and Phase 2 Open House.

Process

The engagement process included two workshops, one public open house, and input that was gathered through two online surveys to obtain both focused and broad public input on ideas for revisions to the OCP. On July 6th and 9th 2019, Phase 1 community workshops were held to review and comment on Town Centre Policy from the OCP and the Urban Design Plan (2011). The City of White Rock also lead an online survey in order to review the OCP overall. Participant feedback is summarized in the Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm Review Phase 1 Engagement Summary Report. Input received during Phase 1 informed the development of a set of draft recommendations that were shared with residents at a public open house and through an online survey in Phase 2.

The Phase 2 online survey was completed by 27 participants and seven participants provided in-person written survey responses for a total of 34 responses. Representative comments have been summarized to provide an overview of feedback received, while a full list of survey responses can be found in the Appendix. This feedback informed the refinement of recommendations which are being put forward in this document for Council consideration as the final step of the Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm Review.

PHASE 1

During Phase 1 residents shared their priorities for the Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm policies. This informed the creation of draft recommendations.

BACKGROUND REVIEW

ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOPS
July 6 and 9, 2019 Workshops

OCP REVIEW ONLINE SURVEY
May 31 - July 15, 2019

ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY
REPORT

PHASE 2


In Phase 2 residents provided feedback on draft policy recommendations. This engagement summary and updated recommendations report was prepared.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS
OPEN HOUSE
December 10, 2019

ONLINE SURVEY
December 10 - January 15, 2020

PHASE 2 ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY
& RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT





Phase 2 Engagement Outcomes and Town Centre Recommendations

A Green Town Centre

The greening of the Town Centre was a common theme during Phase 1 engagement. Participants expressed a desire to see sustainable buildings, best practices for rainwater management and an expanded tree canopy. During Phase 2, four recommendations were shared under this theme through the online survey and during the Phase 2 Open House for resident input. Feedback received through these engagement opportunities was overall supportive of this theme and the recommendations below:

1. Grow the Tree Canopy and Species Mix

a. The City should consider a policy requiring targets for tree canopy on large sites (8,094 m² (2.00 acres) or more) (e.g. 20% on the ground level); and, for medium sites (3,035 m² to 8,093 m² (0.75 to 1.99 acres) (e.g. 20% between ground and roof level).

b. The City should consider requiring that a minimum percentage of trees be coniferous trees (e.g. 10%).

2. Manage Rainwater Sustainably

The City should consider amending its Zoning Bylaw to require a maximum effective impervious surface area (e.g. 65%). To achieve 65% effective impervious area, on-site stormwater best management practices such as rainwater harvesting, porous paving and on-site infiltration would be required to reduce the effective impervious area on the site overall.

3. Improve Soil Connectivity

The City should consider a policy requiring continuous soil for tree health and rainwater infiltration on medium to large sites (3,035 m² (0.75 acres) or more). For example, the City could establish a minimum percentage of continuous soil for sites (e.g. 10%) which would be achieved by reducing the size of the podium and by providing parkade setbacks.

4. Prioritize Green Buildings

a. The City should consider prioritizing the development of a Green Building Strategy requiring targets for building performance. This strategy could take a holistic approach to include other sustainable design considerations such as operational and embodied greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, renewable energy generation, water efficiency, integrated rainwater management, healthy materials and indoor air quality, and waste reduction strategies.

b. The City should consider prioritizing adoption of the BC Energy Step Code to incentivize and enforce incremental improvements in energy efficiency for new construction.

A Strong and Connected Community

Housing options, new land uses, and transit were common themes during the Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm Phase 1 Workshops. Participants recognized that community life can be enriched by providing a range of housing options (such as rental housing and affordable housing), new land uses (such as a new City Hall, hotel or museum), and a new transit loop. During Phase 2, three recommendations were shared under this theme through the online survey and during the Phase 2 Open House for resident input. Feedback received through these engagement opportunities was predominantly supportive of this theme, however Recommendation #6 has been updated to reflect community concerns around a new City Hall, which will require further community engagement.

5. Create Social and Affordable Housing

The City should consider policies and tools for the creation of social and affordable housing, such as:

a. Rental Zoning – Negotiate a target Floor Area Ratio (FAR) (e.g. 1.0 FAR) be preserved as rental housing after development;

b. Density Bonus Policy – Negotiate a target FAR (e.g. 1.0 FAR) or a percentage of new developments be affordable housing as a part of the existing Community Amenity Contribution density bonus policy;

c. Non-profit Housing Organization – Support the establishment of a non-profit housing organization (or work with an existing regional housing organization) that would provide and manage non-market housing stock; and,

d. Housing Needs Report and Action Plan – The City's Housing Needs Report could be the basis for a Housing Action Plan.

6. Increase the Mix of Uses

The City should set a target for some of the density entitlement in the Town Centre (e.g. 1.0 FAR) for use as new civic facilities, including a hotel or conference center.

7. Identify Transit Exchange Options

The City should continue to support the establishment of a new transit exchange in the Town Centre; and, prioritize identification of long-term options for the development of a new transit exchange in collaboration with TransLink and the City of Surrey.

A Vibrant Sense of Place

The character of the Town Centre is influenced by building scale, open spaces and the pedestrian realm; these were central topics during Phase 1 engagement. During Phase 2, the five recommendations were shared under this theme through the online survey and during the Phase 2 Open House for resident input. Feedback received through these engagement opportunities was overall supportive of this theme and the below recommendations.

8. Refine the Community Amenity Contribution Density Bonus Policy

The City should consider updating the Zoning Bylaw to reduce the CAC bonus from 5.4 GFA to a GFA that would achieve an urban design vision that better aligns with the OCP and resident aspirations for Town Centre. For example, the City could consider the GFAs that are outlined in the two illustrations (see page 28 of this report).

9. Building Heights

The City should consider restricting buildings to the height outlined in the diagram and perspective below (see page 32 of this report).

Summary of Height Recommendations:

- Low rises retain the village quality of Johnston Road;
- Johnston Road is limited to 3 storeys (see Recommendation 10 for suggested variance);
- Mid-rises are the predominant neighbourhood form;
- High rises are permitted along North Bluff Road. These taller buildings allow for flexibility so that generous open spaces and community amenities can be provided.

10. Plazas, Patios and Green Space

Assuming Recommendation 9 on building heights is followed, the City should consider a build height relaxation to promote plazas and patios on Johnston Road. For example, the City could allow up to 13.7m (approximately 4 storeys) with a 2m stepback after the third floor if a 7m setback for patio or tree canopy is provided (e.g. trees growing to a minimum of 7m canopy diameter spaced at a maximum of 7m apart).

11. Build the Open Space Network

The City should continue to support the establishment of the open space network as outlined in the Town Centre Urban Design Plan (2011) through the Community Amenity Contribution Policy in the Town Centre. To date, these amenities have been delivered through a density bonus program.

12. Identify Town Centre Priorities


The City should identify pre-determined target amenities that they intend to seek from development sites. This will allow the City to establish priorities for Town Centre that clearly identify communities needs. In addition to ensuring that the impacts of development in the Town Centre are offset through the delivery of amenities in Town Centre, this approach will provide some predictability for the community and developers before the negotiation phase.

RECOMMENDATION 1

A Green Town Centre: Grow the Tree Canopy and Species Mix

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Trees provide ecosystem services by managing rainwater and reducing the urban heat island effect. When tree species are mixed to include coniferous types, trees provide additional value as nesting and refuge space for songbirds.



RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendations are being put forward:

- The City should consider a policy requiring targets for tree canopy on large sites (8,094 m² (2.00 acres) or more) (e.g. 20% on the ground level); and, for medium sites (3,035 m² to 8,093 m² (0.75 to 1.99 acres) (e.g. 20% between ground and roof level).
- The City should consider requiring that a minimum percentage of trees be coniferous trees (e.g. 10%).

QUICK FACTS:

In 2014, the Metro Vancouver Climate Action Committee reported that the City of White Rock has 23% Tree Canopy Cover. The average tree canopy cover of the 21 members within the jurisdiction is 32% for lands within their boundaries and within the Urban Containment Boundary. The City of White Rock is 13th on this list, falling just behind the City of Vancouver which holds the 12th place at 24% tree canopy coverage.*

“Against conventional wisdom, high density housing (e.g. condos and towers) has accommodated increasingly more trees in recent decades...”*

Over the next 20-30 years, “tree canopy cover in the Urban Containment Boundary is projected to decrease from 32% to 28%” *

* Regional Tree Canopy Cover and Impervious Surfaces, Metro Vancouver Climate Action Committee, August 2019.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?


During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendations below and shared their level of support:

a. The City should consider a policy requiring targets for tree canopy on large sites (8,094 m² (2.00 acres) or more) (e.g. 20% on the ground level); and, for medium sites (3,035 m² to 8,093m² (0.75 to 1.99 acres) (e.g. 20% between ground and roof level).

b. The City should consider requiring that a minimum percentage of trees be coniferous trees (e.g. 10%).

Level of Support for this Recommendation

The majority of participants (79.4%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- Tree Canopy cover - this should be 1st! It's great to consider developing the canopy on streets, etc but a 50% of the City Centre has buildings with that asphalt roofs - this is ridiculous in this day and age
- We should strive for as much greening as physically possible. More is better.
- Trees add to the atmosphere/feel of the city. we don't want to be known as the concrete jungle. Greenery helps transform the look and feel of a city to one that's more relaxed and peaceful
- Trees provide not only shade and environmental benefits but also provide beauty to any site.
- Trees, shrubs, and greenery will give beauty and help the environment!
- Anything to get more trees. We destroyed so many all over the town centre in the last few years.
- Greening of the town centre will give it a feel much needed beyond the concrete. And the City needs to increase its tree canopy overall.
- Trees provide oxygen and their roots maintain soil and prevent erosion
- The city should be a Metro Van municipal leader on green/enviro/sustainable growth and should endeavor to achieve the maximum recommended targets.
- Trees are being removed all over White Rock and South Surrey by developments. This should stop. We need to keep and plant as many trees as possible to mitigate climate change.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Green Space via a tree canopy makes environmental sense, the targets. However, should be negotiating with developers depending on the layout/configuration of the site, elevations, cost, etc
- I think it's a good idea, as long as the density on the balance of the site is high enough
- Healthy urban tree canopies are over 30%, not 20% as a target.
- I think there are many ways to attain green - doesn't need to be trees - what about vegetable and herb plants which can be used for food sustainability?
- Trees are essential to our health and well being and for wildlife, coastal native tree species should be used
- Incentives for private owners to add suitable trees would be helpful
- Should be the comparable height in coordination with building height
- Green roofs - grass, shrubs, whatever grows on a flat roof to increase green cover
- Develop and enforce a strong tree bylaw for both city and private properties to maintain old growth trees
- Whatever we do please replace our tree canopy with trees that are more than ornamental. Thanks
- Don't make the bylaw too restrictive to type of tree
- Yes, also recommend coast native plant shrub layer and perennials in landscaping, over time, little or no maintenance is required
- Have a strong tree by law for City and private properties - perfect legacy (old) trees; enforce regulations
- Balcony uses - from vegetables, florals & suitable growth tips & safety measures could be on City website. Getting strata boards on-side with constructive info will be useful
- New developments should have rooftop greenhouses where residents can have a vegetable garden. It's therapeutic and the produce could be given to the food bank or sold at the farmer's market.
- I like the idea of greenery being incorporated into walking paths and outdoor restaurant patios, not just tree planting to fill up requirements

NOT IN SUPPORT


- The city can plant trees on city property and let private property owners decide whether or not they want trees
- Insufficient tree requirement, very few sites are over 2 acres
- Important but other issues I consider more critical

RECOMMENDATION 2

A Green Town Centre: Manage Rainwater Sustainably

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Integrated rainwater and comfortable micro-climates were common themes during Phase 1 engagement; and, how we treat rainwater influences the urban heat-island effect, flood risk, and stream health. As the Town Centre evolves, development has the potential to improve upon the rainwater system by reducing impervious surfaces and managing rainwater in a way that mimics nature.



Examples of a variety of rainwater management techniques that could be applied to sites on Johnston Road to achieve target rainwater management on site.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendation is being put forward:

The City should consider amending its Zoning Bylaw to require a maximum effective impervious surface area (e.g. 65%). To achieve 65% effective impervious area, on-site stormwater best management practices such as rainwater harvesting, porous paving and on-site infiltration would be required to reduce the effective impervious area on the site overall.

QUICK FACTS:

The City's Zoning Bylaw has established a maximum lot coverage of 65%. This calculation only accounts for the lot coverage of buildings, not all impervious paved areas. Examples of excluded impervious surfaces include paved walkways, driveways, and concrete patios. The City of White Rock Integrated Stormwater Management Plan recommends including non-pervious areas from paving in the overall site area calculation.

In 2014, the Metro Vancouver Climate Action Committee reported that the City of White Rock is 61% impervious surface. The average imperviousness of the 21 members within the jurisdiction is 50% for lands within their boundaries and within the Urban Containment Boundary. The City of White Rock is tied with the City of Delta at 13th on this list and followed closely by City of Langley (62% impervious) and City of Vancouver (63% impervious).*

* Regional Tree Canopy Cover and Impervious Surfaces, Metro Vancouver Climate Action Committee, August 2019.


HOW DID WE GET HERE?

During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendation below and shared their level of support:

The City should consider amending its Zoning Bylaw to require a maximum effective impervious surface area (e.g. 65%). To achieve 65% effective impervious area, on-site stormwater best management practices such as rainwater harvesting, porous paving and on-site infiltration would be required to reduce the effective impervious area on the site overall.

Level of Support for this Recommendation

The majority of participants (82.3%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- This practice is a good way to reduce flood risk and improve stream health
- Again White Rock is 13th on the list - should be 1st
- Best use of H₂O
- I am not knowledgeable in this area. However I do recall places down the hill suffering from flooding several years ago, when I was not a resident. Rain gardens and permeable paving are good ideas
- We should always try to minimize run off onto streets. As sated above it will manage rainwater in the best way possible.
- Water is our most important resource
- It is an effective and workable solution
- Any green ideas are working with the natural order of Nature. When we put something up that is manmade, we should take every effort to work with nature..have a symbiotic relationship with nature.
- I like the phrase “mimic nature”, you can’t get much better than that.
- Obviously a necessity to prevent massive future stormwater works.
- Water is a precious resource.
- It’s important to reduce impervious surfaces, managing rainwater in a way that mimics nature.
- Keeps contaminated water from flowing directly into the bay
- Rainwater collection and reuse will add to the overall reduction of water through municipal systems
- This idea is good for our environment to reduce runoff, flooding and soil erosion.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Perhaps encourage brown water, garden barrels and ways to repurpose/store in the event of any drought in decades to come
- It's nice idea, but we need to be careful not to drive all developers to the other side of North Bluff because of excess
- Why not save the water to use for watering the greenery and save on the runoff!
- The City needs to get with it in terms of environmental practices to improve liveability in the City and beyond.
- I like the idea, but do not have sufficient understanding to agree with a 65% figure. We should not put onerous requirements on new businesses or development coming in to the area.
- Some rainwater integration is better than none = don't make it so restrictive make it an achievable amount and encourage over achieving rather than forcing something that isn't workable
- Assume part of the 65% impervious surface area includes the building , if not, the City can do better than a 65% impervious surface area
- Increase the 65% to 80%
- Important but other issues I consider more critical
- I guess it sounds like a good idea. Do we have an expert we could ask?
- This should be done in all zones in the city, starting with no impervious treatment of city property ie boulevards
- Planting more trees and green roofs would help
- Stored roofwater used for low-grade usages now in many parts of the world so elements added for detention of conveyance now may be used for other purposes later
- Provide opportunity for water features as street level using rainwater to be included in the scope of surface area
- There are so many options now for porous surface materials.
- Recycled water sources could be incorporated into building design ensuring maximum resource savings

NOT IN SUPPORT

- The City should match the rain water sustainability of Semiahmoo Town Centre, otherwise business and development will move to Surrey
- I think 65 % is too high for high density areas. Also consideration should be given to materials used for impervious areas
- In doubt about the infrastructure of this city including the cost to do what is suggested

RECOMMENDATION 3

A Green Town Centre: Improve Soil Connectivity

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Soil volume impacts the potential for trees to grow to mature canopy size. By planning for continuous soil large sites can contribute to tree canopy and the establishment of long living 'legacy' trees.




Illustration showing how 10% of a sample site in the Town Centre could be reserved for continuous soil where legacy trees could be established.

QUICK FACTS:

Continuous soils are soils at grade that maintain the soil profile and hydrology through to bedrock and are not located on top of a structure (e.g. underground parking).

A 'legacy' tree is a long living tree. By providing the conditions to make long-term growth viable, 'legacy' trees can be established as a gift to future generations.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendation is being put forward:

The City should consider a policy requiring continuous soil for tree health and rainwater infiltration on medium to large sites (3,035 m² (0.75 acres) or more). For example, the City could establish a minimum percentage of continuous soil for sites (e.g. 10%) which would be achieved by reducing the size of the podium and by providing parkade setbacks.


HOW DID WE GET HERE?

During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendation below and shared their level of support:

The City should consider a policy requiring continuous soil for tree health and rainwater infiltration on medium to large sites (3,035 m² (0.75 acres) or more). For example, the City could establish a minimum percentage of continuous soil for sites (e.g. 10%) which would be achieved by reducing the size of the podium and by providing parkade setbacks.

Level of Support for this Recommendation

The majority of participants (73.6%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- White Rock should be leading the way in managing green spaces that are environmentally friendly and sustainable for future residents.
- To improve tree survivability and also importantly to provide larger green spaces for people to improve quality of life
- Mature tree canopies are necessary for the shade enjoyment of public spaces

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- While this policy makes sense from an environmental perspective, the cost to the developer in terms of lost parking and space or less commercial on the podium needs to be considered
- Again I support returning our “village” to an attractive nature setting as much as possible. We have far too much concrete. I think we should stop monster houses with no garden or green space as well.
- When it makes sense - sure - but not every site will make sense for this
- Agree though would like to see a greater percentage for continuous soil and planting
- Consider views with tree selection. only allow trees that max height is below residential floors
- In principal I’m fully supportive but parking is at a premium in and around the town centre and that’s critical to local business success. Ideally, we should be looking to a fully walkable town centre w/ adjacent or u/g parking.
- Without stable healthy soil trees cannot thrive and grow to their potential.
- Parking setbacks would help to achieve this.
- Don’t establish policies which can’t be achieved and then have to be rewritten or variances

NOT IN SUPPORT


- The City should match the rain water sustainability of Semiahmoo Town Centre, otherwise business and development will move to Surrey.

RECOMMENDATION 4

A Green Town Centre: Prioritize Green Buildings

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Building performance can contribute to sustainability by helping to increase energy efficiency for new buildings and reduce energy consumption.



QUICK FACTS:

OCP Policy 12.5.3 Green Building Strategy recommends developing a strategy to enhance the environmental and human health performance of buildings.

The OCP supports the adoption of the province's Energy Step Code to move toward net-zero energy ready buildings.

Many municipalities across the Province have now adopted the BC Energy Step Code.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendations are being put forward:

- a. The City should consider prioritizing the development of a Green Building Strategy requiring targets for building performance. This strategy could take a holistic approach to include other sustainable design considerations such as operational and embodied greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, renewable energy generation, water efficiency, integrated rainwater management, healthy materials and indoor air quality, and waste reduction strategies.
- b. The City should consider prioritizing adoption of the BC Energy Step Code to incentivize and enforce incremental improvements in energy efficiency for new construction.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?


During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendations below and shared their level of support:

a. The City should consider prioritizing the development of a Green Building Strategy requiring targets for building performance. This strategy could take a holistic approach to include other sustainable design considerations such as operational and embodied greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, renewable energy generation, water efficiency, integrated rainwater management, healthy materials and indoor air quality, and waste reduction strategies.

b. The City should consider prioritizing adoption of the BC Energy Step Code to incentivize and enforce incremental improvements in energy efficiency for new construction.

Level of Support for this Recommendation

The majority of participants (79.4%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- Moving to green buildings is a must. Builders/developers are/should build to a LEED Gold standard to ensure a low carbon footprint
- Have sense from an environmental point & climate change - reduce GHGs as much as possible & set an example for other communities
- We desperately need to act to improve our climate.
- This is the way the progressive world by helping to address climate change and become a more liveable city.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- As we move towards development of the town centre we should ensure that we meet and even exceed Green building codes to ensure that we are leaders in these areas.
- Sharing expertise from the Provincial Gov. is very important in making this goal work.
- How about rewarding developers who build under the energy step code and penalizing those that don't
- Should require more than minimum step code
- The fact that hardly a solar panel can be seen in the city is a testimony to how badly this policy needs encouragement
- Start at step 3 or better

- The city should be a Metro Van leader in green/enviro/sustainable growth.
- This is a must, but don't give money to "developers"; make them do the right thing. They've been destroying our town and the rest of the Lower Mainland for profit for far too long.
- Just follow the BC Step Code which is already sustainable
- Additional rebates for solar panels? or how can we use them?
- Most of the infrastructure "form" we are building today could be here for centuries. Yet the netzero-ready code could be here in 10. We are currently building a lot of buildings that will be relatively speaking, instantly obsolete.
- Residential builders with "green" plans should receive city support and owners get tax breaks
- Require Passivehaus or Leed certification of Gold+ for all new permits
- Don't "consider" prioritizing the adoption of the BC Energy Step Code, just do it.

NOT IN SUPPORT

- My concern is that the targets may be too high - then either costs are passed on to tenants resulting in higher rents, or new buildings are built elsewhere altogether
- Until India and China improve their green strategies, we are wasting our time
- The more restrictions the city places on Town Centre development, the higher the rental/purchase costs will be for business and residents, thus reducing affordability
- Leave generating renewable energy for others, as this is a very different business from municipal affairs.

RECOMMENDATION 5

A Strong and Connected Community: Create Social and Affordable Housing

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

A variety of housing types and tenures provides the opportunity for people in a variety income levels and stages of life to take part in and contribute to the life and culture of Town Centre.



QUICK FACTS:

OCP Policy 12.5.3 Green Building Strategy recommends developing a strategy to enhance the environmental and human health performance of buildings.

The OCP supports the adoption of the province's Energy Step Code to move toward net-zero energy ready buildings.

Many municipalities across the Province have now adopted the BC Energy Step Code.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendations are being put forward:

The City should consider policies and tools for the creation of social and affordable housing, such as:

- a. Rental Zoning – Negotiate a target Floor Area Ratio (FAR) (e.g.. 1.0 FAR) be preserved as rental housing after development;
- b. Density Bonus Policy – Negotiate a target FAR (e.g.. 1.0 FAR) or a percentage of new developments be affordable housing as a part of the existing Community Amenity Contribution density bonus policy;
- c. Non-profit Housing Organization – Support the establishment of a non-profit housing organization (or work with an existing regional housing organization) that would provide and manage non-market housing stock; and,
- d. Housing Needs Report and Action Plan – The City's Housing Needs Report could be the basis for a Housing Action Plan.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?


During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendations below and shared their level of support:

The City should consider policies and tools for the creation of social and affordable housing, such as:

- Rental Zoning – Negotiate a target Floor Area Ratio (FAR) (e.g.. 1.0 FAR) be preserved as rental housing after development;
- Density Bonus Policy – Negotiate a target FAR (e.g.. 1.0 FAR) or a percentage of new developments be affordable housing as a part of the existing Community Amenity Contribution density bonus policy;
- Non-profit Housing Organization – Support the establishment of a non-profit housing organization (or work with an existing regional housing organization) that would provide and manage non-market housing stock; and,
- Housing Needs Report and Action Plan – The City's Housing Needs Report could be the basis for a Housing Action Plan.

Level of Support for this Recommendation

The majority of participants (64.7%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- Also encourage developers & stratas to have “inclusive” units; perhaps incentives to sell ‘at cost’ to non-profit to oversee/manager for screened tenants (seniors; persons with intellectual or other disabilities)
- A vibrant mixed community where many are welcome and can participate in the community is always going to create a more sustainable and healthy mix rather than a ghetto for the wealthy.
- It is very important to support all segments of our community
- Our city needs to be inclusive. if everything is expensive, how can people who work as servers work and live here.
- Very long overdue
- Critical issue!!
- We are in a housing affordability crisis! White Rock has become a haven for the well off. Lower income seniors have little choice in any kind of affordable rentals in this city and beyond. Something has to change to address this.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Some rental housing should be developed
- Because we need more affordable rentals in the area!
- In particular, we should be supporting non-profit housing organizations. We call them “non-profit” when, in fact, this simply means that communities and the public profit, not profiteers. Building a new city hall at this time is a bad idea- self-serving.
- Too many HUGE new residences are not affordable for local families
- Densify through allowing Coach houses and allowing single family lots to become duplex, triplex, or fourplex
- Unless some attention is paid to affordability, few if any workers can remain in the community to serve the coffee in shops
- Again give density bonuses for permanent social and rental housing
- 1/3 of White Rock’s population are renters. Smart housing policies are critical, particularly as the city continues to grow and existing rental stock is re-developed.
- The city needs to clearly define what it means by “affordable”. Affordability can be defined differently depending on a municipality’s demographics
- Co-op housing as they have in False Creek? CMHC input?
- I have lived in a very successful mixed use community (South False Creek) the mix of young and old and the inclusion of every economic segment truly made that neighbourhood liveable and vibrant
- Encourage investors who buy properties in White Rock and rent them out for non-profit stock or rent controlled housing by offering them a rebate on their property taxes
- I definitely support Co-op and non-profit affordable housing. We have little to none. This was a problem created by the Federal Government at the end of the 90’s, (I think), however, anything we can do alleviate this I support
- Coach houses and basement suites are the easiest and cheapest way to create social and rental housing. encourage multiply basement suites and coach houses
- Build more co-ops and low income rental units for seniors and families
- There should be no provisions for bonus densities. The goals for social and affordable housing should be met without giving more density

NOT IN SUPPORT

- While there is a need for social and affordable housing, the above suggested policies may cause developers to look elsewhere. Too many restrictions/ policies have a negative effect on the business case for development
- The more Council restricts development, developers will choose to take this business elsewhere, like Semiahmoo Town Centre
- The market should decide how much of a given building is rental. Also I don’t feel that everyone has a “right” to live in White Rock - I had to wait a few decades before I could afford to live here
- Unfortunately we will never keep up with affordable housing. People will have to do what we did which was move to where we could afford
- We’ve already seen an uptick in property and petty crime and it appears to be increasing as the population of rough looking characters is also increasing. We should not be encouraging that. Let the province or feds deal with this issue.
- I prefer the idea of an empty home tax levied against the owner of a property that is not in use
- White Rock has less rain than Vancouver making it a more desirable location for homeless already. This is not an issue that the city should be dealing with. It needs to be dealt with on a national level. Or at least a provincial one.

RECOMMENDATION 6

A Strong and Connected Community: Increase the Mix of Uses

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Diverse land uses will enrich the Town Centre:

- Relocating City Hall and other civic facilities would reinforce the Town Centre as the centre for cultural, civic and public life; and,
- A hotel or conference centre would contribute to the desirability of White Rock as a destination for events.

QUICK FACTS:

The OCP and Community Amenity Contribution Policy currently supports the possibility of relocating City Hall to the Town Centre as well as establishing other civic facilities.

The OCP and Zoning Bylaw currently support hotel and conference centre uses in Town Centre.



City Hall Today.

Image: Jonathan Morgan & Company Limited.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendation is being put forward:

The City should set a target for some of the density entitlement in the Town Centre (e.g. 1.0 FAR) for use as new civic facilities, including a hotel or conference center.


HOW DID WE GET HERE?

During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendation below and shared their level of support:

The City should set a target for some of the density entitlement in the Town Centre (e.g. 1.0 FAR) for use as a new City Hall, civic facilities, hotel or conference center uses.

Level of Support for this Recommendation

The level of support for this recommendation was balanced between support and somewhat support (44.1%) and do not support and somewhat do not support (44.1%).



Based on the input received during this process, a lack of support for this recommendation was predominantly associated with the building of a new City Hall. This recommendation has been updated to no longer include this consideration and any recommendations for a new City Hall will require further community engagement.

Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- Mixed use is good and in its own way enriching.
- This type of facility is badly required
- This just makes sense.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Do not agree with relocation of City Hall but agree with civic facilities, hotel or/and conference centre
- Appreciate the age & limits of current City Hall; the potential for enhanced tourism & meeting space that's needed
- A hotel and/or conference centre use would need to be required to provide, create a multi use facility/facilities to enrich the cultural life of the City. By making White Rock a destination for the Arts: Dance, theatre, Art, sculpture etc.
- If the City Hall moves into the Town Centre then maybe the existing City Hall would become an Art Centre or an art centre.
- White Rock desperately needs a conference centre. The WRCC is fine, but we need a venue that can accommodate more than 220 people. The few facilities that are here are old and depressing.
- I like the idea of higher density in the city centre, but small town should be a small town!

- Also insist the first two levels of any new structure be commercial ie offices, retail etc. This is the only industry we can attract
- By creating a cultural destination, White Rock would be able to differentiate itself from other cities in attracting people from around the Semiahmoo peninsula and benefiting businesses.
- I support a hotel or conference centre within the Town Centre, but not the relocation of City Hall + Civic Facilities. These civic facilities are more suitable in the area they are in now
- White Rock needs a conference centre/hotel which can attract overnight visitors
- Do not support moving City Hall, do not need a Conference Centre, do need a natural history interpretive centre
- It is very important that the arts culture be looked at for the city of white rock.
- This whole plan so far negates that. AS a matter of fact, space for art SHOULD BE PART of the negotiations with developers. We need space for arts (visual/performance)
- Private-Public Partnership for a new conference/cultural centre in Town Centre
- A hotel/conference centre on the waterfront built on the City of the Sea theme, something reflecting WR's former unique character and charm, would have worked; however, the town centre looks like every other urban wasteland, so why come to White Rock?
- Partner with Semiahmoo and build a casino/hotel/conference centre on East Beach
- City Hall can be renovated as a green building. WR needs an nature interpretive centre, little nature or place celebrated in WR
- Create a proper town square, similar to those created over a century ago where 8 to 10 acres form the centre of town, with 3 to 4 storey buildings form the perimeter with courtyard for town events. Do so by trading existing city property for WR Elementary

NOT IN SUPPORT

- The City should increase density, not decrease it, and require developers to incorporate Civic Facilities into their developments, to be paid for by CAC's
- If it is not broken, do not fix it and do not go further into debt. I do not think the public has an appetite in these
- I believe a hotel in White Rock would lose money. City Hall is fine where it is
- Where would this be situated and where will the money come from. The city seems to struggle to maintain basic amenities upgraded. We need to take care of the basics before we consider this idea.
- We need to focus on the arts FIRST..create a reason for people to come to the city first. Besides tourism, arts is the second reason people come to white rock.
- Despite all assertions to the contrary, a new storey can be built over the existing city hall whereby new structure captures and reinforces the old structure in a manner that addresses current seismic issues. The greenest building is the one already
- The town centre is now a blight on our community. City hall is fine where it is, closer to 5 corners which bears a resemblance to an uptown City By the Sea. A hotel/conference centre would be good, why would anyone come to ubiquitous ugliness?
- I do not support a new City Hall at the time. Sorry.
- The city always needs to set target densities. I object to the building of a new city hall. Upgrade the old one. Use other space to house more employees if necessary. The tax burden on us is already too high. Do not waste money on new fancy buildings
- Not for city hall. Extend the "town centre" definition down to Five Corners on Johnston Rd to Buena Vista to ensure plans consider all uptown
- City hall is fine where it is, we do not need more civic facilities we need more parks. Leave the conference center to the private sector
- I like the current city hall
- Re-use or repurpose the facilities we already have

RECOMMENDATION 7

A Strong and Connected Community: Identify Transit Exchange Options


CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Convenient and accessible transit contributes to sustainable, affordable and healthy lifestyles. As the Town Centre evolves, the need for good access to transit will also grow. By identifying a location for appropriate long-term facilities, the City of White Rock, City of Surrey and TransLink will safeguard the land for this important facility to be integrated into the urban fabric in the future.

QUICK FACTS:

The OCP and Community Amenity Contribution Policy currently supports the possibility of relocating City Hall to the Town Centre as well as establishing other civic facilities.

The OCP and Zoning Bylaw currently support hotel and conference centre uses in Town Centre.



Map of the current bus exchange showing on street bus stop locations. The City of White Rock Strategic Transportation Plan recognizes that the existing bus exchange needs improvement.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendation is being put forward:

The City should continue to support the establishment of a new transit exchange in the Town Centre; and, prioritize identification of long-term options for the development of a new transit exchange in collaboration with TransLink and the City of Surrey.


HOW DID WE GET HERE?

During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendation below and shared their level of support:

The City should continue to support the establishment of a new transit exchange in the Town Centre; and, prioritize identification of long-term options for the development of a new transit exchange in collaboration with TransLink and the City of Surrey.

Level of Support for this Recommendation

The majority of participants (79.4%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- Public Transit options need to be beefed up for both residents and employers commuting to for work lowers carbon emissions
- Increasing transit options encourages business (employees) to take transit to work thus reducing dependency on providing parking spaces.
- With densification of the City Centre, a better, more efficient transportation system is needed.
- If we wish to be green we need to get more cars off the road and give folks availability.
- Public transport is even more important in an ecological society and we should make it easy to take.
- No climate change action makes sense without massive investment in public transpo.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Improved transit needs to be factored in before more developments occur in the Town Centre rather than later when options will be more constrained.
- Transit contributes to a walkable, vibrant town centre. Designs and location of a new transit exchange should be considered in conjunction with opportunities to shut down certain streets to vehicle traffic and create adjacent parking options
- Push for skytrain to have a stop in WR. Could require future tower development to plan for skytrain station as part of structure in exchange for 3 more floors
- White Rock needs to speak up now. When we have BIG players like YVR on our side, why are we not in the news every day pushing for better service from transit?

NOT IN SUPPORT

- I think this should be addressed in conjunction with South Surrey + one transit exchange on or near the border should be established
- The exchange in Surrey serves adequately, and there is not much room for this in Town Centre.


RECOMMENDATION 8

A Vibrant Sense of Place: Refine the Community Amenity Contribution Density Bonus Policy

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Community amenity contributions (CACs) are an important tool for delivering amenities. The Town Centre Zone currently permits a density bonus to 5.4 Gross Floor Area (GFA) for proponents who enter into a community amenity contribution agreement with the City. This GFA is in conflict with the urban design vision that is set out in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the Urban Design Plan (2011).

PROPOSED MAXIMUM GFA



QUICK FACTS:

In White Rock the Community Amenity Contribution (CAC) policy has allowed for the creation of a new community centre in the Town Centre, upgrades to Johnston Road, and parking improvements at the Waterfront.

The Zoning Bylaw currently allows for a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 1.75 times the lot area in the Town Centre (CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial / Residential Zone) however this GFA may be increased to a maximum of 5.4 times the lot area where the proponents enter into an amenity agreement with the City.

Under current zoning buildings may not exceed a height of 10.7m (approximately 3 storeys) unless the applicant enters into a Community Amenity Contribution (CAC) agreement with the City. Under the CAC policy, height may be increased to 80.7m (approximately 25 storeys). Recommendations for updated building height restrictions are also provided as a part of this planning process. See Recommendation 9.)

RECOMMENDATION


Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendation is being put forward:

The City should consider updating the Zoning Bylaw to reduce the CAC bonus from 5.4 GFA to a GFA that would achieve an urban design vision that better aligns with the OCP and resident aspirations for Town Centre. For example, the City could consider the GFAs that are outlined in the two illustrations.

During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendation below and shared their level of support:


This aerial view illustrates the proposed development site, outlined in orange. The site is bounded by Duke Street to the north, Johnston Road to the east, River Street to the south, and Third Avenue to the west. The development consists of several high-rise buildings, some with curved facades, and lower-rise structures. The surrounding area shows existing urban infrastructure, including streets and other buildings.

PROPOSED MAXIMUM GFA



Level of Support for the Draft Recommendation

The majority of participants (61.8%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- A set formula is too restrictive for the CAC bonus. Moving to GFA's outlining on the diagrams may make sense but again the developer would need to do a cost/benefit analysis
- Strongly support this recommendation. Bonuses can destroy the feel and vision for the Town Centre.
- I'm not sure I understand the diagrams above, but support the idea of "identity of the Town Centre as a Village by the Sea."
- TOTALLY SUPPORT ALL CACs being spent within Upper town centre.
- Without attending the open house, I don't totally understand the concept.. but if it means reducing High Rises and heights I support it. Sorry I'm not up to speed with the jargon.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- you can keep the CAC the way it is but you must address the amenities needed to service everything. The size of the roads, the need for art/creative space the need for parking. build a funicular...how do you tie everything in. look at the big picture
- Update the OCP to reflect the current situation so we are not facing anymore court challenges going forward
- Continuing from #25. Our community must deal with the long term effects of allowing increased density....strain on facilities, maintenance, services. The current CAC levels are a gift to developers in my opinion.
- Keep in mind the developers will find other places to develop if the restrictions are too great. White Rock needs an increased tax base to survive or give over and become a community of Surrey again. Choices.
- Develop a town square that is at least 6-10 acres. Work with Province Min Ed to exchange the land at WR Elementary for the existing land the city hall/ annex/RCMP block. Build a new WR Elementary to include the existing library location, then build town sq
- Such considerations must translate into affordable housing for all income levels

NOT IN SUPPORT

- We need the tax base that higher densities provide
- If anything the CAC should be increased substantially. They are too low. The developers are benefiting from the current arrangement. The city must take a much stronger position.
- Overall, I'm comfortable with the current GFA for the town centre area. The city is small and we need to leverage this area to maximize growth and tax revenue generation
- Your not going to have much of a town of you cover the lots with trees and then don't allow tall buildings.
- The previous council allowed too much development, too fast. We need high density, though. Allow for high densities. Just slightly slow down the pace of growth and use the CAC bonus money to put the necessary infrastructure in place.

RECOMMENDATION 9

A Vibrant Sense of Place: Building Heights

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

The following height recommendations are based on the outcomes of Phase 1 engagement, access to sunlight on future open spaces, view, neighbouring context and delivery of community amenities. The need for the recommended height limit changes are to be implemented via both OCP and Zoning amendments.

RECOMMENDATION


Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendation is being put forward:

The City should consider restricting buildings to the height outlined in the diagram and perspective below.

QUICK FACTS:

Under current zoning buildings may not exceed a height of 10.7m (approximately 3 storeys) unless the applicant enters into a Community Amenity Contribution (CAC) agreement with the City. Under the CAC policy, height may be increased to 80.7m (approximately 25 storeys).

PROPOSED MAXIMUM HEIGHTS



Summary of Height Recommendations:


- Low rises retain the village quality of Johnston Road;
- Johnston Road is limited to 3 storeys (see Recommendation 10 for suggested variance);
- Mid-rises are the predominant neighbourhood form;
- High rises are permitted along North Bluff Road. These taller buildings allow for flexibility so that generous open spaces and community amenities can be provided.

Proposed Maximum Heights (*indicates where a variance is recommended - see Recommendation 10)

HOW DID WE GET HERE?

During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendation below and shared their level of support:


The City should consider restricting buildings to the height outlined in the diagram and perspective below.



PROPOSED MAXIMUM HEIGHTS

Summary of Draft Height Recommendations:


- Low rises retain the village quality of Johnston Road;
- Johnston Road is limited to 3 storeys (see Recommendation 10 for suggested variance);
- Mid-rises are the predominant neighbourhood form;
- High rises are permitted along North Bluff Road. These taller buildings allow for flexibility so that generous open spaces and community amenities can be provided.



Proposed Maximum Heights (*indicates where a variance is recommended - see Recommendation 10)

Level of Support for the Draft Recommendation

The majority of participants (61.8%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- I agree with densification of the Centre as displayed, but I question the use of CAC's agreements - does this mean that developers can build to 25 stories simply by entering into a CAC with the City
- Street front lower scale with set back of floors 3 or 4 or more helps reduce the sense of over bearing that towers impose
- I do agree to a "stepped down" building height for buildings south of 16th towards 5 corners
- I totally support keeping Johnston Road as a low rise venue. Again my level of trust in what is being proposed is sketchy, having been burned so often in the past by various administrations.
- I agree with high rises on the stipulation there is more connected green space

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Once again, if developers want to build, they need to be 1)green 2)mixed used 3)provide art space 4) look at infrastructure to support the increased density
- Development on level ground is fine but on sloping ground, views must be maintained
- 1) Maintaining the Village by the Sea image. 2) Need to ensure that the infrastructure can support the rapid increase in population.
- Some development is desired in the Town Centre but needs to maintain a small community feel.
- Development on level ground is fine but on sloping ground, views must be maintained

NOT IN SUPPORT

- Building height + density need to be correlated to the cost of land, construction & return on investment for the developer. Developers will allocate their invested dollars to the North side/Surrey side of 16th if that Council allows greater height + density
- Because the previous OCP recently adopted & we support the existing OCP
- It is obvious that the City does not want anymore development in Town Centre. With the cost of property developers cannot afford to develop with such low heights and densities
- A higher tower will allow a larger tax base while still allowing much more green space than lower buildings
- We need way higher densities to increase the tax base so that our taxes can be lowered. Allow much greater density along 16th.
- I think the current OCP and Town Centre needs to get with the times and reallocate the height restriction to preserve the beach area and not worry about the Johnson Road area between 5 Corners and Town Centre - 3 stories is too low I'm a bigger fan of 12

RECOMMENDATION 10


A Vibrant Sense of Place: Plazas, Patios and Green Space

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

A generous public realm for plazas, patios and green space is desirable in retail areas; however, it can be difficult for smaller sites to deliver these amenities. A relaxation on building heights from 3 to 4 storeys* would provide an incentive for more public spaces. *This assumes that building heights are guided by those outlined in Recommendation 9.

QUICK FACTS:

Under current zoning buildings may not exceed a height of 10.7m (approximately 3 storeys) unless the applicant enters into a Community Amenity Contribution (CAC) agreement with the City. Under the CAC policy, height may be increased to 80.7m (approximately 25 storeys).



RECOMMENDATION

Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendation is being put forward:

Assuming Recommendation 9 on building heights is followed, the City should consider a build height relaxation to promote plazas and patios on Johnston Road. For example, the City could allow up to 13.7m (approximately 4 storeys) with a 2m stepback after the third floor if a 7m setback for patio or tree canopy is provided (e.g. trees growing to a minimum of 7m canopy diameter spaced at a maximum of 7m apart).


HOW DID WE GET HERE?

During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendation below and shared their level of support:

Assuming Recommendation 9 on building heights is followed, the City should consider a build height relaxation to promote plazas and patios on Johnston Road. For example, the City could allow up to 13.7m (approximately 4 storeys) with a 2m stepback after the third floor if a 7m setback for patio or tree canopy is provided (e.g. trees growing to a minimum of 7m canopy diameter spaced at a maximum of 7m apart).

Level of Support for the Draft Recommendation

The majority of participants (76.5%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- More public space is conducive to a more involved community downtown increasing socializing - suitable for improved mental health
- More green space incorporated into building designs is always a good idea from both an aesthetics + environmental perspective
- I agree as long as lots of green (trees, shrubs) are planted and roofs are green, not black top. Let's get into the 21st century. Too many
- I hope this can be implemented. I like the 4-story height.
- This is very reasonable in order to improve the streetscape and enjoyment.
- Better to provide more stories and keep the patio/tree canopy

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Perhaps we need to review and relax bylaws on sidewalk seating....go to Europe for reference
- We need to beautify all the old buildings so they don't look like dollar stores. you can't just have new building next to ugly buildings.
- Add a couple of more stories and create a park at least 1 block square
- creating a plaza for people to sit will naturally attract people to visit uptown to relax.

NOT IN SUPPORT


- You do not need higher buildings to have patios and plazas. In fact, it would be nice if patios and plazas had sunshine instead of shadows cast by cement towers.
- none of these spaces would be big enough to be viable, bigger spaces and bigger trees are needed

RECOMMENDATION 11

A Vibrant Sense of Place: Build the Open Space Network

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

A complete open space network in the Town Centre provides residents and visitors with opportunities for active and passive enjoyment of the Town Centre; and, encourages an active lifestyle by promoting walking and cycling.



QUICK FACTS:

The Town Centre Urban Design plan includes a large public park, extension of Bryant Park across Russell Avenue, pedestrian connections and series of plazas.

The Town Centre Urban Design Plan is available online on the City of White Rock Website: <https://www.whiterockcity.ca/DocumentCenter/View/1132/Town-Centre-Urban-Design-Plan-PDF>

RECOMMENDATION

Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendation is being put forward:

The City should continue to support the establishment of the open space network as outlined in the Town Centre Urban Design Plan (2011) through the Community Amenity Contribution Policy in the Town Centre. To date, these amenities have been delivered through a density bonus program.


HOW DID WE GET HERE?

During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendation below and shared their level of support:

The City should continue to support the establishment of the open space network as outlined in the Town Centre Urban Design Plan (2011) through the Community Amenity Contribution Policy in the Town Centre. To date, these amenities have been delivered through a density bonus program.

Level of Support for the Draft Recommendation

The majority of participants (64.7%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- This network provides a good balance versus density + heights of buildings
- There is some flow now to building. The options with trade offs for inclusive housing us parklets need weight in value & likelihood of active of passive uses
- I think the plan is great + the density bonus program makes a lot of sense

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- More pedestrian only, traffic free streets would contribute a great deal to the livability of the Town Centre
- We need more indoor diverse convertible spaces for different uses such as for arts. That's more important than outdoor event spaces
- Develop green space / pathway for pedestrians, bikes, and other sports down to Marine Dr. Link with the revised Parks Master Plan
- The traffic grid should be built around pedestrian traffic not vehicles
- More pedestrian only, traffic free streets would contribute a great deal to the livability of the Town Centre
- I like that idea and the rotary park next to the farmers market

NOT IN SUPPORT


- The City should try to achieve the network through means other than density bonuses.

RECOMMENDATION 12

A Vibrant Sense of Place: Identify Town Centre Priorities

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Developments in the Town Centre provide the opportunity to deliver amenities. While the Waterfront is an important part of White Rock's identity and a draw for visitors and residents alike, it is important that the Town Centre and residents therein benefit from the funding that is delivered through the Community Amenity Contribution Policy.



Funding from Community Amenity Contributions can help the City to provide amenities like affordable housing, arts and cultural facilities, and open space amenities. Examples of potential open space amenities are shown above.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on participant feedback on the draft recommendations that were shared during the Phase 2 Open House and Online survey (see following summary), the following recommendation is being put forward:

The City should identify pre-determined target amenities that they intend to seek from development sites. This will allow the City to establish priorities for Town Centre that clearly identify communities needs. In addition to ensuring that the impacts of development in the Town Centre are offset through the delivery of amenities in Town Centre, this approach will provide some predictability for the community and developers before the negotiation phase.


HOW DID WE GET HERE?

During the Phase 2 Open House and Online Survey, participants reviewed the draft recommendation below and shared their level of support:

The City should identify pre-determined target amenities that they intend to seek from development sites. This will allow the City to establish priorities for Town Centre that clearly identify communities needs. In addition to ensuring that the impacts of development in the Town Centre are offset through the delivery of amenities in Town Centre, this approach will provide some predictability for the community and developers before the negotiation phase.

Level of Support for the Draft Recommendation

The majority of participants (82.4%) were in support or somewhat supportive of this recommendation.



Participants also shared why they answered that way. Below is a summary of representative, verbatim comments:

IN SUPPORT

- Predict ability and certainty for developers is always helpful. Transparency of where CAC are allocation allows citizens to understand the significant contributions developers provide to the city. These contributions fund needed city infrastructure and keeps residential property taxes from increasing dramatically
- Absolutely support this approach. The previous council did nothing for our community and the results are stark and unsettling with over-development in the Upper Town Centre.
- Clarity and transparency have a high value in decision making.
- Hopefully, having the developers know what to expect will prevent any “surprises” regarding how the residents want White Rock to look and feel.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- This is a great idea - however I encourage Council to consult with the development community first to get their feedback - there won't be any CAC money based on the reduced height + densities being proposed
- There should be some thought into how next to link the waterfront (marine dr) to the Town Centre. They are pretty well separate entities now
- we need to develop a vision for the practical growth of arts activities in the Town Centre
- Get developers to fund the funicular..the funicular will help in so many levels for the city of white rock.
- Natural history should be celebrated here instead of hidden in the closet.
- Negotiations on amenities must be balanced with developers on other community needs such a designated rental and affordable housing integrated in the developments

NOT IN SUPPORT

- We don't support the changes in the existing OCP. We need more density & heights in Town centre

Appendix: Open House #2 Online and In-Person Survey Responses



A Green Town Centre: Grow the Tree Canopy and Species Mix

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- Tree Canopy cover - this should be 1st! It's great to consider developing the canopy on streets, etc but a 50% of the City Centre has buildings with that asphalt roofs - this is ridiculous in this day and age
- O2/Song birds/air quality
- Would be good to have a baseline of air quality and shade temps. Now then compare as things evolve - perhaps student university partnership project
- Green Space via a tree canopy makes environmental sense, the targets. However, should be negotiating with developers depending on the layout/configuration of the site, elevations, cost, etc
- Tree Canopy I do support
- I think it's a good idea, as long as the density on the balance of the site is high enough
- The focus for Town Centre should be a vibrant dense community that includes civic facilities and together with the Semiahmoo - Town Centre, encourages rapid transit. Building height can reduce footprint, thus encouraging more green space and community vibrancy
- Need to have more density in the town centre so we can reduce the mass of the structures so that we can have more trees
- More density in the town centres along North bluff, one block of Johnston Road
- Green roofs - grass, shrubs, whatever grows on a flat roof to increase green cover
- Develop and enforce a strong tree bylaw for both city and private properties to maintain old growth trees
- Should be the comparable height in coordination with building height
- I think the trees should be that of Portuguese Laurels and of those which do not shed leaves in the fall thereby avoiding drain clogs and people slipping and falling on wet leaves. A lot of thought should be given to the type of trees to be planted
- Incentives for private owners to add suitable trees would be helpful
- Roof level greenspace is appealing but often causes problems with roots penetrating membranes and resulting in leaks
- TO support the idea that we need trees shrubs etc. to absorb Carbon dioxide from pollution, and to make the city a more liveable place with shade and places to escape the urban jungle.
- We need more trees uptown
- We are becoming the City by the Cement instead of City by the Sea
- Trees are very important for ecological reasons but must be kept pruned
- We should strive for as much greening as physically possible. More is better. trees add to the atmosphere/feel of the city. we don't want to be known as the concrete jungle. Greenery helps transform the look and feel of a city to one that's more relaxed and peaceful
- Trees provide not only shade and environmental benefits but also provide beauty to any site.
- Benefits of tree canopy, tree diversity, tree groupings, tree biomass, tree volume, ecological services are well established. are well established
- Trees, shrubs, and greenery will give beauty and help the environment!
- Healthy urban tree canopies are over 30%, not 20% as a target.
- Ecology and appearance

- Anything to get more trees. We destroyed so many all over the town centre in the last few years.
- Greening of the town centre will give it a feel much needed beyond the concrete. And the City needs to increase its tree canopy overall.
- Trees provide oxygen and their roots maintain soil and prevent erosion
- We want greenery, but not at any cost.
- I think there are many ways to attain green - doesn't need to be trees - what about vegetable and herb plants which can be used for food sustainability?
- Trees are essential to our health and well being and for wildlife, coastal native tree species should be used
- more trees near buildings may cause more window bird deaths.
- I believe that the addition of green spaces provide better optical and lead to a more satisfactory use
- insufficient tree requirement, very few sites are over 2 acres
- The city should be a Metro Van municipal leader on green/enviro/sustainable growth and should endeavor to achieve the maximum recommended targets.
- The city can plant trees on city property and let private property owners decide whether or not they want trees
- Trees are being removed all over White Rock and South Surrey by developments. This should stop. We need to keep and plant as many trees as possible to mitigate climate change.
- Will you make the buildings taller to accommodate the 20% tree coverage?
- Will the increase the cost of housing?
- We need greenery to give us more breathing space and walkability
- Living walls and roof areas could contribute to this total as well green roofs or gardens on roofs
- I realize that many of the older trees provided hazardous walking, and I was disappointed to see that they were replaced with very young trees which will take years to provide the ambiance that our streets had before.
- Economic benefits are also well known.
- Takes the edge off and softens buildings!
- Quit putting bushes that block the view of crosswalks. It makes it dangerous for drivers and pedestrians.
- Trees not towers.
- Whatever we do please replace our tree canopy with trees that are more than ornamental. Thanks
- Don't make the bylaw too restrictive to type of tree
- Yes, also recom end coast native plant shrub layer and perennials in landscaping, over time, little or no maintenance is required
- require green rooftops, including trees
- more trees, start by stopping the cutting of existing trees
- Policies absent enforceable bylaws or a willingness to hold property developers accountable will be, ultimately, meaningless.
- Important but other issues I consider more critical
- Plant more trees everywhere possible. The empty lot at Johnston Road and Russell Avenue should be filled with trees and benches for the community to rest and relax in the busy uptown area.



A Green Town Centre: Manage Rainwater Sustainably

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- This practice is a good way to reduce flood risk and improve stream health
- Again White Rock is 13th on the list - should be 1st
- Best use of H₂O
- Perhaps encourage brown water, garden barrels and ways to repurpose/store in the event of any drought in decades to come
- I am not knowledgeable in this area. However I do recall places down the hill suffering from flooding several years ago, when I was not a resident. Rain gardens and permeable paving are good ideas
- It's nice idea, but we need to be careful not to drive all developers to the other side of North Bluff because of excess
- The City should match the rain water sustainability of Semiahmoo Town Centre, otherwise business and development will move to Surrey
- Planting more trees and green roofs would help
- I think 65 % is too high for high density areas. Also consideration should be given to materials used for impervious areas
- We should always try to minimize run off onto streets. As stated above it will manage rainwater in the best way possible.
- environmental concerns
- in doubt about the infrastructure of this city including the cost to do what is suggested
- Water is our most important resource
- It is an effective and workable solution
- any green ideas are working with the natural order of Nature. When we put something up that is manmade, we should take every effort to work with nature..have a symbiotic relationship with nature.
- I like the phrase "mimic nature", you can't get much better than that.
- Obviously a necessity to prevent massive future stormwater works.
- Why not save the water to use for watering the greenery and save on the runoff!
- Really no shortage of water around here
- Water is a precious resource.
- The City needs to get with it in terms of environmental practices to improve liveability in the City and beyond.
- It's important to reduce impervious surfaces, managing rainwater in a way that mimics nature.
- I like the idea, but do not have sufficient understanding to agree with a 65% figure. We should not put onerous requirements on new businesses or development coming in to the area.
- Some rainwater integration is better than none = don't make it so restrictive make it an achievable amount and encourage over achieving rather than forcing something that isn't workable
- Assume part of the 65% impervious surface area includes the building , if not, the City can do better than a 65% impervious surface area
- keeps contaminated water from flowing directly into the bay
- Rainwater collection and reuse will add to the overall reduction of water through municipal systems
- increase the 65% to 80%%
- Important but other issues I consider more critical
- This sounds like environmental B.S.

- This idea is good for our environment to reduce runoff, flooding and soil erosion.
- I guess it sounds like a good idea. Do we have an expert we could ask?
- Stored roofwater used for low-grade usages now in many parts of the world so elements added for detention of conveyance now may be used for other purposes later.
- provide opportunity for water features as street level using rainwater to be included in the scope of surface area
- There are so many options now for porous surface materials.
- Recycled water sources could be incorporated into building design ensuring maximum resource savings
- this should be done in all zones in the city, starting with no impervious treatment of city property ie boulevards
- Water catchment ?



A Green Town Centre: Improve Soil Connectivity

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- Good environmental impact
- While this policy makes sense from an environmental perspective, the cost to the developer in terms of lost parking and space or less commercial on the podium needs to be considered
- 10% for soil where there are trees should be reasonable. Again I am no expert
- Not sure I fully understand concept. Will it add to the aquifer
- If we have higher tree canopy requirements, this will likely happen anyways
- The City should match the rain water sustainability of Semiahmoo Town Centre, otherwise business and development will move to Surrey
- It is important to provide a liveable environment for greenspaces
- White Rock should be leading the way in managing green spaces that are environmentally friendly and sustainable for future residents. environmental concerns
- not sure if you mean trees on the street for all to enjoy or on the roof of the 21 story highrises.
- have a natural setting around the city makes the city look and feel like you are in an urban oasis..not in a concrete jungle, it will make this city an attractive place to move or just for a visit.
- Sounds like a good idea.
- I tried to establish a soil management plan for the entire city years ago. It may still be many years away but society will soon understand all soils are in degeneration or regeneration.
- I like the idea!
- How will you have 65% impervious area and a decent tree canopy with only 10% continuous soil? It doesn't add up.
- Again I support returning our "village" to an attractive nature setting as much as possible. We have far too much concrete. I think we should stop monster houses with no garden or green space as well.
- To improve tree survivability and also importantly to provide larger green spaces for people to improve quality of life.
- Same reasons as question #1
- see previous answers
- when it makes sense - sure - but not every site will make sense for this
- Agree though would like to see a greater percentage for continuous soil and planting
- consider views with tree selection. only allow trees that max height is below residential floors
- Mature tree canopies are necessary for the shade enjoyment of public spaces
- if you want legacy trees start by saving existing "heritage" trees
- In principal I'm fully supportive but parking is at a premium in and around the town centre and that's critical to local business success. Ideally, we should be looking to a fully walkable town centre w/ adjacent or u/g parking.
- Reasonable suggestion
- Without stable healthy soil trees cannot thrive and grow to their potential.
- Parking setbacks would help to achieve this.
- What are the impact of the decisions?
- don't establish policies which can't be achieved and then have to be rewritten or varianced
- plan so green space and walkways enable a path from uptown to marine drive
- This is only for town centre, correct?



A Green Town Centre: Prioritize Green Buildings

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- Moving to green buildings is a must. Builders/developers are/should build to a LEED Gold standard to ensure a low carbon footprint
- Have sense from an environmental point & climate change - reduce GHGs as much as possible & set an example for other communities
- Best use of environmental compounds
- I fully command forward thinking
- Just follow the BC Step Code which is already sustainable
- My concern is that the targets may be too high - then either costs are passed on to tenants resulting in higher rents, or new buildings are built elsewhere altogether
- The more restrictions the city places on Town Centre development, the higher the rental/purchase costs will be for business and residents, thus reducing affordability
- Additional rebates for solar panels? or how can we use them?
- Have a strong tree by law for City and private properties - perfect legacy (old) trees; enforce regulations
- More trees period!
- A rose garden with benches. Check out the garden at Fleetwood Park, there are some grand ideas
- Seniors are not overly impressed by grasses and modern landscaping. It is a comfort thing and wakes memories. I know this because I tend the rose garden at the White Rock lawn bowling club and the many compliments I get
- Balcony uses - from vegetables, florals & suitable growth tips & safety measures could be on City website. Getting strata boards on-side with constructive info will be useful
- I like the idea of greenery being incorporated into walking paths and outdoor restaurant patios, not just tree planting to fill up requirements
- Waste reduction should start at the source not at the retail or consumer level.
- Clamshell food packaging for fruits, tomatoes etc. are a bad culprit in this area.
- As we move towards development of the town centre we should ensure that we meet and even exceed Green building codes to ensure that we are leaders in these areas.
- cost and again does the green apply to all or only the developers and their highrises.
- until India and China improve their green strategies, we are wasting our time
- Sharing expertise from the Provincial Gov. is very important in making this goal work.
- we need to move into the 21st century with how we produce and harness our energies. There are currently lots of green technology that is cost effective and it just makes sense to incorporate those things. Be the city that is on the leading edge of LEEDS
- We desperately need to act to improve our climate.
- White Rock hosted the first solar energized (thermal technology not PV) strat building in Canada. Much later the Green Operations building was built.
- Would like to know what the total cost would be to add this into the build!
- This is a must, but don't give money to "developers"; make them do the right thing. They've been destroying our town and the rest of the Lower Mainland for profit for far too long.

- I'm no expert, but it sounds reasonable.
- This is the way the progressive world by helping to address climate change and become a more liveable city.
- Green is good
- How about rewarding developers who build under the energy step code and penalizing those that don't
- Support green building strategies, not enough soon enough.
- should require more than minimum step code
- The fact that hardly a solar panel can be seen in the city is a testimony to how badly this policy needs encouragement
- start at step 3 or better
- The city should be a Metro Van leader in green/enviro/sustainable growth.
- I wish this was for more than town centre
- Environmental B.S.
- Leave generating renewable energy for others, as this is a very different business from municipal affairs.
- New developments should have rooftop greenhouses where residents can have a vegetable garden. It's therapeutic and the produce could be given to the food bank or sold at the farmer's market.
- Most of the infrastructure "form" we are building today could be here for centuries. Yet the netzero-ready code could be here in 10. We are currently building a lot of buildings that will be relatively speaking, instantly obsolete.
- Require adaptability.
- Residential builders with "green" plans should receive city support and owners get tax breaks
- require Passivehaus or Leed certification of Gold+ for all new permits
- do not prioritize, give large incentives to do this ie density bonus
- Don't "consider" prioritizing the adoption of the BC Energy Step Code, just do it.

A Green Town Centre

Complete List of Additional Verbatim Comments:

- It is very important to have staff with expertise in this area, as well as people to maintain and monitor the results after implementation. I have concerns that we do not currently have a sufficient level of maintenance for our current green spaces
- Flower boxes along Johnston Road between Russell and 16th.
- Build an open stormwater feature right through it!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Yes, Stop Building High Rises that block light and create wind tunnels with concrete abounding and a few bushes, pretending to be gardenesque.
- Green roofs, green walls such as the Semiahmoo Library which is gorgeous and appreciated by the community. Use Native coastal plants to attract birds and pollinators
- Make Johnston Rd pedestrian only between Thrift and N Bluff
- Rooftop garden spaces for lease to tenants to grow their own vegetables could be designed into some dimensions of building planning
- A thriving, vibrant and fully walkable town centre should be the goal. Efforts should be made to look at ways to achieve that through closing down certain streets to traffic, providing parking alternatives at the edges of the town centre area, mandating developers provide a certain percentage of u/g parking for public use.
- Plant many more trees.



A Strong and Connected Community: Create Social and Affordable Housing

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- Too many people who rent are basically out on the street downtown developers and very high rental cost. (Ex - the building on the corner of First and Russel st). 18 units there and the tenants are highly stressed at this time of Christmas and good will Ha!!!! Despicable
- Also encourage developers & stratas to have “inclusive” units; perhaps incentives to sell ‘at cost’ to non-profit to oversee/manager for screened tenants (seniors; persons with intellectual or other disabilities)
- We have lived in White Rock for almost 40 years and have seen/experienced a gradual increase in the number of cars/vehicles in driveways and logging up the roads all over the City. This is directly linked to an increase in the number of renters in the community - I suspect that there are a lot of illegal suites in White Rock contributing to this issue. Also, in general, renters do not care for the community, do not participate in events like this, as much as stable White Rock citizens.
- While there is a need for social and affordable housing, the above suggested policies may cause developers to look elsewhere. Too many restrictions/ policies have a negative effect on the business case for development
- The more Council restricts development, developers will choose to take this business elsewhere, like Semiahmoo Town Centre
- The market should decide how much of a given building is rental. Also I don’t feel that everyone has a “right” to live in White Rock - I had to wait a few decades before I could afford to live here
- The city needs to clearly define what it means by “affordable”. Affordability can be defined differently depending on a municipalities demographics
- Co-op housing as they have in False Creek? CMHC input?
- The moral obligation is fine, but there are several sad examples of Co-op housing. I Coquitlam a building had to be demolished due to its deplorable condition.
- A vibrant mixed community where many are welcome and can participate in the community is always going to create a more sustainable and healthy mix rather than a ghetto for the wealthy.
- where and how would the affordable housing be built. Would it really be affordable. What is affordable
- Some rental housing should be developed
- It is very important to support all segments of our community
- our city needs to be inclusive. if everything is expensive, how can people who work as servers work and live here.
- There is a need for low rental housing in this area.
- On trend!
- Because we need more affordable rentals in the area!
- In particular, we should be supporting non-profit housing organizations. We call them “non-profit” when, in fact, this simply means that communities and the public profit, not profiteers. Building a new city hall at this time is a bad idea- self-serving.
- Unfortunately we will never keep up with affordable housing. People will have to do what we did which was move to where we could afford
- I actually support all of the above, but my level of trust that this will occur meant I stepped back a bit.
- Too many HUGE new residences are not affordable for local families

- We've already seen an uptick in property and petty crime and it appears to be increasing as the population of rough looking characters is also increasing. We should not be encouraging that. Let the province or feds deal with this issue.
- I prefer the idea of an empty home tax levied against the owner of a property that is not in use
- Very long overdue
- Densify through allowing Coach houses and allowing single family lots to become duplex, triplex, or fourplex
- Unless some attention is paid to affordability, few if any workers can remain in the community to serve the coffee in shops
- again give density bonuses for permanent social and rental housing
- 1/3 of White Rock's population are renters. Smart housing policies are critical, particularly as the city continues to grow and existing rental stock is re-developed.
- Critical issue
- Left wing B.S.
- We are in a housing affordability crisis! White Rock has become a haven for the well off. Lower income seniors have little choice in any kind of affordable rentals in this city and beyond. Something has to change to address this.
- I have lived in a very successful mixed use community (South False Creek) the mix of young and old and the inclusion of every economic segment truly made that neighbourhood liveable and vibrant.
- If it means higher FARS in order to execute while capitalizing existing owners, it will not be popular with the public.
- I definitely support Co-op and non-profit affordable housing. We have little to none. This was a problem created by the Federal Government at the end of the 90's, (I think), however, anything we can do alleviate this I support.
- There should be no provisions for bonus densities. The goals for social and affordable housing should be met without giving more density.
- White Rock has less rain than Vancouver making it a more desirable location for homeless already. This is not an issue that the city should be dealing with. It needs to be dealt with on a national level. Or at least a provincial one.
- Encourage investors who buy properties in White Rock and rent them out for non-profit stock or rent controlled housing by offering them a rebate on their property taxes
- coach houses and basement suites are the easiest and cheapest way to create social and rental housing. encourage multiply basement suites and coach houses
- Badly needed
- Build more co-ops and low income rental units for seniors and families.



A Strong and Connected Community: Increase the Mix of Uses

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- Do not agree with relocation of City Hall but agree with civic facilities, hotel or/and conference centre
- Appreciate the age & limits of current City Hall; the potential for enhanced tourism & meeting space that's needed
- Not sure about this as there are private interests & will depend on so many other factors (eg. transit) not under the purview of the City.
- I support a hotel or conference centre within the Town Centre, but not the relocation of City Hall + Civic Facilities. These civic facilities are more suitable in the area they are in now
- The City should increase density, not decrease it, and require developers to incorporate Civic Facilities into their developments, to be paid for by CAC's
- If it is not broken, do not fix it and do not go further into debt. I do not think the public has an appetite in these
- Times of restraint
- Mixed use is good and in its own way enriching.
- A hotel and/or conference centre use would need to be required to provide, create a multi use facility/facilities to enrich the cultural life of the City. By making White Rock a destination for the Arts: Dance, theatre, Art, sculpture etc.
- If the City Hall moves into the Town Centre then maybe the existing City Hall would become an Art Centre or an art centre.
- I believe a hotel in White Rock would lose money. City Hall is fine where it is
- Where would this be situated and where will the money come from. The city seems to struggle to maintain basic amenities upgraded. We need to take care of the basics before we consider this idea.
- we need to focus on the arts FIRST..create a reason for people to come to the city first. Besides tourism, arts is the second reason people come to white rock.
- White Rock desperately needs a conference centre. The WRCC is fine, but we need a venue that can accommodate more than 220 people. The few facilities that are here are old and depressing.
- Despite all assertions to the contrary, a new storey can be built over the existing city hall whereby new structure captures and reinforces the old structure in a manner that addresses current seismic issues. The greenest building is the one already
- I like the idea of higher density in the city centre, but small town should be a small town!
- The town centre is now a blight on our community. City hall is fine where it is, closer to 5 corners which bears a resemblance to an uptown City By the Sea.
- A hotel/conference centre would be good, why would anyone come to ubiquitous ugliness?
- Also insist the first two levels of any new structure be commercial ie offices, retail etc. This is the only industry we can attract
- I do not support a new City Hall at the time. Sorry.
- It makes sense
- The city always needs to set target densities. I object to the building of a new city hall. Upgrade the old one. Use other space to house more employees if necessary. The tax burden on us is already too high. Do not waste money on new fancy buildings

- White Rock needs a conference centre/hotel which can attract overnight visitors
- Do not support moving City Hall, do not need a Conference Centre, do need a natural history interpretive centre
- Not for city hall. Extend the "town centre" definition down to Five Corners on Johnston Rd to Buena Vista to ensure plans consider all uptown
- This type of facility is badly required
- city hall is fine where it is, we do not need more civic facilities we need more parks. Leave the conference center to the private sector
- This just makes sense.
- Not of significance to me
- I like the current city hall
- Density is at it's limit already with highrise developments in the Upper Town Centre.
- By creating a cultural destination, White Rock would be able to differentiate itself from other cities in attracting people from around the Semiahmoo peninsula and benefiting businesses.
- it is very important that the arts culture be looked at for the city of white rock.
- This whole plan so far negates that. AS a matter of fact, space for art SHOULD BE PART of the negotiations with developers. We need space for arts (visual/performance)
-built. See Walrus article , <the false promise of green housing>
- Private-Public Partnership for a new conference/cultural centre in Town Centre
- A hotel/conference centre on the waterfront built on the City of the Sea theme, something reflecting WR's former unique character and charm, would have worked; however, the town centre looks like every other urban wasteland, so why come to White Rock?
- Partner with Semiahmoo and build a casino/hotel/conference centre on East Beach
- City Hall can be renovated as a green building. WR needs a nature interpretive centre, little nature or place celebrated in WR
- Create a proper town square, similar to those created over a century ago where 8 to 10 acres form the centre of town, with 3 to 4 storey buildings form the perimeter with courtyard for town events. Do so by trading existing city property for WR Elementary
- Re-use or repurpose the facilities we already have.



A Strong and Connected Community: Identify Transit Exchange Options

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- Public Transit options need to be beefed up for both residents and employers commuting to for work lowers carbon emissions
- Increasing transit options encourages business (employees) to take transit to work thus reducing dependency on providing parking spaces.
- With densification of the City Centre, a better, more efficient transportation system is needed.
- This is the only way to go
- Negotiate well-access yet limit iddling buses. Perhaps temp + Surrey benefactor to having name rights for funicular down to waterfront
- I myself do not take public transit downtown - a horrific experience. Taxi or Handy Dart only!
- I think this should be addressed in conjunction with South Surrey + one transit exchange on or near the border should be established
- To have the transit we need more density in the town center along North Bluff
- Eventually Sky Train should make its way to White Rock - or something similar. Highway 99 should expand to 3 lanes each way - this is inevitable as the population in South Surrey and White Rock continues to increase.
- No need more people in the town centre to revive the area and bring business back. For business we need more density in the town centre and along North Bluff
- White Rock Community Centre has been a huge boost to connect our community. Congrats on that one!!!
- Take a look at squares in small town USA. Arizona, New Mexico, etc. - they are the focal point of the community
- Community animators/embassadors for various age groups could share a storefront & workplace house to offer community info & tourism info plus do outreach on neighbourhoods
- Improved public transit should lead to lower individual car use.
- The bus exchanges on 152 and 16th block traffic and cause bottlenecks.
- They should be off road and connected to a transit stop for exchange to all buses rather than being spread around.
- If we wish to be green we need to get more cars off the road and give folks availability.
- Public transport is even more important in an ecological society and we should make it easy to take.
- I support better transit but do not believe that TransLink has the will or resources to expand transit options in our community.
- i don't take transit
- If White Rock continues to grow, it needs to address the transit facilities.
- Seniors are reluctant to go into Vancouver because they are unsure of how the system works and are used to the 351 which went straight downtown, very convenient.
- No climate change action makes sense without massive investment in public transpo.
- I don't use transit often, I think it works well now!
- The exchange in Surrey serves adequately, and there is not much room for this in Town Centre.
- works fine the way it is

- Again I have a lack of trust with regard to this point. However, I recognize we need more transit. Ours has been negatively impacted with the Canada line and Bridgeport. I understand YVR is calling for more rapid transit to our area.
- Improved transit needs to be factored in before more developments occur in the Town Centre rather than later when options will be more constrained.
- Better transit limits the need for single occupant vehicles
- We have YVR on our side. They want Skytrain to come here and direct express buses in the interim. Capitalize on that. There can be a low cost (for the city) high benefit improvement.
- White Rock needs better bus transportation period
- Improved transit can reduce car use
- Plan future needs assuming Skytrain will arrive within 20 years and will need a station
- Increased public transportation is the only way to encourage residents to abandon their vehicles
- We need more and more convenient transit,
- Folks in affordable housing and those decreasing energy footprint must be able to access transit
- Shouldn't spend so much on transit. People prefer cars
- White Rock needs to speak up now. When we have BIG players like YVR on our side, why are we not in the news every day pushing for better service from transit?
- Push for skytrain to have a stop in WR. Could require future tower development to plan for skytrain station as part of structure in exchange for 3 more floors
- Transit contributes to a walkable, vibrant town centre. Designs and location of a new transit exchange should be considered in conjunction with opportunities to shut down certain streets to vehicle traffic and create adjacent parking options.

A Strong and Connected Community

Complete List of Additional Verbatim Comments:

- As stated develop a multi use theatre/conference centre building with smaller rooms accommodating artists of varying disciplines. this would enhance the cultural life of the City.
- get that funicular..then you will really connect the community from uptown to the waterfront. The funicular satisfy 1) parking situation at the beach) 2) business development 3) art development 4) waterfront development 5) tourism development. there is no other funicular in Canada besides one in Quebec. You want people from uptown to go downtown and to the waterfront..that's how you connect the town centre to the rest of white rock
- The Arts community needs to be a focus for the development of the Town Centre. There is no central venue where artists can show and sell their art. Currently, there is the pop up gallery which is fine, but we need a much larger place that artists can call "home".
- Traffic calming on Johnston Road similar to Morgan Crossing, pedestrian friendly
- Yes, I have been a proponent of closing Johnston from North Bluff to Russell as a minimum, even better to Thrift to make the roadway a pedestrian, planted green way with sitting areas and cafes.
- In that Bosa buildings will benefit significantly from improvements in adjacent area I hope there is an expectation for cooperation and contributions to the improvements to City centre



A Vibrant Sense of Place: Refine the Community Amenity Contribution Density Bonus Policy

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- A huge impact on the pedestrian realm is that many drivers must think its fair game. I myself have been almost hit. Several other walking folks have shook their head after almost being run over. Yes, I now make eye contact with drivers. But a lot of the drivers look too stoned. God help us all!
- A set formula is too restrictive for the CAC bonus. Moving to GFA's outlining on the diagrams may make sense but again the developer would need to do a cost/benefit analysis
- Part of the quality of life here is the calm tranquility with nature, listening to birds and gentle vibe. People fled Vancouver, New West, other places to get away from party town 24/7 noise & traffic
- We need the tax base that higher densities provide
- In order to maintain the "Village by the Sea" image
- I'm not sure I understand the diagrams above, but support the idea of "identity of the Town Centre as a Village by the Sea."
- Because I wasn't at this meeting I have no idea what the resident aspirations are or were.
- If anything the CAC should be increased substantially. They are too low. The developers are benefiting from the current arrangement. The city must take a much stronger position.
- i don't have a issue with the buildings in that area... we are growing and we need more living space.
- The residents have expressed their disapproval of the Foster/Martin and also Bosa Towers previously. We were listened to, but not heard. Whatever ambiance White Rock has will be lost with all the high-rise development and look like Metrotown.
- TOTALLY SUPPORT ALL CACs being spent within Upper town centre.
- Otherwise courting failure of the entire enterprise.
- Not sure how this works
- This question is unclear. If you are suggesting that we no longer allow developers to buy us off so they can further ruin our city for their profit, then I strongly agree. Don't allow any bonus GFA. Stop building towers.
- Review the charette that was complete about 7/8 years ago
- Without attending the open house, I don't totally understand the concept... but if it means reducing High Rises and heights I support it. Sorry I'm not up to speed with the jargon.
- Strongly support this recommendation. Bonuses can destroy the feel and vision for the Town Centre.
- We need to consider residential needs
- Can't really tell what's being asked.
- Update the OCP to reflect the current situation so we are not facing anymore court challenges going forward
- To be used in upper town centre for green space
- Such considerations must translate into affordable housing for all income levels
- density bonuses should be used to achieve green housing and social affordable housing not to line the pockets of city hall to waste on vanity projects as we have continued to see in the past
- Overall, I'm comfortable with the current GFA for the town centre area. The city is small and we need to leverage this area to maximize growth and tax

revenue generation.

- It is logical to update and avoid poor judgment in recent past
- Too vague. What amenities? I prefer to stick to agreed density levels
- Density is at the maximum this small city can handle. With Semiahmoo Centre highrise development on our doorstep our city will be undriveable and unwalkable.
- Your not going to have much of a town if you cover the lots with trees and then don't allow tall buildings.
- I have been a resident since 1984. When we first moved here it was a little eclectic and we are totally losing that vibe. What aspirations are going to be left if we remove all the artstions do we have left
- Continuing from #25. Our community must deal with the long term effects of allowing increased density....strain on facilities, maintenance, services. The current CAC levels are a gift to developers in my opinion.
- you can keep the CAC the way it is but you must address the amenities needed to service everything. The size of the roads, the need for art/creative space the need for parking. build a funicular...how do you tie everything in. look at the big picture
- Do we really need 24/25 story condos? They may be selling, but are people going to move into them?
- I couldn't help but chuckle when I read "enhance the identity of the Town Centre as a Village by the Sea." What a very sad joke! City Hall should be ashamed of what it has allowed developers to do.
- Yes, sorry I'm not more coherent with my comments.
- The previous council allowed too much development, too fast. We need high density, though. Allow for high densities. Just slightly slow down the pace of growth and use the CAC bonus money to put the necessary infrastructure in place.
- Keep in mind the developers will find other places to develop if the restrictions are too great. White Rock needs an increased tax base to survive or give over and become a community of Surrey again. Choices.
- develop a town square that is at least 6-10 acres. Work with Province Min Ed to exchange the land at WR Elementary for the existing land the city hall/ annex/RCMP block. Build a new WR Elementary to include the existing library location, then build town sq
- Don't you have 13M burning a hole in your pocket from CAC's?



A Vibrant Sense of Place: Building Heights

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- Too many high rises in White Rock. Downtown that fool --> Wayne Baldwin, such a dirty rotten trick. Just more money from the developers into the coffers of City Council
- I agree with densification of the Centre as displayed, but I question the use of CAC's agreements - does this mean that developers can build to 25 stories simply by entering into a CAC with the City
- Street front lower scale with set back of floors 3 or 4 or more helps reduce the sense of over bearing that towers impose
- Building height + density need to be correlated to the cost of land, construction & return on investment for the developer. Developers will allocate their invested dollars to the North side/Surrey side of 16th if that Council allows greater height + density
- Because the previous OCP recently adopted & we support the existing OCP
- It is obvious that the City does not want anymore development in Town Centre. With the cost of property developers cannot afford to develop with such low heights and densities
- A higher tower will allow a larger tax base while still allowing much more green space than lower buildings
- I do agree to a "stepped down" building height for buildings south of 16th towards 5 corners
- Doing this by paying a lot of dollars or whatever ?? This still needs to conform to the OCP
- Thank you to the present mayor Darryl Walker. Finally the sense of intelligence to involve the tax payers (your public)
- 1) Maintaining the Village by the Sea image. 2) Need to ensure that the infrastructure can support the rapid increase in population.
- Overdevelopment and too many high rises will destroy the concept of White Rock as a friendly liveable city. Increase density and all the inherent problems associated with that: traffic waste disposal, schooling etc.
- The high rises do allow for flexibility. What generous open spaces? Really? Only for the few who have a view or to be shortly taken away from another high rise to take away another view. We have no village left. Where is this village?
- High rises have no place south of Thrift Ave. We must maintain some ocean view to be considered a "Village by the Sea"
- Stick to the Plan!
- it's already done.
- As above, the Foster/Martin project will block sunlight, ocean views, and create another wind tunnel--regardless of what the planners say.
- Residents were promised lowering of heights in all directions from Bosa 1 apex. Not respecting this is lowering public trust.
- Every property in TC should have same rights
- This diagram reflects the continued manipulation in this process. How can anyone think that what is proposed here has anything to do with a "Village by the Sea"? I wish you were joking, but I know you aren't. This is a flawed process. Do you live in WR?
- we are too small to be a concrete jungle
- I totally support keeping Johnston Road as a low rise venue. Again my level of trust in what is being proposed is sketchy, having been burned so often in the

past by various administrations.

- Some development is desired in the Town Centre but needs to maintain a small community feel.
- It is foolish to blot out sun and views with too many tall large buildings
- We need way higher densities to increase the tax base so that our taxes can be lowered. Allow much greater density along 16th.
- I think the current OCP and Town Centre needs to get with the times and reallocate the height restriction to preserve the beach area and not worry about the Johnson Road area between 5 Corners and Town Centre - 3 stories is too low I'm a bigger fan of 12
- I agree with high rises on the stipulation there is more connected green space
- protecting views by reducing heights towards the bay is the right way to protect owners equity in current and future projects
- Tradeoffs will need to be made for affordable housing
- building heights should be used to create more light and open space, of course this is never done so low rises seem to be an alternative
- As stated in the previous question. We're small, we need to leverage the town centre to maximize growth & tax revenue.
- If current 3 floor rentals and older buildings are to be replaced the new buildings must be affordable and not luxury
- Keep the Lower Town Centre low-rise and less congested.
- 3 stories on Johnston? Have you seen 24th ave? No thank you
- Development on level ground is fine but on sloping ground, views must be maintained
- No Exceptions!
- once again, if developers want to build, they need to be 1)green 2)mixed used 3)provide art space 4) look at infrastructure to support the increased density
- I can only hope that residents of WR manage to get their vision of our "village by the sea" directly to Council and that they put a stop to the madness that will likely result from your flawed process. You are looking for the results you want.
- Count how many chain stores are located in White Rock. Very few. That's because most of them rate the cost of rental (of which taxes are a large component) highly in their formula's for determining profitability. We need our taxes lowered.
- Poor decision for heights on Oxford developments
- Let the community decide on density, not developers.
- I don't want to live in an ocean of townhomes like fleetwood thanks



A Vibrant Sense of Place: Plazas, Patios and Green Space

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- More public space is conducive to a more involved community downtown increasing socializing - suitable for improved mental health
- More green space incorporated into building designs is always a good idea from both an aesthetics + environmental perspective
- I agree as long as lots of green (trees, shrubs) are planted and roofs are green, not black top. Let's get into the 21st century. Too many
- Some broad side walks adequate, yet pocket parklets in the care likely not well used have sense of flow/connections versus many hiccups like are at saltair with Hilcrest Bakery way way back from walk by customers
- It is obvious that the City does not want anymore development in Town Centre. With the cost of property developers cannot afford to develop with such low heights and densities
- Building in White Rock have flat, asphalt roofs - the City should be demanding that existing (old) buildings plant greenery - are there roofs (if possible engineering wise)
- To beautify and green space the city.
- What is actually left on Johnston Road to promote patios etc.? At this point and time parking is also a major problem and where would all these people be from to enjoy these patios. The owners of the high rises on Johnston Rd.
- Okay but not south of Thrift Ave
- Confusing language
- creating a plaza for people to sit will naturally attract people to visit uptown to relax.
- I hope this can be implemented. I like the 4-story height.
- Lack of attention to green& open space will ultimately make UTC less attractive than what Surrey will do across the street. Long term but likely.
- You do not need higher buildings to have patios and plazas. In fact, it would be nice if patios and plazas had sunshine instead of shadows cast by cement towers.
- again see the charette
- Sounds good, but lack of trust....and not schooled enough to feel confident in what I'm understanding.
- This is very reasonable in order to improve the streetscape and enjoyment.
- Makes ecological sense
- Obviously we want pretty spaces. Not just density.
- Better to provide more stories and keep the patio/tree canopy
- But if go higher with step backs, would allow for more connected green space and pedestrian areas
- Max 4 stories would be good to keep open feel of Johnston
- The fourth level could itself provide green space, plazas, etc.
- none of these spaces would be big enough to be viable, bigger spaces and bigger trees are needed
- I like concept but believe it should extend to beyond city centre where open space is also desirable
- We need more public space to live in simply put.
- Green space good short buildings bad
- Perhaps we need to review and relax bylaws on sidewalk seating....go to Europe for reference
- we need to beautify all the old buildings so they don't look like dollar stores.

- you can't just have new building next to ugly buildings.
- Your questions assume your own answers.
 - lack of trust .
 - Sell 1510 Johnston Rd as it is way too small for a proper town square, and cost too much for only 0.33 of an acre. Invest the cash in building a new WR Elementary on the existing City Hall / Annex/RCMP, etc block (cost \$25MM?), and build new town square
 - add a couple of more stories and create a park at least 1 block square

A Vibrant Sense of Place: Build the Open Space Network

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- This network provides a good balance versus density + heights of buildings
- Goes without saying
- There is some flow now to building. The options with trade offs for inclusive housing us parklets need weight in value & likelihood of active of passive uses
- I think the plan is great + the density bonus program makes a lot of sense
- It is obvious that the City does not want anymore development in Town Centre. With the cost of property developers cannot afford to develop with such low heights and densities
- On one hand – City wants to reduce the CAC on the other hand - wants to build the open space network with CAC money. Doesn't make any sense
- Did not review the 2011 plan
- With control of density.
- Where would one park in order to enjoy these spaces on this drawing?
- It's a good mix.
- The traffic grid should be built around pedestrian traffic not vehicles.
- outdoor event spaces don't work if not thought out properly such as the bosa outdoor performance space where you can't even use it because of noise complaints. green spaces and places to sit are good.
- I feel that the downtown area will look bland and boring with too many highrises.
- All design should start with open space network. Had Rykon followed this principle, many future options would not have been closed off.
- If the Town Centre Urban Design Plan (2011) has created the ugliness of the present town centre and will continue with the ugliness reflected in your diagram above, then absolutely not.
- In the past it was so easy to shop and park uptown. I have lived here for over 30 years. I can't hike like I used to and I fear, I will soon have to park underground everywhere with no surface parking and shopping under this plan.
- The City should try to achieve the network through means other than density bonuses.
- It agrees with my view of a small town plan
- see previous answers
- As long as the money is used to create open space network and not used for archways across the road!
- Not a Village by the Sea, WR is a city with a lot of high rises, with 7 going up as this survey is being conducted. The City over the years has allowed the removal of all character buildings such as heritage cottage and decomoderne. Since we are here now
- Make it better planned than current patchwork of development's green space, that seem disjointed currently.
- we need even bigger spaces
- Does this preclude CAC contribution toward affordable units?
- I don't want high density
- I like that idea and the rotary park next to the farmers market
- More pedestrian only, traffic free streets would contribute a great deal to the livability of the Town Centre

- we need more indoor diverse convertible spaces for different uses such as for arts. That's more important than outdoor event spaces.
- Develop green space / pathway for pedestrians, bikes, and other sports down to Marine Dr. Link with the revised Parks Master Plan

A Vibrant Sense of Place: Identify Town Centre Priorities

Complete List of Verbatim Comments:

- This is a great idea - however I encourage Council to consult with the development community first to get their feedback - there won't be any CAC money based on the reduced height + densities being proposed
- Just makes a lot of sense!
- Again SAA
- Predict ability and certainty for developers is always helpful. Transparency of where CAC are allocation allows citizens to understand the significant contributions developers provide to the city. These contributions fund needed city infrastructure and keeps residential property taxes from increasing dramatically
- Have a few in mind to negotiate yet allow for evolving innovation, including inclusive housing
- I support this idea, as long as the priorities identified are amenities that can be enjoyed by all, such as open space amenities. I don't see that affordable housing fits in this category
- There should be some thought into how next to link the waterfront (marine dr) to the Town Centre. They are pretty well separate entities now
- Community resource info drop-in hub staffed by area non-profits & volunteers
- We don't support the changes in the existing OCP. We need more density & heights in Town centre
- Yes. Increase density and height - this will encourage the development of vibrant, affordable housing and rental rates that local, independent businesses can afford, and will encourage young families to move into White Rock
- The basic skills that all humans are capable of; 1)be kind 2) Be forgiving 3) Be helpful 4) Offer verbal support 5)Offer/give baked goods 6) End a arm or leg of support 7) Support others with anything they need 8) Pay/play it forward 9) Be forgiving 10) We must help other human kind + the wild life
- Balance the active & passive elements facilitate 'beating' west stops & conversation opportunities
- Provides a clearer, up front direction for potential developers.
- To support the concept of "enhance the identity of the Town Centre as a Village by the Sea."
- we need to develop a vision for the practical growth of arts activities in the Town Centre
- nice images and if White Rock was able to create something even close to them that would be amazing. My experience living here is where on earth would be have such open space with seating and trees and a meandering road. And where would a visitor park?
- I'd like to see an upmarket permanent "market place" similar to covered markets in Europe, containing restaurants, food courts, fish stalls, meat stalls etc.
- Hard not to support this initiative. The City must take an aggressive stance in negotiating with developers. Our vision of this must be well formed, articulate and not "slap dash"
- We are in dire need of art/performance/convertible spaces in development sites which wasn't even addressed in this survey.
- Hopefully, having the developers know what to expect will prevent any "surprises" regarding how the residents want White Rock to look and feel.

- And those amenities should prioritize green/open space.
- Again, this is a leading question. Of course this should be done, but I think you think you've been doing this and you haven't. Look at the pictures. Only one of them is possible with the mess you've made and especially the mess your diagram reveals.
- It sounds reasonable, but again....not sure my level of trust links to the language.
- Amenities should be required from developers as part of their plans without any bonuses.
- Taxpaying current residents need the opportunity to share their views
- Clarity and transparency have a high value in decision making.
- Let's figure out first what we want - then find developers who support the vision rather than letting developers give their vision and we are left to either support or not
- Agree though the greatest missing amenity is connected green space with trees, shrubs and perennials attracting pollinators and birds. The green space should be connecting throughout the city to road ends.
- Negotiations on amenities must be balanced with developers on other community needs such a designated rental and affordable housing integrated in the developments
- I am unsure about how the money would be spent, I do not trust council will do the right thing in the long run
- If amenities include significant affordable housing, not just enhancing town centre
- Absolutely support this approach. The previous council did nothing for our community and the results are stark and unsettling with over-development in the Upper Town Centre.
- arts spaces cannot be secondary uses or multi-use spaces, they must be dedicated space available for the community to grow into
- If we want a truly vibrant sense of place, time, staffing and sufficient funding must be in place.
- get developers to fund the funicular..the funicular will help in so many levels for the city of white rock.
- Notice there is sunshine and mature trees in your pictures. Why would you mislead residents to think that these things are possible in the town centre your diagram envisions? Only shadows if you are allowed to continue to collude with developers.
- Natural history should be celebrated here instead of hidden in the closet.
- Nature viewing is the top economic driver in North America yet where is WR on this front?
- Implement dedicated bike paths and more parks where street vendors can set up. ie. like a year round farmers market type vendors allowed and planned for all year

A Vibrant Sense of Place

Complete List of Additional Verbatim Comments:

- Cultural activities are beneficial to businesses as they attract residents and visitors.
- to be vibrant, you need people, and what would attract the people? the people want to feel like they want to be there ... so arts, green spaces, outdoor seating, a funicular are essential to creating a vibe for uptown which is currently dead. People want their senses satisfied with sight, sounds smells and feel. address these needs and wants from people and it will be vibrant.
- No more nail salons, acupuncture clinics--there are 4 within a 4-block radius of where I live. Also, local coffee shops only--no franchises. How about a movie theatre in White Rock and as I mentioned before, an Arts Community place.
- It also depends upon the type of business we attract. I think we have an over abundance of hair and nail salons. We used to have a well used vibrant plaza with easy access. Now we don't And I imagine Central Plaza's days are numbered...so people leave to shop at Morgan Crossing where is it still possible to surface park and shop. White Rock should look more like that.
- But I realize it's too late . We were sold out. Apologies for the negative attitude. I know it's not helpful.. Please make it as easy to get around as possible and with much greenery as you can foster!
- Build a tram to the beach from the Town Centre
- Said above, connected green spaces, interpretation, open air events and cafes
- Require new developments to include more parking for public use. Currently many new developments do not even build an equal number of parking spaces as strata units. Then the City would manage the public parking sections
- More open space, plazas and trees. At the very least.

FINAL COMMENTS

Participants were asked if there was anything else they would like to add. Below are their verbatim comments:

- Don't forget about Marine Drive! The waterfront is important & considerations should be given to closing down traffic or making it go one way in the summer months. Other cities have done this & it improves the quality of life.
- More enforcement of by-laws is needed - noise (loud motorcycles), dogs, tree cutting, etc
- I am so pleased to be able to attend a meeting that welcomes the public input
- Have you added up the number of residents from these high rises when they are fully occupied? Assuming that at least of/these people will not be driving will there be enough green space and activities for them? I am sure that many of them would like to stay fit and walk as much as possible, so free shuttle to the waterfront would be an incentive for better health and quality of life. Just a suggestion

- Will promote engagement with neighbours. We all need to take initiatives to engage neighbours more
- Missed these engagement workshops because I attended these a few years back and was a waste of energy and the city did what they were going to do anyway. Which is build high rises - too many too fast and too high. We are left with out space for what this council deems to do and we also have lost the intended arts corridor to White Rock. Without a community that supports the arts the art is just another commodity.
- address the arts!!! and get that funicular
- White Rock is still struggling to find its identity. Hopefully, the new administration and the residents can define what that looks like and make White Rock a place to go to all year round.
- Given the current situation of all properties and zonings, I read all of the staff recommendations as positive.
- I hope others who are participating in this process are as attuned to its flaws as I am.
- Concern I have it will be another expensive study and then shelved as the previous ones have
- I think I took part in the earlier workshops, but frankly, I can't be sure. I've been out to many events. One with the consultant required more time that night than I could give and so I had to depart. I apologize for not being more helpful. Hoping for the best. Not a negative individual at heart....but trust is so broken.
- Thank you for the work so far. The OCP review is the most important initiative of the City.
- I am very pleased with the wiligness (and the interest) that the new council has in obtaining feedback from the residents. I am a resident, an owner of commercial property and an owner of a business (in that commercial property). We want a vibrant, safe and fun city without the insanely high taxes we now pay. To do that we need to allow a lot of development, but do it in a well planned way and in a way that does not encourage the "freeloaders" in our society.
- Look forward to the next phase
- Hope to see the City move forward with green infrastructure, green buildings and greenways planted with coastal native plants. Long overdue.
- Please ensure that the bylaws are modified to protect existing residents and taxpayers of the City so we do not have to pay more taxes to subsidize new developments that are not contributing enough fees to cover the increase in services, including traffic, water, parking, roadworks, parks, etc.
- I have never seen a public engagement in White rock or Surrey where the results were not manipulate to suit the powers that be or their supporters
- Thank you for consulting
- I appreciate the approach involving the whole community our new mayor and council has taken since being elected. Please continue your thoughtful approach to the needs of our citizens. Thank you for your hard work.
- Are we doing another recon 2024?

APPENDIX B

Review of Implementation Mechanisms and “Considerations” tied to DIALOG Recommendations pertaining to the Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm Review

DIALOG Recommendation 1a):

The City should consider a policy requiring targets for tree canopy on large sites (8,094 m² (2.00 acres) or more) (e.g. 20% on the ground level); and, for medium sites (3,035 m² to 8,093m² (0.75 to 1.99 acres) (e.g. 20% between ground and roof level).

Staff Comment on Recommendation 1a):


Concur with recommendation.

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) OCP Amendment
- b) Town Centre Development Permit Area Guidelines

Considerations:

Figure 1.0 below highlights parcels within the Town Centre based on the area thresholds identified in the recommendation. It is noted that lot consolidation and/or subdivision would affect the threshold that properties fall within and accordingly the way the policy would apply to the lands.



- i) An amendment to the OCP could be made to introduce a policy which would set a target for the creation of spaces that could be used to support tree planting and an overall increase in the tree canopy. It is acknowledged that tree plantings on rooftops in a seaside City can be challenging due to winds and other climactic conditions. Taking this into account it may

be beneficial that this policy be introduced as an “aspirational” policy (i.e., not a requirement).

- ii) Amendments to the Town Centre Development Permit Area (DPA) Guideline could recognize the policy targets and provide direction regarding the types of tree species likely to thrive in White Rock. The DPA Guidelines may also recognize a period over which the tree canopy would be expected to make up the 20% canopy (ground and/or roof coverage) as noted in the policy.

DIALOG Recommendation 1b):

The City should consider requiring that a minimum percentage of trees be coniferous trees (e.g. 10%).

Staff Comment on Recommendation 1b):

Concur with recommendation. Appropriate species and tree selection at the time of planting, based on soil conditions, solar exposure, etc. will be essential for long-term health of trees.

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) OCP Amendment
- b) Town Centre Development Permit Area Guidelines

Considerations:

This could be effectively implemented within the Town Centre DPA Guidelines with a corresponding, enabling, OCP Policy.

DIALOG Recommendation 2:

The City should consider amending its Zoning Bylaw to require a maximum effective impervious surface area (e.g. 65%). To achieve 65% effective impervious area, on-site stormwater best management practices such as rainwater harvesting, porous paving and on-site infiltration would be required to reduce the effective impervious area on the site overall.

Staff Comment on Recommendation 2:

Concur with recommended regulation, but propose that it be implemented through Development Permit Area Guideline to allow flexibility and allow proponents to demonstrate through their design how the performance target is achieved (rather than a Zoning Bylaw regulation with less flexibility).

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) Town Centre Development Permit Area Guidelines

Considerations:

- i) The intention of this DPA guidelines would be to allow for the controlled infiltration of stormwater into the municipal stormwater management system and/or to allow for stormwater to be absorbed naturally into the land.
- ii) The recommendation could be introduced as an amendment to Guideline 22.3.2(j), which currently reads “Incorporate Low Impact Development Techniques for stormwater

management, where appropriate and in accordance with the City’s Integrated Storm Water Management Plan (ISWMP). This includes but is not limited to bio-swales, cisterns, and permeable paving. Narrower lanes/access roads and the use of porous asphalt are encouraged.”

The amendment would establish a maximum effective impervious surface of 65% within lands designated Town Centre in the Official Community Plan. The standard would ultimately quantify that 35% of newly developed private lands within the Town Centre remain effectively pervious.

- i) Would want to create a definition of “effective impervious surface” to recognize components that would be applied in determining compliance with the standard.
- ii) There may be a need to recognize exemptions to the standard in circumstances such as the redevelopment of small, constrained sites, where it may be impractical to achieve 35% pervious surface while accommodating the core components of development (e.g., driveway access, building footprint, parking, etc.).
- iii) The City may also wish to exclude lands subject to a Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) from the calculation of the percentage of effective impervious surface when these lands accommodate infrastructure such as pedestrian paths and bike lanes, recognizing that pervious surface treatments (e.g., permeable concrete, interlocking stone, etc.) can come with higher costs.
- iv) **Note:** In the Town Centre context, the ability to achieve 65% effective impervious surface may result in substantial costs to redevelopment as impervious surfaces, in some cases covering 100% of an existing property, would need to be replaced with pervious surfaces. In defining “effective impervious surfaces” there may be a means of recognizing (exempting) surfaces that allow for the retention of stormwater (e.g., rooftop retention) thereby acting to support the overall intention of the standard.

DIALOG Recommendation 3:

The City should consider a policy requiring continuous soil for tree health and rainwater infiltration on medium to large sites (3,035 m² (0.75 acres) or more). For example, the City could establish a minimum percentage of continuous soil for sites (e.g. 10%) which would be achieved by reducing the size of the podium and by providing parkade setbacks.

Staff Comment on Recommendation 3:

Concur with recommendation. Coniferous trees particularly would require areas of continuous soil to achieve healthy lifespans.

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) Official Community Plan Amendment
- b) Zoning Bylaw Amendment

Considerations:

- i) The recommendation could be introduced as an OCP policy which identifies the intention behind establishing continuous soil while a zoning standard could be introduced to require a minimum percentage of continuous soil for sites greater than 3,035 m².

- ii) A definition of “continuous soils” would need to be added to the Zoning Bylaw to ensure the standard can be effectively, and consistently, implemented.

DIALOG Recommendation 4a):

The City should consider prioritizing the development of a Green Building Strategy requiring targets for building performance. This strategy could take a holistic approach to include other sustainable design considerations such as operational and embodied greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, renewable energy generation, water efficiency, integrated rainwater management, healthy materials and indoor air quality, and waste reduction strategies.

Staff Comment on Recommendation 4a:

Concur with recommendation. As Energy Step Code implementation is already endorsed as a Council Strategic Priority, staff proposed that a separate Green Building Strategy be deferred until after the Energy Step Code is implemented.

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) Existing: Official Community Plan contains enabling policy to pursue Strategy (12.5.3)
- b) Town Centre Development Permit Area Guidelines
- c) Amendment to Density Bonus / Amenity Contributions Policy (No. 511)

Considerations:

- i) The preparation of a stand-alone Green Building Strategy may require additional resources. It is noted that some municipalities have retained an Environmental / Sustainability Coordinator responsible for reviewing measures to achieve enhanced levels of building efficiency and to provide in-house oversight in the implementation of such measures.
- ii) Efforts are underway to implement the BC Energy Step Code which will allow for the realization of improvements in building performance (sustainability) and may lessen the urgency / need for a Green Building Strategy specific to White Rock.
- iii) Changes to the Town Centre DPA Guidelines could allow for the recognition of sustainability measures that would allow for improved building performance. Recognizing these features within the DPA Guidelines would provide some flexibility not otherwise available in a municipal bylaw.
- iv) Amendments to the Density Bonus / Amenity Contributions Policy could allow for the recognition of enhanced building performance measures (i.e., those that go beyond the requirements of the BC Building Code) as a basis for the reduction in amenity contributions and/or the basis for an increase in density being exempt from a contribution requirement.

DIALOG Recommendation 4b):

The City should consider prioritizing the adoption of the BC Energy Step Code to incentivize and enforce incremental improvements in energy efficiency for new construction.

Staff Comment on Recommendation 4b):

Concur with recommendation. This work is at early stages but underway with the addition of the Building Official III position.

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) White Rock Building Code Bylaw, 2012, No. 1928

Considerations:

- i) The BC Energy Step Code establishes different levels, or “steps”, of energy-related building design measures applicable to different types and scales of development. The determination of which step to go to will be the focus of future review.
- ii) City staff are working on the implementation of the BC Energy Step Code. The work will require amendments to the White Rock Building Bylaw. As this work proceeds Council will be provided periodic updates.

DIALOG Recommendations 5a) to 5d):

- 5a. Rental Zoning – Negotiate a target Floor Area Ratio (FAR) (e.g.. 1.0 FAR) be preserved as rental housing after development;
- 5b. Density Bonus Policy – Negotiate a target FAR (e.g.. 1.0 FAR) or a percentage of new developments be affordable housing as a part of the existing Community Amenity Contribution density bonus policy;
- 5c. Non-profit Housing Organization – Support the establishment of a non-profit housing organization (or work with an existing regional housing organization) that would provide and manage non-market housing stock; and,
- 5d. Housing Needs Report and Action Plan – The City’s Housing Needs Report could be the basis for a Housing Action Plan.

Staff Comment on Recommendations 5a) to 5d):

Generally concur with recommendation 5a) and 5b), with additional specifics to be discussed in presentation to Land Use and Planning Committee. Support intent of recommendation 5c) and 5d), no further action required to implement these items at this time.

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) Official Community Plan Amendment
- b) Zoning Bylaw Amendment
- c) Amendment to Density Bonus / Amenity Contributions Policy (No. 511)
- d) Housing Needs Report

Considerations:

Regarding Recommendations 5a & 5b:

- i) Policy amendments to the OCP may be used to enable greater density subject to the dedication of a specific amount of floor area (e.g., 1.0 FAR) to rental and/or affordable housing.
- ii) Policy amendments within both the OCP and the Density Bonus Policy (No. 511) may also be made to enable a waiver of a portion of the required community amenity contribution, perhaps being automatic, when the density is tied to either, or both, rental and affordable housing. The current policy allows for the waiver of up to 100% of the CAC when tied to “affordable rental” and up to 50% when tied to “rental” housing.

- iii) Policy amendments to the OCP and Density Bonus Policy may benefit from the introduction of a formal definition of “affordable” as the term relates to rental and ownership housing.
- iv) Amendments to the Zoning Bylaw could be made to require that specific proportions of development tied to a rezoning application for which a density bonus is sought be subject to specific allocations of density to rental housing and/or affordable housing.

Regarding Recommendations 5c and 5d:

- i) It may be advantageous to leverage the expertise that exists within established non-profit housing organizations such as Metro Vancouver Housing Corporation (MHVC), taking advantage of economies of scale, rather than directing resources to establishing a non-profit housing organization specific to White Rock.
- ii) The preparation of a Housing Needs Report is scheduled to occur this year. Note that UBCM has recently announced a new intake deadline for grant funding, being October 16, 2020. The City’s application for this funding has been submitted. Resource limitations and the on-going COVID-19 crisis have hindered the ability of staff to advance the Housing Needs Report in accordance with the timelines referenced in the original funding application. As the deadline for submissions draws nearer staff will provide UBCM with an updated work plan to reflect the status of the undertaking, at that time, and any adjustments that will be made to ensure the project continues to move forward.
- iii) The Housing Needs Report will ultimately be used to identify areas of local housing need. Stemming from this work, staff will seek direction from Council to implement measures that will help to address these areas of need. These measures may include, but are not limited to: policy and regulatory incentives to support affordable housing and the construction of various housing types; efforts to establish collaborative partnerships with local housing providers and agencies that deliver housing-related services; and, the creation of funding mediums (e.g., reserve funds, tax abatement programs, etc.) that make it more cost efficient for the development industry to address needs within the non-market housing sector.

DIALOG Recommendation 6:

The City should set a target for some of the density entitlement in the Town Centre (e.g. 1.0 FAR) for use as new civic facilities, including a hotel or conference centre.

Staff Comment on Recommendation 6:

Concur with intent of recommendation, with additional specifics to be discussed in presentation to Land Use and Planning Committee (see also recommendation 9). As the floor area of City owned community facilities (i.e. “community amenity space”) does not count towards a property’s maximum floor area, staff recommend that these types of facilities be incentivized at strategic locations near existing and future civic facilities through consideration of additional building height for properties incorporating these facilities.

Implementing Mechanism(s):

- a) Official Community Plan Amendment
- b) Zoning Bylaw Amendment
- c) Amendment to Density Bonus / Amenity Contributions Policy (No. 511)

Considerations:

- i) A review of how existing community amenity contributions (funds) ought to be spent was the focus of a recent review to help identify local interests as they relate to potential amenity investments. The results of this work were presented to Council on March 30, 2020. Investing in “civic facilities” was identified as the “most important” amenity project by only 12 percent of the 523 people who completed a survey related to the review.
- ii) Amendments to the OCP and Density Bonus Policy could be made to dedicate a portion of any amenity contribution, or space within a development which benefits from a density bonus, to the creation of civic facilities, including a hotel or conference centre.
- iii) Amendments to the Zoning Bylaw would be needed to ensure any pre-determined allocation of FAR (if it is not owned by the City) towards a specific facility or amenity is realized (i.e., make the allocation a clear requirement and not something to be negotiated through policy).

DIALOG Recommendation 7:

The City should continue to support the establishment of a new transit exchange in the Town Centre; and, prioritize identification of long-term options for the development of a new transit exchange in collaboration with TransLink and the City of Surrey.

Staff Comment on Recommendation 7:

Concur with recommendation.

Implementing Mechanisms:


- a) Consultation and facilities planning with staff at both TransLink and the City of Surrey to look at opportunities for a transit exchange in the Town Centre
- b) Official Community Plan Amendment
- c) Zoning Bylaw Amendment


Considerations:

- i) City of White Rock staff have been working with planning staff at the City of Surrey as a plan for the Semiahmoo Town Centre continues. It will be important to collaborate on efforts to centralize a transit exchange, within approximately 500 metres of the northern portion of the City of White Rock’s Town Centre to take advantage of the population density (ridership) that is likely to be generated through the realization of the Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan and on-going development within White Rock’s Town Centre.
- a) Staff will circulate a copy of the minutes of this meeting to transportation / land use planning staff at the City of Surrey and TransLink as an indication of Council’s support for a transit exchange being situated within 500 metres of the Town Centre’s northern boundary (i.e., North Bluff Road or 16 Avenue).

DIALOG Recommendation 8:

The City should consider updating the Zoning Bylaw to reduce the CAC bonus from 5.4 GFA to a GFA that would achieve an urban design vision that better aligns with the OCP and resident aspirations for Town Centre. For example, the City could consider the GFAs that are outlined in the two illustrations below.





Buildings shown in blue represent the proposed maximum GFA.

Staff Comment on Recommendation 8:


Generally concur with intent of recommendation (lowering of maximum GFA from what is currently identified as allowable in the Zoning Bylaw), but propose that the implementation mechanism be more broad (i.e. the same density allocation applying over an entire block, versus property by property) and that smaller sites be encouraged to be consolidated with larger adjacent parcels to provide more opportunities for the development to incorporate public open space (plazas, pedestrian pathways, landscaped areas, etc.) on the ground level. Smaller parcels would have the opportunity to transfer their development potential. The proposed densities (in the revised Figure 9 below) represent a reduction of approximately 12-25% from the level of density currently permitted in the OCP (with the exception of the block in the south-east corner, which has a potentially 16% increase), with further reductions if sites are not assembled into larger parcels. This reduction in development potential, whether at the level in the DIALOG recommendation or as proposed by staff, may result in some property owners delaying the redevelopment of their property.

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) Official Community Plan Amendment
- b) Zoning Bylaw Amendment
- c) Amendment to Density Bonus / Amenity Contributions Policy (No. 511)

Considerations:

- i) The maximum Gross Floor Area Ratio (FAR) figure by DIALOG should be considered against the maximum FAR currently recognized in Figure 9 of the OCP. The portion of the Town Centre north of Russell Avenue currently considers a maximum (FAR) of 5.4, if developed in accordance with the City's 2011 Town Centre Design Plan (which does not illustrate a 5.4 FAR on all parcels) whereas DIALOG's figure, if implemented through amendments to the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw, would lower the maximum FAR to between 2.30 and 3.95 FAR. For some land owners the reduction in what they understand to be their maximum FAR may render redevelopment plans financially unfeasible, leading to the stagnation of the properties.



* indicates 2.0 FAR

- ii) South of Russell Avenue and north of Thrift Avenue the OCP considers maximum FAR of 4.0. For the most part, DIALOG's recommendation has excluded lands which have been recently redeveloped or where no change to the FAR is recommended as existing development would largely align with the current maximum. Lowering FAR permissions south of Russell Avenue, from 4.0 to between 2.30 and 3.10, would help to achieve the massing vision as communicated by members of the public but it may also render redevelopment of these lands financially unfeasible.
- iii) Tying zoning standards such as a minimum lot area and frontage requirements to increased density permissions may incent land assembly, thereby helping to realize a more cohesive build out of the Town Centre and its open space network. For example, land assembly may not only support the realization of the height and density permissions recommended by DIALOG but it may also enable developers to provide contiguous open spaces and urban design features as contemplated in the Town Centre Urban Design Plan.

For example, the following base density (i.e. FAR) provisions could be built into the CR-1 Zone to incent land assembly by allocating the density available to land based on its size:

i. Base Density by Minimum Lot Area:


1. 1.75 FAR base with no minimum lot area;
2. 2.3 FAR base with minimum lot area of 0.75 acres;
3. 3.5 FAR base with minimum lot area of 1.25 acres;
4. 4.0 FAR base with minimum 2.0 acres

Additional requirements for accessing density above 1.75 FAR could include a minimum provision of rental units, a fully office/employment development to encourage local job opportunities, amenity contribution, and achievement of Energy Step Code levels.

The actual density achieved by the sites under the above size criteria may be similar to what is presented in Recommendation 8, due to the existing parcel configuration (smaller parcels along Johnston Road), but would be fairer to owners of smaller parcels who could transfer their development potential to adjacent redevelopments.

- iv) Alternative to the FAR figures presented by DIALOG, planning staff propose the following FAR figures which applies the same density allocation over an entire block, versus property by property. While still an overall reduction in allowable density (generally), this will encourage smaller sites to be assembled with adjacent parcels to allow the density to be shifted on the site and allow additional public green/open space at the street level. This is also a means of enabling some renewal of undeveloped properties in the Town Centre. The following Figure illustrates potential amendments to Figure 9 of the OCP.

(Revised Figure 9 from OCP – previous FAR in brackets)




DIALOG Recommendation 9:


The City should consider restricting buildings to the height outlined in the diagram and perspective below. Summary of Height Recommendations:

- Low rises retain the village quality of Johnston Road;
- Johnston Road is limited to 3 storeys (see Recommendation 10 for suggested variance);
- Mid-rises are the predominant neighbourhood form;
- High rises are permitted along North Bluff Road. These taller buildings allow for flexibility so that generous open spaces and community amenities can be provided.

PROPOSED MAXIMUM HEIGHTS



Proposed Maximum Heights (*indicates where a variance is recommended - see Recommendation 10)



Staff Comment on Recommendation 9:

Generally concur with intent of recommendation, and believe that it captures the general consensus of public input in Phase 1 and 2 of this Town Centre Review. For clearer policy direction and graphical clarity, given that existing 8/9 storey buildings are unlikely to redevelop to 12 storeys and that sites with existing 23 storey buildings would not redevelop as 10 storey buildings, staff propose that sites which are not anticipated to redevelop in medium term (20+ years) do not have a maximum height specified in the diagram, and instead the maximum height for those properties is noted as the maximum allowed in the Zoning Bylaw at the time the building permit for the property was issued. Staff further propose that any taller buildings around the block bounded by Russell Avenue, Foster Street, North Bluff Road, and Johnston Road, including a taller building on Russell Avenue which was not illustrated in the DIALOG diagram, be required to incorporate a significant civic/public amenity (such as a theatre / art gallery / new City Hall) to access their maximum height, as a means to encourage a variety of uses in the Town Centre and complement the Community Centre facility.

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) Official Community Plan Amendment
- b) Zoning Bylaw Amendment
- c) Amendment to Density Bonus / Amenity Contributions Policy (No. 511)

Considerations:

- i) The heights recommended by DIALOG reflect, to an extent, the build out of the maximum FARs discussed in Recommendation 8. The heights as shown in the “Proposed Maximum Heights” figure do not, however, align with the existing height of buildings in the Town Centre which, in several instances, greatly exceed those proposed. For example, existing

buildings in the Miramar Village development range from 15 to 21 storeys whereas the height mapping proposed, if implemented through amendments to the OCP and Zoning Bylaw, would “enable” heights ranging from 3 to 8 storeys. This change would also necessitate amendments to Figure 10 in the OCP, being a schedule that illustrates “conceptual height transitions in the Town Centre, Town Centre Transition, and Lower Town Centre Areas”.




- ii) Similar to the notes in the section above, the downgrading of height permissions recognized in the OCP and implemented through the underlying Zoning Bylaw, may limit the feasibility of any future redevelopment scheme on those lots that have not been the subject of more recent development.
- iii) Alternative to the building heights presented by DIALOG, planning staff propose the following heights. The following Figure illustrates potential amendments to Figure 10 of the OCP.

(Revised Figure 10 from OCP)



Note: the “^” symbol identifies where additional density and height would only be enabled if a significant on-site amenity / civic facility (e.g., hotel / conference centre, City Hall, etc.) were provided to complement the Community Centre and future central park within the block as contemplated by the 2011 Town Centre Urban Design Plan (see figure below). The base height would otherwise be 10 storeys.

Town Centre Design Plan (2011) Green Space Network



- iv) If Council supports the changes to maximum FAR and height as recommended by DIALOG, additional changes to similar standards ought to be considered around the perimeter of the Town Centre so as to ensure an appropriate transition in building heights moving out of the City's downtown core. For example, at present, Figure 10 of the OCP contemplates heights of 18 storeys at the southeast corner of George Street and North Bluff Road and between Blackwood and Martin Streets at North Bluff Road. Opposite the abutting streets in these two locations, the height mapping recommended by DIALOG proposes heights of 12 storeys, creating a somewhat staggered interruption to the transition of heights moving east and west from the Town Centre.

DIALOG Recommendation 10:

Assuming Recommendation 9 on building heights is followed, the City should consider a building height relaxation to promote plazas and patios on Johnston Road. For example, the City could allow up to 13.7m (approximately 4 storeys) with a 2m step back after the third floor if a 7m setback for patio or tree canopy is provided (e.g. trees growing to a minimum of 7m canopy diameter spaced at a maximum of 7m apart).

Staff Comment on Recommendation 10:

Concur with recommendation. This would assist in enabling reasonable scale development on smaller parcels at the base density (1.75 FAR) if they are unable to be assembled with adjacent parcels, while achieving modest open space at street level.

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) Official Community Plan Amendment

b) Zoning Bylaw Amendment

Considerations:

- i) The recommendation could be implemented by way of introducing an enabling policy into the OCP, generally recognizing the desire to step buildings back away from Johnston Road where doing so is undertaken concurrent with greater step backs from the street, used to accommodate spaces for patios and plantings.
- ii) Amendments to the Zoning Bylaw would be undertaken to limit building heights in accordance with the recommendation.

DIALOG Recommendation 11:

- 11) The City should continue to support the establishment of the open space network as outlined in the Town Centre Urban Design Plan (2011) through the Community Amenity Contribution Policy in the Town Centre. To date, these amenities have been delivered through a density bonus program.

Staff Comment on Recommendation 11:

Concur with recommendation.

Implementing Mechanism:

None required at this time. Staff could consider updates to the Density Bonus Policy to incorporate explicit reference to the open space network and eligible on-site amenities if additional emphasis/clarity on achieving the open space network is desired by Council (see recommendation 12 below), but staff do not consider this to be necessary.

Considerations:

The open space network identified in the 2011 Town Centre Plan is part of the existing OCP policies for the Town Centre area, and is discussed with applicants as part of the pre-application process. Staff

DIALOG Recommendation 12:

- 12) The City should identify pre-determined target amenities that they intend to seek from development sites. This will allow the City to establish priorities for Town Centre that clearly identify community needs. In addition to ensuring that the impacts of development in the Town Centre are offset through the delivery of amenities in Town Centre, this approach will provide some predictability for the community and developers before the negotiation phase.

Staff Comment on Recommendation 12:

Concur with recommendation. Actual implementation of this recommendation should follow Council's workshop on the use of Community Amenity Contributions (anticipated Fall 2020), and any direction that comes following the workshop.

Implementing Mechanisms:

- a) Community Facilities and Amenities Study (if requested by Council following workshop)

- b) Public Engagement
- c) Official Community Plan Amendment
- d) Amendment to Density Bonus / Amenity Contributions Policy (No. 511)

Considerations:

- i) The “ear-marking” of eligible/candidate on-site amenities can be beneficial in setting clear expectations for both developers, staff and the public. The approach can also contribute to a more transparent negotiation process while allowing for a phased approach to obtaining higher-cost amenities (i.e., those that would not be covered by a single amenity contribution but may require multiple contributions to overcome cost constraints). Council has already requested a workshop to further discuss the outcomes of public engagement taken on Community Amenity Contribution priorities in January 2020.

Should further information be required following the Council workshop, the approach could benefit from the completion of a “Community Facilities and Amenities Study” (i.e. a detailed evaluation of the supply of existing and planned facilities and amenities relative to current and planned population of the catchment area of such facilities and amenities so as to determine whether there are gaps that may be addressed through targeted amenity investments).

- ii) If specific facilities and amenities are identified as being needed, the OCP could be amended to recognize these facilities and amenities as “priorities” in the Town Centre. Similar amendments could be made within the Density Bonus Policy, to further incentivize projects that contribute to facilities and amenities not just desired by the community but recognized as being of localized need.

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF WHITE ROCK CORPORATE REPORT



DATE: February 8, 2021

TO: Land Use and Planning Committee

FROM: Carl Isaak, Director, Planning and Development Services

SUBJECT: CR-1 (Town Centre) Zoning Amendment to Implement Official Community Plan Review Recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee recommend that Council:

1. Give first and second readings to “White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000, Amendment (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions) Bylaw, 2021, No. 2376;”
2. Direct staff to schedule the public hearing for “White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000, Amendment (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions) Bylaw, 2021, No. 2376;” and
3. Direct staff, in addition to arranging the required newspaper notification of the public hearing, to mail notifications of this public hearing to the property owners of the 18 non-stratified properties in the Town Centre identified in this corporate report, despite this mailed notification not being required by the *Local Government Act* (per section 466(7)).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the September 16, 2020 Land Use and Planning Committee (LUPC) meeting, staff were directed to prepare implementation tools for recommendations related to the Town Centre topic in the Official Community Plan (OCP) Review, including amendments to the CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial / Residential Zone. This corporate report introduces a draft zoning amendment bylaw that would revise the CR-1 zone to reflect the recommendations presented in the September 16, 2020 corporate report, including lowering the maximum heights and density permitted in the zone. The draft bylaw is attached to this report as Appendix A.

Owners of potential redevelopment properties in the Town Centre were invited to provide written feedback on the proposed policy changes, via a letter circulated in November 2020, which offered an opportunity to discuss the policy changes with staff and provide written feedback by January 15, 2021. To date, two (2) property owners contacted provided feedback on the proposed changes. Their written comments are attached to this report as Appendix B.

Key features of the proposed zoning amendment bylaw are:

- Limiting the scale of development by lowering the overall maximum density (the top end lowered 25% to 4.0 FAR from 5.4 FAR);

- Supporting greater housing choices and employment opportunities by requiring that any development above the base density of 1.75 FAR provide either 30% market rental units, 10% of the units as 10% below average rents, or that the building be entirely non-residential uses (i.e. employment generating space);
- Encouraging rational consolidation and redevelopment of smaller properties by introducing minimum site sizes necessary to obtain higher densities;
- Providing greater space for tree planting and better water infiltration by requiring a minimum 10% area for permeable surface area on development sites larger than 0.75 acres;
- Reducing the overall height allowed and supporting a greater mix of uses by introducing a maximum height of ten (10) storeys for CR-1 properties east of Foster Street and eight (8) storeys west of Foster Street, with additional height supported in prominent locations where an on-site civic use facility such as a conference centre or City Hall is provided;
- Reinforcing the pedestrian focused “high street” experience along Johnston Road by introducing a maximum height of three (3) storeys for most properties fronting Johnston Road, with a fourth storey permitted only if the top level is set back 2.0 metres from the floors below;
- Supplying housing that better meets the needs of those with mobility needs by requiring that 50% of all homes be designed to meet the Adaptable Housing standards in the Building Code; and
- Providing for future community amenities by continuing to require a contribution to the City’s Amenity Reserve Fund for any density above the 1.75 FAR base density.

Staff recommend that the draft Zoning Amendment Bylaw proceed to Council for consideration of first and second reading, and that Council authorize staff to schedule the required Public Hearing, which would be conducted by electronic means due to the current health orders.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DIRECTION

Motion # & Meeting Date	Motion Details
2020-LU/P-027 September 16, 2020	<i>THAT Land Use and Planning Committee recommend that Council consider the Town Centre Phase 2 Engagement Summary and Recommendations Report prepared by DIALOG Design, attached to this corporate report as Appendix A, and direct staff to proceed with preparing the proposed implementing mechanisms as described in staff’s evaluation of the DIALOG recommendations in Appendix B.</i>
2020-570 November 23, 2020	<i>THAT Council directs the scope for the Official Community Plan (OCP) review be reduced at this time to only the Town Centre building height and density and building heights around the Town Centre and height at the waterfront along Marine Drive.</i>


INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The Official Community Plan (OCP) Review was started in 2019, with the public engagement and design work for the Town Centre Urban Design and Public Realm topic supported by a consultant team from DIALOG Design. A summary of the Phase 1 public engagement was

provided in the November 4, 2019 LUPC agenda, and a summary of the Phase 2 public engagement was provided in the September 16, 2020 LUPC agenda.

Phase 3 of the Review Process involves taking the public input and feedback on options developed through Phase 1 and Phase 2, and presenting these recommendations for policy changes to Council (as in this corporate report). In the case of the Town Centre area, in order to implement these recommendations an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw is necessary in addition to amendments to the OCP, as many of the properties are already pre-zoned for heights and density (via a density bonus system) that would exceed the recommendations coming out of the OCP Review. If amendments were made to the OCP only, a CR-1 zoned property could still apply for a Development Permit at a height or density that exceeds the new OCP policies.

The draft zoning amendment bylaw would revise the CR-1 zone to ensure that the changes to the OCP are also implemented by the zoning bylaw. Two conceptual illustration of what the future built form and public space resulting from these changes (and from the completion of existing projects under construction) may look like are included for reference below:





The draft zoning amendment bylaw is attached to this corporate report as Appendix A. Key changes to the zone are described in the sections below.

Proposed Changes to CR-1 Zone

1. Reduced Maximum Density

The revised zone would scale down the massing of development by lowering the overall maximum density (dropping the top end by 25% to 4.0 FAR from 5.4 FAR). This change responds to the sentiments broadly expressed during the OCP Review Phase 1 workshops and Phase 2 open house and survey, that indicate residents consider recently developed projects at 5.4 FAR to be overly dense and would prefer a reduced scale. In the survey conducted during Phase 2 of the Town Centre OCP Review, 61% of respondents said they support/somewhat support reducing the current maximum density to a lower density.

Further, due to proposed lot assembly requirements, most lots in the CR-1 zone would not be able to obtain the maximum 4.0 FAR on their own as they would not be large enough, and would instead be limited to 1.75 FAR (no lot area minimum), 2.3 FAR (0.75 acres minimum), or 3.5 FAR (1.25 acres minimum).

These minimum lot size requirements would encourage smaller properties to consolidate in order to access the density permitted when they are combined, helping to promote orderly development and avoid stranded undevelopable parcels.

Reducing the development potential of properties will likely slow interest in redeveloping existing properties and potentially cause property owners to delay their redevelopment plans in the expectation that policies may change in the future. The proposed maximum density levels would still enable mid-rise development within the Town Centre in an urban form but may not be sufficient to result in redevelopment in the near term.

2. Encouraging More Affordable Housing Choices and Employment Uses

Supporting greater housing choices and employment opportunities by requiring that any development above the base density of 1.75 FAR provide either 30% market rental units, 10% of the units as 10% below average rents, or that the building be entirely non-residential uses (i.e. employment generating space).

3. Green Space

Provide greater space for tree planting and better water infiltration by requiring a minimum 10% area on the site for permeable surface areas on development sites larger than 0.75 acres (i.e. those which are likely to have enough size to permit flexibility in the design of the underground parking to allow for this without adding additional parking levels). These permeable areas would have to be free of any underground parking structures and impermeable landscape materials.

4. Lower Overall Building Heights


Reducing the overall height allowed and supporting a greater mix of uses by introducing a maximum height of ten (10) storeys for CR-1 properties east of Foster Street and eight (8) storeys west of Foster Street. A further height limitation would apply to portions of most properties fronting Johnston Road (as described in #5 below, relating to the “High Street Experience”).

Current height maximums in the existing CR-1 zone for buildings that provide an amenity contribution are 80.7 metres (265 feet), or approximately 25 storeys, which applies throughout the CR-1 zone. While the existing CR-1 zoning does reference the City’s 2011 Town Centre Urban Design Plan (TCUDP) as a general guide for the location and height of new buildings, and the concept plans in the TCUDP do not illustrate 25 storey buildings on every lot, this has not been an effective method for limiting height of proposed buildings in Development Permit applications given the flexibility of the existing CR-1 zone and the TCUDP.

The proposed CR-1 zoning would allow additional height (18-29 storeys) supported in prominent locations, but only where an on-site civic use facility (such as a conference centre, public art gallery or City Hall) is provided on the site, with a minimum floor area of 1,400 square metres (15,000 square feet). Additional heights in these locations are to help offset costs of providing public space by allowing more water views from units within these buildings. Encouraging space for civic uses in the Town Centre, in close proximity to the existing White Rock Community Centre at Miramar Village, helps to provide a diverse range of activities and services within walking distance for residents, and reinforces the importance of the Town Centre as a hub of community life.

The proposed locations where additional height would be contemplated are on the edges of the block, primarily on North Bluff Road, where there would be less shadow impact on the desired future public park in the middle of the block bounded by Russell Avenue, Foster Street, North Bluff Road, and Johnston Road. These locations are noted in the height diagram below (indicated with the ^ symbol beside the number of storeys).


It may be that the opportunity for additional height is not sufficient to generate interest by a developer in providing community amenity space within their building, in addition to the provision of a community amenity contribution. In these circumstances, the development would be limited to a maximum height of 10 storeys.



Note: CR-1 zoned properties are coloured pink in the diagram above; the ^ symbol beside the number of storeys above identifies where additional height is permitted if an on-site community amenity space (such as a City-owned conference centre, public art gallery, or City Hall) is provided in addition to the amenity contribution, with a minimum floor area of 1,400 square metres (15,069 square feet). The maximum height in storeys on these lots without such community amenity space is ten (10) storeys.

5. High Street Experience

Reinforcing the pedestrian focused “high street” experience along Johnston Road by introducing a maximum height of three (3) storeys for most properties fronting Johnston Road, with a fourth storey permitted only if the top level is set back 2.0 metres from the floors below, and the overall building has a generous setback for planting/patio/plaza area as illustrated in the diagram below:



6. Increasing Adaptable (Accessible-Ready) Housing

Adaptable housing design makes future adjustments to enable greater accessibility easier and less costly to provide. While there are increased costs for the builder at the outset, it is far more efficient to make provisions in the original design rather than renovating the unit after construction to incorporate items such as grab bars in bathrooms and reachable electrical outlets.

By requiring that 50% of all homes be designed to meet the Adaptable Housing standards in the Building Code this will help to supply housing that can help residents stay in their own home even as their mobility needs change due to injury, illness or aging.

The Town Centre area in particular is a suitable area for adaptable and accessible housing due to the number of businesses and services within walking distance and the relatively flat terrain.

While this topic has not been explicitly discussed during the OCP Review, the update of the Town Centre zone offers an opportunity to consider including this improvement to the zone. The current OCP policy 11.1.2 (Age-Friendly Housing for People with Disabilities) identifies the City's desire to 'incorporate age-friendly measures that respond to the needs of older individuals and people with disabilities by ... developing design criteria for accessible units and establishing a minimum number of units required to be accessible in new developments.' While "adaptable units" under the BC Building Code are not fully accessible, providing a minimum number of adaptable units will allow for greater conversion to accessible in the future as residents require.

7. Continued Requirement for Amenity Contributions

The growth in population resulting from development in the Town Centre also requires that new amenities such as parks and community facilities be provided for the new and existing residents to maintain a livable community. The proposed amendment to the zoning bylaw continues to

require a contribution to the City's Amenity Reserve Fund for any density above the 1.75 FAR base density, which will help to fund future public amenities.

Consideration of Impact on Pace of Development

The City has experienced a large volume of development in the Town Centre area and beyond in the past four years, which will result in both new property tax revenues as well as increased demands for services from the new residents and businesses. The impact of construction activities simultaneously on multiple sites has included road closures affecting access to businesses as well as noise, low availability of street parking, and other impacts to residents. With the construction already underway in the Town Centre (at 1484 Martin Street, 1588 Johnston Road, and 1456 Johnston Road), there will be approximately two more years of construction activity to complete these projects in the Town Centre.

The proposed changes to the CR-1 zone would generally have the impact of lowering the development scale permitted within the zone while specifying requirements (e.g. minimum percentages of affordable units or accessible housing units) that would reduce the profitability of a proposal relative to a project that could be built without such restrictions. The overall effect is likely to be that the pace of development applications in the Town Centre under these parameters will be reduced until market conditions change to allow for enough profit from the overall development to cover the increased costs, or current land owners reduce the price at which they are willing to sell to a developer to a level that allows the builder to proceed with a financially viable project. Developers may also delay submitting new applications in anticipation of future changes that would support a greater financial return and/or develop projects in other cities.

Written Correspondence from Property Owners

As noted in the September 16, 2020 corporate report, staff sent letters to non-strata property owners in the Town Centre area (i.e. those whose properties could be redeveloped without requiring consent from other strata owners) advising them of the proposed changes and offering an opportunity to discuss with staff and provide written comments to staff, with a January 15, 2021 deadline. To date, two property owners have provided written correspondence, and one property owner's representative requested a meeting with staff. The two letters from the property owners are attached to this report as Appendix B and are opposed to the proposed changes.

Additional Public Consultation

In the September 16, 2020 corporate report, staff also indicated that an electronic Public Information Meeting (PIM) would be held to obtain further public input on the Town Centre policy changes, prior to bylaw readings and a public hearing. Council directed staff on November 23, 2020 to reduce the scope of the OCP Review to accelerate the project.

Given the desire to conclude the OCP Review, and the length of time required to advertise for, host, and report back on a PIM, staff recommend that the proposed Zoning Amendment Bylaw proceed directly to public hearing to obtain the views of residents and interested persons on the proposed bylaw, without an additional PIM.

Relationship between Zoning Bylaw change and Regional Growth Strategy

The Town Centre area is identified as an Urban Centre (classified "Municipal Town Centre") in the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy, and the City's Regional Context Statement states it is the "focus for the majority of future growth over the life of this Official Community Plan and is noted as the City's centre for cultural, civic, economic, and public life in the City."

While the proposed amendment to the CR-1 zone would have the effect of moderately reducing the overall density and therefore population growth related to new development in the Town Centre, staff consider that despite the reduction in density, the Town Centre remains the principal

area for growth and that the City's population projections contained in the Regional Context Statement can still be met at the revised development scale. Further, by encouraging more civic and employment-generating uses and non-strata housing options in the zoning, this will help to promote the area as the centre for cultural, civic, economic and public life.

Additional OCP Review Recommendations

Adoption of this proposed zoning amendment bylaw would address the majority of the 12 Town Centre OCP Review recommendations identified in the September 16, 2020 report, however there are further updates to the OCP Bylaw itself that will be brought forward in a future corporate report(s). These include:

- Heights permitted in the proposed CR-1 zone also being reflected in the Official Community Plan (this could be updated at the same time as the Town Centre Transition areas from the "Building Heights outside the Town Centre", as the height map in the OCP covers both areas);
- Minimum tree canopy targets (including rooftop planting areas as well as planting on the ground level), as well as tree species mix, through updates to the Town Centre Development Permit Area (DPA) guidelines;
- Performance targets for maximum effective impervious area (e.g. 65%), via DPA guidelines requiring applicants to demonstrate achievement through rainwater harvesting, porous paving, etc.;
- Green building strategy, which would be deferred to future years (i.e. 2023 or beyond) due to current resources and a priority for first implementing the Energy Step Code; and
- Bus exchange location – this will require further discussion with the City of Surrey and TransLink, as the immediately adjacent Semiahmoo Town Centre plan area in Surrey is also redeveloping and transit routes/service may change as a result.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The City's 2021-2025 Draft Financial Plan includes an estimate of new taxation revenues annually from new developments. These new construction revenues help to offset increasing costs and play a part in keeping tax rates down in future years. For 2022, \$1.1M in new taxation revenue has been budgeted for the completion of developments that are currently underway. Increases for 2023 - 2025 are budgeted at approximately \$700K annually. These estimates are revised in the annual budget process to reflect actual development projects that are expected to be built.


LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Under section 458 of the *Local Government Act*, compensation is not payable to any person for any reduction in value of that person's interest in land, or for any loss or damages that result from the adoption of a Zoning Bylaw (or official community plan).

As the proposed bylaw changes may have an impact on property values, particularly those of properties which have not been developed to the potential currently allowed in the Zoning Bylaw, it is advisable to provide opportunities for affected owners to share their views on the proposed changes with Council. This was the intent of mailing notification letters to property owners with an opportunity for them to provide written comments to Council as well as meet with staff if they had questions.

While the public hearing notice requirements for the proposed Zoning Amendment Bylaw would not require mailed notification to owners and tenants in occupation, per section 466(7) of the *Local Government Act* (as it would affect more than 10 parcels owned by 10 or more persons), staff recommend that in addition to the general newspaper notification, notice of the public hearing be mailed to the owners of the following 18 non-stratified properties to provide additional awareness of the Public Hearing, as indicated in the following list and map:

- 1) 1461 Foster Street
- 2) 1538 Foster Street
- 3) 1530 Foster Street
- 4) 15100 North Bluff Road
- 5) 15176 North Bluff Road
- 6) 1549 Johnston Road
- 7) 1542 Johnston Road
- 8) 1532 Johnston Road
- 9) 1531 Johnston Road
- 10) 1513 Johnston Road
- 11) 1493 Johnston Road
- 12) 1492 Johnston Road
- 13) 15226 Russell Avenue
- 14) 15141 Russell Avenue
- 15) 1478 Johnston Road
- 16) 1468 Johnston Road
- 17) 1446 Johnston Road
- 18) 1434 Johnston Road



COMMUNICATION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The September 16, 2020 corporate report to Land Use and Planning Committee summarizes the public engagement that occurred in Phase 2 of the Town Centre OCP Review.

Future opportunities for the public to share their views on the proposed bylaws (Phase 3) may be obtained through a public hearing. If directed by LUPC, staff could host an additional virtual public information meeting on this topic, however that would delay consideration of the bylaws, and it is recommended that the bylaw proceed to Public Hearing after receiving first and second readings by Council.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL INVOLVEMENT/IMPLICATIONS

The proposed amendments to the CR-1 zone have been reviewed by staff from within the Planning and Building sections of the Planning and Development Services Department, and the overall recommendations of the Town Centre OCP Review have also been reviewed by staff within the Engineering and Municipal Operations Department. Future amendments that relate to cross-departmental issues such as surface drainage and tree canopy targets will involve consultation with departmental representatives.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

The increased requirement for permeability in the proposed changes to the CR-1 zone in the Zoning Bylaw will help with providing additional areas for plantings, thereby modestly helping in the uptake of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and reducing the urban height island effect. The recommendations also, however, lessen the amount of development that may be realized in the Town Centre. This, over time, could place pressure on the municipality to support growth in areas that are not as well-served by public transit facilities and the mix of uses which are known to reduce the overall need for private automobile use, being recognized as a key contributor to climate change.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

The Town Centre Review in the Official Community Plan (OCP) Review is identified as a Top Priority action in the 2021-2022 Council Strategic Priorities.

This action supports the “Our Community” objective of guiding land use decisions of Council to reflect the vision of the community.

OPTIONS / RISKS / ALTERNATIVES

The following options are available for LUPC’s consideration. The LUPC may recommend that Council:

1. Amend the proposed Zoning Amendment Bylaw with items as directed by LUPC, give first and second readings to the bylaw as amended, and direct staff to schedule a Public Hearing;
2. Direct staff to host and report on a virtual Public Information Meeting on the topic of the proposed zoning amendment bylaw, prior to giving bylaw readings. This would delay consideration of the proposed bylaw at a Public Hearing by at least six weeks due to the need to schedule, advertise, conduct, and report back to Council with the meeting feedback;
3. Defer consideration of the proposed Zoning Amendment Bylaw pending receipt of information to be identified by the LUPC; or
4. Direct staff to undertake no further work on the proposed Zoning Amendment Bylaw and provide an alternative approach for implementing the OCP Review for the Town Centre. If Council does not amend the CR-1 zone in the Zoning Bylaw but does proceed with amendments to the OCP related to the Town Centre, a property owner may still apply for a development permit for a building under the existing CR-1 zone, which may go against the intention of policies in the amended OCP but still be legally valid.

CONCLUSION

This corporate report introduces a draft zoning amendment bylaw that would revise the CR-1 zone to reflect the recommendations of the Town Centre OCP Review Process.

Key features of the proposed zoning amendment bylaw are limiting the scale of development by lowering the overall maximum density (the top end lowered 25% to 4.0 FAR from 5.4 FAR) and reducing the overall height allowed and supporting a greater mix of uses by introducing a maximum height of ten (10) storeys for CR-1 properties east of Foster Street and eight (8) storeys west of Foster Street, with additional height (18-29 storeys) supported only in prominent locations where an on-site civic use facility (such as a conference centre, public art gallery or City Hall) is provided in the development.

Additional proposed changes to the CR-1 zone encourage: rational consolidation and redevelopment of smaller properties, greater space for tree planting and better water infiltration, reinforcement of the pedestrian focused “high street” experience along Johnston Road, and requiring that 50% of all new homes be designed to meet the Adaptable Housing standards in the Building Code.

Staff recommend that the draft Zoning Amendment Bylaw proceed to Council for consideration of first and second reading, and that Council authorize staff to schedule the required public hearing, which will be conducted by electronic means due to the current health orders.


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: Draft Zoning Amendment (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions) Bylaw, No. 2376
Appendix B: Written Correspondence from Property Owners (2)

The Corporation of the CITY OF WHITE ROCK BYLAW 2376



A Bylaw to amend the
"White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000" as amended

The CITY COUNCIL of the Corporation of the City of White Rock in open meeting assembled ENACTS as follows:

1. Schedule A - Text of the *White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000* as amended is further amended by deleting the existing Section 6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial/Residential Zone in its entirety and replacing it with a new Section 6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial/Residential Zone as follows:

6.16 CR-1 Town Centre Area Commercial / Residential Zone

The intent of this zone is to accommodate a mix of uses and activities, including residential and commercial development along with cultural and civic facilities, to support the ability of residents to walk to meet their daily needs. Containing the greatest concentration and variety of employment-generating uses, this zone establishes this area as the City's pedestrian and transit-focused growth area, consistent with the objectives and policies of the Official Community Plan.

6.16.1 Permitted Uses:

The following uses are permitted in one (1) or more principal buildings:

- 1) *retail service group 1 uses*;
- 2) *subject to section 9 b), licensed establishments, including liquor primary, food primary, liquor store, agent store, u-brew, u-vin, and licensed manufacturer*;
- 3) *hotel*;
- 4) *civic use*;
- 5) *medical or dental clinic*;
- 6) *multi-unit residential use*;
- 7) *accessory home occupation* in conjunction with a *multi-unit residential use* and in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.3, and that does not involve clients of the home occupation accessing the building in person;
- 8) *one-unit residential use* accessory to a *retail service group 1 use* and limited to a storey above the portion of a building used for the *retail service group 1 use*.
- 9) *adult entertainment use* in accordance with the following provisions:
 - a) the *adult entertainment use* has a valid business license;
 - b) the *adult entertainment use* shall not operate in conjunction with a liquor licence in the same establishment;
 - c) the *adult entertainment use* shall not be located within 500 metres of a school;

- d) despite Section 6.16.2 Lot Size, the minimum *lot* width of a *lot* accommodating an *adult entertainment use* shall not be less than 45 metres;
- e) a *lot* accommodating an *adult entertainment use* must have a *lot line* common with North Bluff Road;
- f) a *building* accommodating an *adult entertainment use* must be set back a minimum of 50 metres from Johnston Road and 30 metres from any other public road; and despite Section 4.14.1 Off-Street Parking Requirements, parking for *adult entertainment use* shall be provided as follows: 1 parking space per every 18.6 m² (200 ft²) of commercial floor area.

6.16.2 Lot Size:

- 1) Subject to section 9 c), minimum lot width, lot depth and lot area in the CR-1 zone are as follows:

<i>Lot width</i>	18.0m (59.0ft)
<i>Lot depth</i>	30.48m (100.0ft)
<i>Lot area</i>	548.64m ² (5,905.5ft ²)

6.16.3 Lot Coverage:

- 1) *Lot coverage* per fee simple lot shall not exceed 65%.
- 2) Despite section 6.16.3(1), on a *lot* exceeding 3,035m² (0.75 acres) in area, the area of impermeable materials on the *lot* shall not exceed 90 percent of the total lot area, and the minimum horizontal (length or width) dimensions for any permeable areas included toward this calculation is 4.0m (13.1 ft).
- 3) For the purposes of section 6.16.3(2), the following materials are impermeable: asphalt, concrete, brick, and stone. Gravel, river rock less than 5 cm in size, wood chips, bark mulch, and other materials which have fully permeable characteristics when in place installed on grade with no associated layer of impermeable material (such as plastic sheeting) that would impede the movement of water directly into the soil below are excluded from the area of impermeable materials.

6.16.4 Density:

The permitted maximum density is varied throughout this zone.

- 1) The maximum *gross floor area* shall not exceed 1.75 times the *lot area*.
- 2) Despite Section 6.16.4.1, maximum *gross floor area* may be increased if:
 - a) the owner of the *lot*
 - (i) provides a community amenity described in the City's *Community Amenity Reserve Fund Bylaw, 2017, No. 2190*, as amended, or
 - (ii) elects to pay to the City cash in lieu of the provision of the amenity under that bylaw in the amount of \$430 per square metre of *gross floor area* above 1.75 times the *lot area* in accordance with an amenity agreement

and a section 219 covenant granted to the City by the owner of the subject real property to secure the amenity;

b) the *lot* size meets the minimums in the table below; and

Minimum Lot Area	Maximum density (<i>gross floor area</i>)
3,035m ² (0.75 acres)	2.3 times the <i>lot</i> area
5,058m ² (1.25 acres)	3.5 times the <i>lot</i> area
8,094m ² (2.0 acres)	4.0 times the <i>lot</i> area*

*maximum density may exceed 3.5 times the *lot* area only for lots north of Russell Avenue

c) the uses within a principal building on a *lot* include:

- i. a minimum of 30% of the dwelling units secured through a housing agreement registered on title as residential rental tenure for the life of the building; or
- ii. a minimum of 10% of the dwelling units secured through a housing agreement registered on title as residential rental tenure for the life of the building at rents 10% below the average rents for the primary rental market in the City as determined by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; or
- iii. only non-residential uses.

3) Despite Section 6.16.4.1 and 6.16.4.2, if a development permit allowing density above 1.75 times the lot area for a *lot* has been issued for the construction of a *principal building* prior to December 31, 2020, the maximum *gross floor area* for that *lot* is the maximum *gross floor area* that applied at the time of development permit issuance.

6.16.5 Building Heights:

The permitted maximum building height is varied throughout this zone.

- 1) *Principal buildings* shall not exceed a *height* of 10.7m (35.1ft).
- 2) Despite Section 6.16.5.1, maximum *heights* may be increased to a maximum of 13.7m (44.95ft) and a maximum of four (4) *storeys*, if the building is set back a minimum 7.0m from the *lot line* adjacent to Johnston Road, and the exterior wall of the top *storey* of a building facing Johnston Road is set back a minimum 2.0m from the exterior wall of the *storey* below it.
- 3) Despite Section 6.16.5.1, if a *lot* qualifies for the increased density described in section 6.16.4.2, the maximum permitted number of *storeys* for a *principal building* on the *lot* shall be in accordance with the number of *storeys* indicated by the following diagram, and in no case shall a *principal building* exceed a *height* of 90.0m (295.3ft).
- 4) Despite Section 6.16.5.1, if a development permit allowing a *principal building* with a maximum *height* over 10.7 metres for a lot has been issued for the construction of a *principal building* prior to December 31, 2020, the maximum *height* for that *lot* is the maximum *height* that applied at the time of development permit issuance.

6.16.6 Minimum Setback Requirements:

- 1) *Principal buildings and structures* in the CR-1 zone shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum *setback* requirements:

Setback	Principal Building	Structures
Front lot line (abutting Johnston Road)	15.24m (50ft) from the street centreline	0.0m (0.0ft) See s. 6.16.7
Front lot line (not abutting Johnston Road)	3.0m (9.84ft)	0.0m (0.0ft) See s. 6.16.7
Exterior side lot line (abutting Johnston Road)	15.24m (50ft) from the street centreline	0.0m (0.0ft) See s. 6.16.7
Exterior side lot line (not abutting Johnston Road)	3.0m (9.84ft)	0.0m (0.0ft) See s. 6.16.7
Interior side lot line	0.0m (0.0ft)	0.0m (0.0ft)
Rear lot line (abutting a street)	3.0m (9.84ft)	Not permitted
Rear lot line (abutting a lane)	0.0m (0.0ft)	Not permitted
Rear lot line (abutting another lot)	0.0m (0.0ft)	Not permitted

- 2) Where the *lot line* abuts another *lot* zoned CR-1 or CD and permitting a principal building that exceeds a height of 13.7 m (44.95ft), the portion of the *principal building* above 13.7m (44.95ft) shall be located a minimum of 12.2m (40.0ft) from the *lot line* to ensure a minimum separation distance of 24.4m (80.0ft) between buildings above 13.7m (44.95ft) in height.

6.16.7 Ancillary Buildings and Structures:

Except as otherwise provided in Section 4.13 and in addition to the provisions of sub-section 6.16.6 above, the following also applies:

- 1) *ancillary buildings* are not permitted.
- 2) *ancillary structures* shall not be sited less than 3.0m from a *principal building* on the same *lot*.
- 3) despite sub-sections 6.16.6 and 6.16.7 (2), patios and awnings are permitted in the front and exterior side yard areas in accordance with White Rock License Agreement (Sidewalk Café / Business License) Bylaw requirements.

6.16.8 Accessory off-street parking shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of Section 4.14.

6.16.9 Accessory off-street loading spaces shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of Section 4.15.

6.16.10 Bicycle parking facilities shall be provided in accordance with the standards of Section 4.16.2 and in the quantities indicated in Section 4.16.3.

6.16.11 Adaptable Units:

In a building containing a multi-unit residential use, a minimum of 50% of the dwelling units shall be adaptable housing units that are constructed to comply with the Adaptable Housing standards prescribed in the *British Columbia Building Code*.

2. This bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “*Zoning Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 2376*”.

Read a first time this _____ day of _____, 2021

Read a second time this _____ day of _____, 2021

Considered at a Public Hearing this day of , 2021

Read a third time this _____ day of _____, 2021

Adopted this day of , 2021

Mayor

Director of Corporate Administration



King Day Holdings Ltd.

#406-1195 West Broadway, Vancouver, Canada V6H 3X5
Tel: (604)738-8819 Fax: (604)738-0159

December 9, 2020

By: Email and Registered Mail

City of White Rock
Planning and Development Services
15322 Buena Vista Ave.
White Rock BC V4B 1Y6

Attn: Carl Isaak, Director of Planning and Development Services

Re: Proposed Charges to White Rock Town Centre Area Official Community Plan and Zoning

Dear Carl,

In response to your letter dated November 10, 2020, we have listed out our comments below. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact our maintenance manager Bob Cusson at 604-312-7939 or email him at bob@kingdayholdings.com

- Change of height from 25 stories to 10 stories as years pass and construction cost increase, simply discourage to redevelopment to city of White Rock
- Will devalue property
- Immediate devalue the property value hence lower property tax income to the city
- Height off 4 to 10 story would not be acceptable
- Height off 15 to 18 story would be acceptable
- Discourage re-development to the property if reducing F.A.R as it does not make any financial sense of return of investment
- Much harder for re-development by adding more restrictions (i.e. Discourage re-development if more costs for re-development)
- Harder for re-development if only gain in further F.A.R by consolidating neighborhood properties. As of our situation, we anticipated that our property won't be ready for re-development for at least 50 years if city of White Rock implemented all the recommendations of phase 2 design
- What happen to the newly stratified build high rises with 25 stories located within the proposed reducing F.A.R and heights in case the building is destroyed and damaged beyond restoration? According to the proposed changes all strata lot owners cannot rebuild their home and they will lose their homes.
- We think this proposal is unfair to the affected property owners.



King Day Holdings Ltd.

#406-1195 West Broadway, Vancouver, Canada V6H 3X5
Tel: (604)738-8819 Fax: (604)738-0159

- We strongly oppose to the proposed changes to the Community Plan and Zoning to City of White Rock.

Sincerely,

George Ng

Director of King Day Holdings Ltd.

Property Owner of 1548 Johnston Road, White Rock B.C Canada V4B 3Z7

Mr. Michael Habibi
Prime Johnston Holdings Ltd.
1513 Johnston Rd.,
White Rock, BC V4B 3Z6
Michael@PrimaWest.com

January 15, 2020

Mr. Carl Isaak
Director of Planning and Development Services
City of White Rock
15322 Buena Vista Avenue, White Rock BC V4B 1Y6

Dear Mr. Isaak,

Further to the letter received from the City of White Rock on November 10, 2020 regarding the proposed changes to White Rock town centre area official community plan and zoning I would like to draw the City's attention to the following points:

The current OCP is the result of two years of Background research, analysis, planning and design, broad community engagement with stakeholders and residents, and iterative review with staff across departments and City Council started in early 2015. Over the life of the process, over 1,500 distinct interactions with residents, business owners, employees, developers, and other participants resulted in extensive public input in all phases of the "Imagine White Rock 2045" planning process.

With trust in City of White Rock's vision for 2045 and respect to the above mentioned long process, like many other developers, investors and individuals, we picked City of White Rock to host our next project. We did not take this decision lightly. We had many meeting with the City planners to make sure that we can meet this vision and can be part of White Rock 2045.

After nearly two years of hard work, it is shocking to hear that there are plans to change the newly developed Official Community Plan that so much money and time was spent on it by the City of White Rock and its residents.

This decision will have a major impact on our investment and the vision that was portrayed in the Official Community Plan for the City of White Rock. Given all the new developments in the Town Centre, changing the OCP at this point will only make this plan look incomplete. Under the proposed density and height and given the purchase price of the land based on the current official community plan, our project, like many others, will not be feasible and cannot proceed for the foreseeable future.

We kindly ask the City of White Rock to consider the situation of all developers and investors who believed in the City of White Rock's vision for future and committed to be part of this process.

Yours Truly,
Michael Habibi

Michael Habibi

MINUTE EXTRACTS REGARDING BYLAW 2376: White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000, Amendment (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions) Bylaw, 2020, No. 2376

Regular Council
February 11, 2019

6.2.5 IMPLICATIONS FOR INCLUDING A TOWN CENTRE AREA HEIGHT AND DENSITY REVIEW IN THE 2019 OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN (OCP) REVIEW

Corporate report dated February 11, 2019 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled “Implications for Including a Town Centre Area Height and Density Review in the 2019 Official Community Plan (OCP) Review”.

2019-067

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council receives for information the corporate report dated February 11, 2019, from the Director of Planning & Development Services, titled “Implications for Including a Town Centre Area Height and Density Review in the 2019 Official Community Plan (OCP) Review”.

CARRIED

Land Use and Planning Committee
November 4, 2019

4. OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW - SUMMARY OF PHASE 1 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Corporate report dated November 4, 2019 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled “Official Community Plan Review - Summary of Phase 1 Public Engagement”.

The Director of Planning and Development Services summarized the corporate report.

Discussion ensued and the Committee spoke to the importance of having commercial property owners to endorse the Official Community Plan (OCP), adding that the City should reach out to them to ensure they have an opportunity to be fully involved in the OCP review process

2019-LU/P-036

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee directs staff to invite commercial waterfront property owners to fully participate in the OCP review process prior to any changes to the Bylaw.

CARRIED

The Committee referenced the thirteen (13) OCP goals noted in the document and suggested that the City implement a dashboard tool to assist in monitoring progress and implementation of the OCP.

2019-LU/P-036 **It was MOVED and SECONDED**

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee directs staff to report back with information regarding the use a dashboard to monitor the goals within the OCP document / track the implementation of them.

CARRIED

Discussion continued and the following comments were noted:

- Appreciative for those that provided their feedback; disappointed that there was only 0.5% of participation
- The City can work on ways of targeting the demographic of residents in terms of engagement efforts (eg: age, gender, new Canadian residents, etc.)
- The City could have information booths about the OCP at community/public events, such as the Farmers' Market
- The City currently uses social media and the website to convey information, it was suggested that postcard mail-outs as another means of communicating the OCP review

2019-LU/P-037 **It was MOVED and SECONDED**

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee directs staff engage in targeted outreach to other community groups and residents in regard to the Official Community Plan review.

CARRIED

Discussion continued and the following comments were noted:

- The City is working with the City of Surrey as they work through the Semiahmoo Town Centre plan
- Surrey and TransLink are still discussing having a rapid bus line to the Town Centre. As inclusion of such a line would impact White Rock, the City has noted that their comments should have influence on the discussions
- With respect to affordable housing, it was noted that affordable home ownership would be a point of consideration
- The City can offer incentives, such as waiving Community Amenity Contributions, in order for projects to provide affordable units. It was noted that it can be difficult for affordable rentals to become available, particularly in new builds, so it was suggested that the City look at ways of preserving existing units on lower land values. This is part of a bigger discussion

- It was suggested that the next intake of feedback could ask participants how long they have resided in the City, as there appears to be different visions for the future of White Rock depending on how long residents have lived in the City

2019-LU/P-038 **It was MOVED and SECONDED**

THAT Land Use and Planning Committee receives for information the corporate report dated November 4, 2019 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled "Official Community Plan Review - Summary of Phase 1 Public Engagement".

CARRIED

Land Use and Planning Committee
March 9, 2020

6.2.8 OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW – WATERFRONT ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY AND TOWN CENTRE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

Corporate report dated March 9, 2020 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled "Official Community Plan Review – Waterfront Enhancement Strategy and Town Centre Public Engagement Update".

2020-110 **It was MOVED and SECONDED**

THAT Council receives for information the corporate report dated March 9, 2020 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled "Official Community Plan Review – Waterfront Enhancement Strategy and Town Centre Public Engagement Update".

CARRIED

Land Use and Planning Committee
July 27, 2020

5. OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW – SUMMARY OF TOWN CENTRE URBAN DESIGN & PUBLIC REALM REVIEW PHASE 2 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Corporate report dated July 27, 2020 from the Director of Planning and Development Services titled "Official Community Plan

Review – Summary of Town Centre Urban Design & Public Realm Review Phase 2 Public Engagement and Recommendations".

The following discussion points were noted:

- Concern with heading west on North Bluff Road to Martin Street and it being noted as 18 stories, would like to have further discussion on transitioning of building heights,
- Go through each recommendation of dialogue to understand the repercussions

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Land Use and Planning Committee defers further discussion and consideration regarding the Official Community Plan Review – Summary of Town Centre Urban Design & Public Realm Review Phase 2 Public Engagement to the next Land Use and Planning Committee meeting.

CARRIED

February 8, 2021
Regular Council

4.4 CR-1 (TOWN CENTRE) ZONING AMENDMENT TO IMPLEMENT OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

Corporate report titled "CR-1 (Town Centre) Zoning Amendment to Implement Official Community Plan Review Recommendations".

The Director of Planning and Development Services gave a PowerPoint presentation to introduce the report information which is based on Part of Phase 3 of the Official Community Plan (OCP) Review.

The following discussion points were noted:

- Clarified that this is proposed amendment(s) to the City's Zoning Bylaw (CR-1 Town Centre Zoning)
- Previous engagement on the matter should also be considered
- Would like to see up to 12 stories in the Town Centre and 16 stories along North Bluff Road

Motion Number: LU/P-025 It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee recommend that Council give first and second readings to "*White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000, Amendment (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions) Bylaw, 2021, No. 2376*".

Motion CARRIED

Councillors Johanson, Kristjanson and Trevelyan voted the negative

Motion Number: LU/P-026 It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee direct staff to schedule the public hearing for "*White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000, Amendment (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions) Bylaw, 2021, No. 2376*".

Motion CARRIED

Councillors Johanson and Kristjanson voted in the negative

Motion Number: LU/P-027 It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee directs staff as follows:

In addition to arranging the required newspaper notification of the public hearing, to mail notifications of this public hearing to the property owners of the 18 non-stratified properties in the Town Centre identified in this corporate report, despite this mailed notification not being required by the *Local Government Act* (per section 466(7); and

Amendment: Motion Number: LU/P-028 It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT staff arrange a full postcard mail out to all residents in White Rock to inform of the public hearing.

Motion CARRIED

Question was called on the Main Motion as Amended and it was CARRIED

From: [Leona Gom](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 8, 2021 2:24:03 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, White Rock Council;

I refer to the card in the mail headed "Changes to Zoning..."

First, it is a confusing notice. Basically, it is not clear whether the buildings and heights marked in yellow represent the heights proposed by the current council or whether these have been proposed earlier, probably by the previous council. "Proposed heights": ambiguous. Proposed BY WHOM? Is the term "proposed" used, and attributable, in the same way it is in "proposed amendments"? If so, this could mean the numbers in yellow are proposed by this council. Help. I have asked smarter people than I for clarification, and they, too, are unsure. I fear the responses you get to this request will be clouded by the ambiguity.

My response in any case is that the (yellow) height limits for that block of North Bluff, Foster, Russell and Johnston are far too high. The traffic congestion, of cars and pedestrians, will make those blocks a nightmare. The infrastructure, especially our water resources, can't handle it. The human-scale small malls and shops there now will be replaced by sun-blocking and alienating high-rise chill.

I strongly urge Council to continue to oppose the destruction of our little city, which has already undergone so many changes for the worse. Yes, please focus on more green space, more pedestrian-friendly strategies, more affordability. My name is legion, though I am also

Leona Gom

From: [Leona Gom](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 10, 2021 12:12:43 PM

C-1
Additional Comments

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.

To: White Rock City Council:

I have sent a response to the notice, but I think now I did not understand its full intent, so please allow me to clarify.

I found the notice confusing and ambiguous, and now I believe its intent might have been to do just that: to confuse and obfuscate. I couldn't believe our council could actually be proposing 23- and 29-storey buildings and increasing the existing 10-storey limit, so I thought surely they meant the previous council had proposed those and that the "proposed amendment" was this council's attempt to to stop it. The bullet-point guidelines on the left all sound fine, so how could they include a 29-storey building? I imagine someone with bi-polar syndrome assembling this notice on two different days.

But, having argued now with a number of people about what is going on, I think I get it. This council, "our council," the council I worked hard to elect, the "no new high-rises" council, really is proposing this.

I am strongly opposed to these high-rises. Our city is sick of the demolitions and destruction of everything that seemed to give it character and history and liveability. The infrastructure cannot handle it. The traffic congestion, the pressures on green spaces, the disappearance of parking, the devaluation of pedestrians, the noise and pollution, the disappearance of small local businesses, the gentrifications.... Please stop this frantic construction and destruction. My name is still legion, though also

Leona Gom

From: [Aroon Shah](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 8, 2021 7:37:08 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 Mayor , Councillors and City Staff:

Your proposed heights range from 4 storeys to 29 storeys. Existing and approved heights range from 5 storeys to 26 storeys.

My biggest concern with your proposal is that it would approve something without understanding the impact on the infrastructure. As you know, there is tremendous development going on already that has frustrated residents. You need to hear the concerns of the residents without branding them as anti-highrise folks. The main concerns stem from already existing issues which will only get worse:

Traffic

Roads not being able to handle the traffic

Water

Impact on utilities, schools, hospital.

Increased Density

My biggest concern is that the city is not accounting for all the highrises that Surrey may approve on Bluff and other neighbouring streets. You don't have any say on that and neither do the residents. I believe the residents thought they elected a council that would keep development on lowrises, allow approved developments with a message that the city will only look at approving highrises above 4-10 storeys after it has had time to study the impact of present mega-developments.

I am completely against approval of any building higher than 4-10 storeys until the residents have been able to study the impact of recent and past decisions on development.

Sincerely

Aroon Shah

Aroon Shah
15588 Victoria Avenue,
White Rock, BC
V4B1H7

This email and any attachments are confidential and may be privileged. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please advise the sender and delete all copies. Thank you. | Le présent courriel et, le cas échéant, ses pièces jointes sont confidentiels et peuvent comporter de l'information privilégiée. Toute utilisation, divulgation ou reproduction non autorisée est interdite. Si vous avez reçu ce courriel par erreur, veuillez en informer son expéditeur et supprimer toute copie en votre possession. Merci.

From: [Dale Evoy](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Changes to zoning
Date: April 8, 2021 6:01:45 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 White Rock City council.

I thought we had elected a council that was dedicated to stopping the rampant over-development of the White Rock town centre. The area has been a nightmare for pedestrians and vehicles for years with flag person nazis popping up everywhere. Now, it seems, that just as light is beginning to show at the end of this tunnel, they are proposing that an already excessive 10 storey limit be increased to a whopping 29 storeys in one case and 23 and 18 storeys in two others. Are they insane? Who but greedy developers and politicians on the take could think this was a good idea. Or is this another instance where they start out with something so outrageous that the public will become compliant when they shave off 2 or 3 storeys.

Please reconsider.

Yours truly,

Dale Evoy
White Rock, BC

From: [IAN CAMPBELL](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: New City Plan
Date: April 9, 2021 4:37:56 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 want to express my opposition to continued development on the west side of Foster to Martin with a height proposal of 8 storey limit.

We have resided at 1442 Foster Tower2 since late 2016. At that time, we were attracted by the view we have from our 6th floor condo, and knew nothing of any plan for anything other than the 3 storey structures

on the east side of the street directly opposite.

Since then, we have endured two years of dust, noise, traffic disruption and compromised enjoyment of life with the on-going construction of the BOSA redevelopment and the new FOSTER-MARTIN development.

Enough is enough! It's time to say no to the developers and let the citizens who have made this city the desired community that it is enjoy the views that they paid for and are entitled to. Our fair city does not need further changes to become another Vancouver west end.

Donald Ian CAMPBEL

Sent from my iPhone

From: [MMLA](#).
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: : "Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)" 29 storey, Vancouver or Guildford, ok. Little city by the sea? NO.
Date: April 10, 2021 11:04:55 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.

Subject line added.

- >
- > We still have that Soleil tower to come up; we have that publicity on the site boasting that it is already 70% sold.
- > Have we been told who were the advanced buyers of those expensive units with - for now - perfect unlimited view?
- > How much are those new owners going to benefit our city, our businesses? Are they going to be living in there? Will they pay the appropriate taxes or dodge them? Will these owners cover the cost of all the improvements needed for the extra population, along with those from the 29 storey - should it ever be approved?
- > Or are seniors or Canadian families going to be hit with more insane property tax increases to cover for the new lot?
- >
- > We need to know WHO THOSE OVERPRICE BOXES ARE AIMED TO; obviously not the affordable housing Canadians need today.
- >
- > Some people are used to be walled in hi-rises, but White Rock should not be another one of those places. We can leave this to Vancouver.
- > For White Rock, 10 storey is already plenty. Living in wind tunnels and the shadow of monster buildings, not in our 'little city'.
- >
- > Thank you.
- > M. Mallet
- > White Rock
- >

From: [leila swenson](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Cc: directorofcorporate@whiterockcity.ca
Subject: Bylaw 2376 CR-1 Town Centre Revisions
Date: April 10, 2021 11:15:20 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.

White Rock has already been subjected to massive growth which cannot supported by its services (water, sewer, garbage, emergency services, schools, hospital etc.). Beyond infrastructure, there is enormous impact on the environment with each demolition and resurrection of a concrete monstrosity, and the soul of the community dies a little more with each blow.

Maybe it's to refocus our efforts to preserve what we can and build our community and business' rather than depleting it further.

There are many vacant commercial properties, why not give owners more incentive to repair and fill their investments...taxes and penalties for unoccupied and unkept spaces would be a start.

I absolutely urge the council to vote "NO" to 29 storey buildings in White Rock.

I look forward the day when Marine Drive thrives once again. That is the spirit and soul of our city by the sea. Feed the soul rather instead of robbing the land.

Thank you for listening,
Leila Swenson

From: [John Vye](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Proposed uptown height change.
Date: April 10, 2021 11:17:22 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.

I am totally opposed to this proposal, just as I was opposed to these proposals when Democracy Direct was campaigning during the last civic election as the slate to vote for to prevent this from happening. I voted for this slate to prevent this and will feel totally deceived if this vote goes through. I live in this zone and find it very stressful to be dealing with. I love my condo and am enjoying my retirement in it. I will not vote for any person who votes for this ridiculous proposal that is ruining what White Rock used to be...a nice get-away from exactly what is now being proposed.

Sent from my Galaxy

From: galberto@shaw.ca
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Re; 29 story
Date: April 10, 2021 11:19:40 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.

NO. A. Leering

From: [C. Fast](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Cc: [Democracy Direct](#)
Subject: RE: Changes to Zoning in White Rock's Town Centre
Date: April 10, 2021 11:54:04 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.

Mayor and Council

As a tax paying resident of White Rock who after having studied the Town Centre paperwork AND doing an area walkaround I want to register my opposition to this proposal. White Rock will hopefully not become another West End and these building height proposals, although the dream of one former Mayor and Council, do not fit into our 'City by the Sea'. The current construction of 25 and 26 storey buildings along with the Miramar have confirmed just how out of place these are in our beach town.

Attached please find changes to the proposals which I'd like made public as maximums and which would include restrictions as to design, site lines and consideration to the existing buildings current views and sunlight. Thank you for this opportunity and for your consideration as I trust that you'll do what the residents and not the developers desire.

Regards

Charles Fast
1130 Finlay St,
White Rock, BC
V4B 4K8

CHANGES TO ZONING IN WHITE ROCK'S TOWN CENTRE


The City of White Rock has proposed a zoning amendment to the Town Centre Area Zone (CR-1).

The Zoning Bylaw Amendment pertains to the CR-1 zoned lands illustrated in pink.

Changes in this zoning amendment, if approved, will include:

- Reducing maximum density
- Encouraging more affordable housing choices and employment uses
- Requiring more green spaces as part of development
- Lowering overall building heights (current maximum height is 80.7 metres, approx. 25-26 storeys). Proposed heights are indicated in yellow circles on map in number of storeys.
- Reinforcing the lower-scale, pedestrian-focused experience on Johnston Road
- Requiring adaptable, accessible-ready housing

For more information regarding the proposed amendments, please visit whiterockcity.ca/CR1



(*) indicates where max. height of four storeys is permitted where the top level is set back 2.0 metres from the floors below and the overall building is setback a min. of 7.0m from the lot line adjacent to Johnston Road – otherwise max. height is three storeys (10.7m);

(^) indicates where the max. height of 10 storeys may be increased to the number of storeys illustrated in the map subject to the provision of an on-site amenity (e.g., City-owned conference centre, art gallery, or City Hall) in addition to an amenity contribution as set out in the CR-1 Zone.

Ways to participate in the virtual Public Hearing Monday, April 19, 2021 at 6 p.m.

SEND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS BEFORE THE PUBLIC HEARING

- Send an email to clerksoffice@whiterockcity.ca, subject line: "Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)".
- Send mail to the Director of Corporate Administration, White Rock City Hall, 15322 Buena Vista Ave. White Rock, B.C. V4B 1Y6.
- Drop mail at City Hall's secure drop box, left of the front door of 15322 Buena Vista Ave.

Submit written comments by noon, April 19, 2021.

SPEAK AT THE PUBLIC HEARING BY PHONE

No need to pre-register. Just follow these instructions:

- Call 778-736-1164
- Enter the Conference ID # when prompted: 624916385#.
- Stay in the virtual waiting room and watch the hearing on the City's Livestream at whiterockcity.ca/agenda.
- When it's your turn to speak, you'll be prompted that you're entering the meeting.
- You have up to five minutes to make your comments to Council.

WATCH THE MEETING AT WHITEROCKCITY.CA/AGENDA For information on the meeting process call 604-541-2127

WHITEROCKCITY.CA

WHITE ROCK
City by the Sea!

From: [L.Nielsen](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Cc: [Planning](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 10, 2021 11:59:13 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.

Mayor and Council,

I wish to object to one aspect of the CR-1 Town Centre plan. I live at 1480 Foster Street (White Rock Square One). The proposed development height for the block at the corner of Foster and Thrift Street (west side) will ultimately block my limited views of the water.

Design principles speak to having building step down as they move down a slope. Therefore the building at Thrift and Foster should be lower than 7 stories (more like 5) in order to prevent blockage of views for those who live higher up the slope. Creating a building height that is higher than WRSQ1 will block views and lower property values.

I urge you to rethink the building height of this block. Those of us who have lived in White Rock for many, many years would be harmed by a decision to increase the building height at this block.

Linda Nielsen

From: [Trina Scott](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Allowing 29 story buildings.
Date: April 10, 2021 12:27:27 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 long time resident of White Rock and the reason that I was attracted to the area was that it had the look of a beautiful seaside village.

Over the years it has changed and I am not against change but this beautiful seaside village is now becoming a group of skyscrapers. We do not have the means of comfortably servicing these huge places. Roads are even now too congested and our water supply will soon be to a max through our old pipes. When the charm of this place goes so does our real estate and tourism .

I definitely am against any building of 29 stories. The most I feel comfortable with , if it is deemed necessary to have these structures built is 12 stories.

Trina Scott

14716 Thrift Ave White Rock V4B 2J5.

From: [Gayle Boutilier](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 Town Centre Revisions
Date: April 10, 2021 1:09:58 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.

As a very concerned White Rock resident , my vote is “NO” to 26 story towers in our City.

Thank you,
Gayle Boutilier
208 - 1280 Merklin Street,
White Rock, BC
V4B 4B9

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Sandee Butterly](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: 29 story buildings
Date: April 10, 2021 3:43:19 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.

Please register me as an absolute NO to 29 story buildings in White Rock, B.C.

Sandee J Butterley
Suite 300,
15176 Buena Vista Avenue,
White Rock, B.C.
V4B1Y3



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

From: [Simon Bergen](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 10, 2021 4:24:24 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.

Really? Most Council members have a lot of nerve introducing this for 29 stories when your very own website <https://www.democracydirect.ca/> has the title "No more HighRises in White Rock" written on each candidates' video. **Get with the message!** Which I, by the way, agree with.

Simon Bergen-Henengouwen
602-15015 Victoria Ave
White Rock, BC
V4B 1G2

From: [judith hampson](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: New 29 story building
Date: April 10, 2021 5:22:04 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 a long term resident in White Rock. I do not agree with changing the permit to a 29 story. We have seen the difference in White Rock with the 3 buildings of foster Martin. The effects on the city traffic would be huge.

Judith Hampson
15858 roper avenue
White Rock

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Pat Glabush](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Changes to Zoning in White Rock's Town Centre
Date: April 10, 2021 7:58:08 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 Mayor and Council

As a homeowner in White Rock, I want to register my opposition to the zoning change proposals for White Rock's Town Centre. I do not want to see White Rock become another West End. These building height proposals do not belong in our 'City by the Sea'. The construction currently underway of 25 and 26 storey buildings are out of place in this beach town.

The tallest buildings should be located in the furthest north locations along North Bluff Road, reducing in height from there. Please restrict building heights to avoid creating wind tunnels and to avoid loss of views and sunlight.

Thank you for this opportunity to participate in this process.

Regards
Pat Glabush
1130 Finlay St,
White Rock, BC
V4B 4K8

From: [Amber Currie](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR -1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 11, 2021 9:16:31 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.

White Rock should allow 29 stories.

Amber Currie

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Scott Willis](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 11, 2021 9:31:13 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 Council, I am really hoping that this bylaw does not pass - please vote NO at your April 19th. meeting! Can this really be the same Democracy Direct group that solicited my vote (and got it) at the White Rock Farmers Market back in 2017-2018 on the basis of no more high-rise development. Think about it! Thanks, Scott Willis.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Pauline Chang](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 11, 2021 3:57:16 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.

I strongly disagree to a proposed amendment to the zoning bylaw to allow buildings of 29 stories in White Rock Centre. The present Council was voted in on the fact that they would never allow buildings of this height. I want Council to Vote No to this development.

Pauline Chang

From: [drumcree lewis](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: bylaw 2376 CR-1 TOWN CENTRE
Date: April 11, 2021 4:00:23 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.

Totally opposed... why would council approve such a plan? what affordable housing are you proposing? when there has never been any affordable housing here in White Rock, White Rock has become a mecca for the affluent majority , no senior housing has been a priority a 29 story building to house whom? how is the city of White Rock able to sustain the water garbage roads ? yes high end senior housing on 16th approved ,not affordable housing? this city will be a concrete only place for the wealthy ,please explain, encourage more affordable housing choices what choices?
green space where???

no we will vote NO ,this proposal has nothing to do with affordable housing !!!! just developers who have massive input into the city planners

Mr & Mrs Lewis

From: [Robert Green](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendment to the Zoning Bylaw To Allow 29 Story Towers
Date: April 11, 2021 9:16:26 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.

We are long-time residents of White Rock, having lived here for the past 42 years. We strongly oppose changing the current zoning bylaw to allow still higher towers in the City of White Rock. In our view there are too many high towers here already, which should never have been allowed to proceed. Now, we are stuck with them. White Rock has a small seaside atmosphere, the charm of which we are quickly losing. We do not see how a city with as geographically small a footprint as White Rock, can support a further influx of residents, traffic and parking which is already in a congested state.

Please ask our council to vote NO to the proposed amendment of the zoning bylaw to allow 29 story towers.

Hopefully,
Robert & Sharon Green

From: [Shelley Mare](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw2376
Date: April 12, 2021 7:25:54 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.

I vote no for 29 stories to buildings.

Shelley Mare

From: [Andrea McCorkell](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 12, 2021 9:24:43 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.

My vote re 29 story tower proposal: No

Thank you,

Andrea McCorkell

15586 Goggs Ave

White Rock, V4B 2N6

From: [TRUDY BISHOP](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 12, 2021 10:27:46 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!

I am sending my submission regarding changes to zoning in White Rock's town centre.

My vote is Yes to approving the proposed zoning amendment, because this amendment would allow more affordable housing choices, more green spaces--and I am definitely in favour of No More Towers!

Please reply and confirm that you received this message and that I have voted. Thank you.

Yours Sincerely,
Trudy Bishop
215- 1280 Fir Street
White Rock, B.C. V4B 4B1

From: valmair@shaw.ca
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: april 12, 2021
Date: April 12, 2021 10:39:44 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.

Re: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revision)

Please accept my view that on no account should the City of White Rock ever agree to any development being 29 stories high. A limit must be established with no options.

thank you for reading this,
Thank you for giving us the opportunity.
Valerie (Mair)

#305 1369 George Street, White Rock
V4B 4A1

From: [Thomas Moore](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Town Centre Zoning Changes
Date: April 12, 2021 11:22:00 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.

Hello City Clerk,

I received the Future Housing Needs card in the mail, thank you for sending these out. I am emailing you regarding the building on Russell Street, 1513. It has a Proposed height of 23 stories. This seems excessive as I understand it is at 17 stories at present time. As I'm sure you are well aware these buildings get taxed on the proposed height level. This is passed onto small business with additional rent. Is the city looking to drive out small business? Covid-19 has caused so many financial problems for small business this kind of additional financial stress is not needed.

In addition, there are not enough long term rental units in White Rock. Far too many are being used as short term vacation rentals. Is there a way these units can be zoned as long term rentals? Or incentives to developers to build rental units?

Thanks for reading.

Kind Regards,

Thomas J. Moore
204-1020 Parker Street,
White Rock, B.C.
V4B 4R7

From: [Vickie Darts](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Cc: [Anthony Manning](#); [Scott Kristjanson](#); [Erika Johanson](#); [Christopher Trevelyan](#); [Darryl Walker](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 12, 2021 12:21:20 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.

David Darts and Vickie Darts residing at 14855 Thrift Ave. White Rock, BC object to the proposed amendment to the zoning bylaw that governs allowable heights in the Town Centre which includes a proposal to allow buildings up to 29 stories tall. I ask that the Councillors who were members of Democracy Direct keep their commitment to keeping future highrises in the town center to 8 to 12 storeys with possibly of 16 storeys along 16th as suggested by the Public Workshops. Dave and Vickie Darts

From: [Daphne Taylor](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 12, 2021 12:52:23 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.

Director of Corporate Administration:

I vote for **no more** huge high-rises in the City of White Rock. Four to 6 stories should be enough.

With the few older rental buildings in White Rock, when are they going to start building actual low-cost housing for the seniors who are currently on fixed incomes?

Is White Rock mayor and council wanting to attract the rich only to come and invest their money?

What do they want to see for White Rock in the future?

Are they trying to make White Rock a huge tourist attraction?

Is this about bringing more property taxes to the City?

Are they trying to phase out the low to average income earners from living in White Rock?

I find it very sad how White Rock has changed from a quaint little city into a huge concrete city.

I know this is happening across Canada but I find it very disturbing.

In my opinion there is too much greed and not enough humanity in this world.

Respectfully,

Daphne Taylor
White Rock, BC

From: [Gale Dawson](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: White Rock Bylaw to change building height to 29 stories
Date: April 10, 2021 10:57:22 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 Council Members

I'm a long term resident of White Rock and am asking you to vote NO on adding more height to buildings! The area in question is already way too congested. I still do not understand why the City adopts a Community Plan and then changes it. Makes absolutely no sense to me.

Gale Dawson

309-1280 Merklin Street
White Rock.

Sent from Gale's new iPad Air!

From: [Fiona Old](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Cc: [White Rock Council](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 12, 2021 3:17:46 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.

Dear Mayor and Council,

"Chloramine is the Godfather of where we have gone wrong with our water". Erin Brockovich from her book Superman's Not Coming.

Before any further development of high rises in White Rock we need to attend to our problem of having Chloramine in our water. We've been told by the city staff that in order to get rid of Chloramine we need to replace our pipes which have Arsenic and Manganese buildup. We should vote NO as a city on further development until water quality and volume has been assessed in connection to further big developments, since we've been told that Arsenic will increase with increases in consumption.

I therefore request that the city vote NO.

Sincerely and respectfully,

Fiona Old
White Rock

From: [Joan Babb](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 town centre revision)
Date: April 12, 2021 5:17:49 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 live At:
306 1437 Foster Street
White Rock

I do not want a 29 storey building in White Rock
I would like to see buildings between 8-10 stories as the highest. Preferably 4 stories
Thank you so much for all that you do
Sincerely
Joan Babb

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Bob Johnston](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Development
Date: April 12, 2021 9:59:44 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.

To Whom it May Concern:

I live at 1480 Foster Street, right next door to the continuous building of million dollars high rises. I am against the densification of the city centre. Follow the money. Most residents in my building will not live to see the day when roads are closed, flag people pause you on your way to grocery shop or the over crowding of roads, services and retail outlets. Sacrifice us, the seniors who live and vote in White Rock for developer funded buy outs of city councillors.

They will pay. Unfortunately, so will we residents!

Robert Johnston

#504

White Rock Square

--

\\\\\\\\\\\\

(o o)

-o00o--()---o00o---

----- ooo0-----

() 0ooo

\ (()

\)) /

(_/

Bob Johnston

Nothing will benefit human health and increase the chances for survival of life on Earth as much as the evolution to a vegetarian diet

-- Albert Einstein

From: [Carol Blacklaws](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 13, 2021 9:22:25 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.

Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)

To Whom it May Concern,

I would like to inform council that I would like them to vote against allowing buildings up to 29 stories in the Town Centre.

Carol Blacklaws

From: [Annabelle MacDonald](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 13, 2021 4:30:11 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 Staff:

With this email message, I want to register my opposition to the proposed amendment to the zoning bylaw for which there will be a public hearing on Monday, April 19th. These building height proposals do not fit in our 'City by the Sea'. The current construction of 25 and 26 storey buildings along with the Miramar have confirmed just how out of place these are in our beach town. I, along with so many others who voted for you and got rid of the majority of the former council, do not want any more towers in White Rock. **Future buildings in White Rock should be no more than 6 stories.**

Thank you for this opportunity and for your consideration. I trust that you'll do what the residents and not the developer's desire.

Sincerely,
Annabelle MacDonald
301-1351 Martin Street
White Rock, BC
V4B 3W6

From: [Diana Manuel](#)
To: [Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2376 (CR-1 Town Centre Revisions)
Date: April 14, 2021 8:07:11 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.

This email is response to your April 14, 2021 post on Facebook regarding:

“A proposed amendment to the zoning bylaw that governs allowable heights in the Town Centre”

I would like White Rock Council to vote **NO** on the 29 storey tower proposal.

Yours truly,
Diana Manuel

RECEIVED

APR 12 2021

CITY OF WHITE ROCK
ADMINISTRATION

APRIL 11, 2021

DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION
WHITE ROCK CITY HALL
15322 BUENA VISTA AVENUE,
WHITE ROCK BC V4B 1Y6

RE: Bylaw 2376
(CR-TOWN CENTRE REVISIONS)

To Whom it May Concern

I AM OPPOSED TO THE HEIGHTS OF
THE FOLLOWING CR TOWN CENTRE COMMERCIAL
& RESIDENTIAL ZONING.

① SECTION 1460, 1444, 1461(2), 1437⁽¹⁴²⁴⁾ Proposed
height is 8 stories would like to keep it
AT EXISTING, 3 STORIES.

② SECTION 1513 - CAN SEE 4 NOT 23¹

③ SECTION 15100, 15176 → CAN SEE 10 NOT 29¹
↳ would like 6 NOT 18¹

The Rest of changes in zoning looks acceptable.
Regards,

Sherry Dockstader

WHITE ROCK BC

403.808.4911

smdockstader@gmail.com