

Public Hearing of White Rock City Council

Minutes



January 18, 2021, 6:00 p.m.

City Hall Council Chambers

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

PRESENT: Mayor Walker
Councillor Chesney
Councillor Fathers
Councillor Johanson
Councillor Kristjanson
Councillor Manning
Councillor Trevelyan

STAFF: Guillermo Ferrero, Chief Administrative Officer
Tracey Arthur, Director of Corporate Administration
Jim Gordon, Director of Engineering and Municipal Operations
Carl Isaak, Director of Planning and Development Services
Greg Newman, Manager of Planning
Debbie Johnstone, Deputy Corporate Officer
Karen Sidhu, Committee Clerk

1. **CALL HEARING/ MEETING TO ORDER**

The Chairperson called the Public Hearing for January 18, 2021 for Bylaw No. 2358 to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. **DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION READS A STATEMENT REGARDING THE PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING(S) TO BE HELD THIS EVENING**

3. **PUBLIC HEARING #1 - 15561/15569 Oxenham Avenue**

Bylaw No. 2358: White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000, Amendment (RS-4 – 15561/15569 Oxenham Avenue) Bylaw, 2020, No. 2358

CIVIC ADDRESS: 15561 and 15569 Oxenham Avenue

PURPOSE: Bylaw 2358 proposes to rezone the two (2) adjacent subject properties from 'RS-1 One Unit Residential Zone' to 'RS-4 One Unit (12.1 m lot width) Residential Zone' to permit the subsequent subdivision of the two (2) 18.9 m wide lots into three (3) 12.6 m wide lots, and allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling on each new lot; three (3) new homes in place of two (2).

3.1 DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION ADVISES HOW THIS PUBLIC HEARING HAS BEEN PUBLICIZED

- Notice was published in the January 7 and 14 editions of the Peace Arch news
- 110 notices were mailed to owners and occupants within 100 metres of the subject property
- A copy of the notice was placed on the public notice posting board on January 5, 2021.

3.2 THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO PRESENT THE PROPOSED BYLAW/ APPLICATION

The Manager of Planning and Development Services gave a brief overview of the application.

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

As of 12:00 p.m. noon January 18, 2021 there were no submissions received for Bylaw No. 2358.

3.4 THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THOSE IN ATTENDANCE TO PRESENT THEIR COMMENTS VIA TELEPHONE-IN PROCESS

At 6:09 p.m. the Chairperson noted there was no one on the line to speak to Bylaw No. 2358. The Deputy Corporate Officer had read out the instruction again as to how to participate and supplied the phone number and meeting ID for anyone wanting to speak to the application who had not registered.

At 6:12 p.m. it was determined that there were no submissions.

3.5 IF REQUIRED, THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO SUMMARIZE THE PROPOSED BYLAW/ APPLICATION

None

4. CONCLUSION OF PUBLIC HEARING #1 - 15561/15569 OXENHAM AVENUE-BYLAW 2358

The Chairperson called the Public Hearing for January 18, 2021 for Bylaw No. 2358 concluded at 6:12 p.m.

5. CHAIRPERSON CALLS THE NEXT PUBLIC HEARING TO ORDER - 1485 FIR STREET

The Chairperson called the Public Hearing for January 18, 2021 for Bylaw No. 2363 to order at 6:13 p.m.

6. PUBLIC HEARING #2 - 1485 FIR STREET

Bylaw No. 2363: White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000, Amendment (CD-64 – 1485 Fir Street) Bylaw, 2020, No. 2363

CIVIC ADDRESS: 1485 Fir Street

PURPOSE: Bylaw 2363 proposes to rezone the subject property from ‘RM-2 Medium Density Multi-Unit Residential Zone’ to ‘CD-Comprehensive Development Zone’ to allow for the construction of a six-storey 80-unit rental residential building over two (2) levels of underground parking. The property is an existing rental building and the development would be subject to Council’s Tenant Relocation Policy. The proposed use, height, and density is consistent with the Town Centre Transition Land Use Designation in the Official Community Plan.

6.1 DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION ADVISES HOW THE PUBLIC HEARING HAS BEEN PUBLICIZED

- Notice was published in the January 7 and 14 editions of the Peace Arch news
- 670 notices were mailed to owners and occupants within 100 metres of the subject property
- A copy of the notice was placed on the public notice posting board on January 5, 2021.

6.2 THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO PRESENT THE PROPOSED BYLAW/ APPLICATION

The Manager of Planning and Development Services gave a brief overview of the application.

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

As of 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, January 13, 2021 there have been **sixteen (16)** total submissions (12 in support / 3 opposed / 1 comments), which were printed directly into the agenda package for this evening.

Author	Date Received	Resident?	Status	Item #
S. Christie	January 8, 2021	Yes	Support	C-1
D. and A. McPhail	January 8, 2021	Yes	Opposed	C-2
Laurel	January 8, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-3
C. Weeks	January 8, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-4
L. King	January 8, 2021	Yes	Opposed	C-5
A. Dhand	January 9, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-6
S. Dhand	January 9, 2021	Yes	Support	C-7
E. Warrtig	January 10, 2021	Yes	Opposed	C-8

P. Best	January 11, 2021	Yes	Comments	C-9
N. Salamat	January 11, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-10
K. Ajiri	January 11, 2021	No	Support	C-11
T Wainwright	January 11, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-12
M. Middleton	January 11, 2021	No	Support	C-13
K. Ghaffari	January 12, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-14
S. Dalirifar	January 12, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-15
A. Chagani	January 12, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-16

Note: Submissions received between 8:30 a.m., January 13, 2021 and 4:30 p.m., January 18, 2021 will be presented “On Table” at the Public Hearing.

Summary of Submissions for Bylaw No. 2363 (Not Including the Phone-In from the Evening):

- **Sixteen (16)** submissions (12 in support / 3 opposed / 1 comments) were submitted and published in the Public Hearing Agenda package on Wednesday, January 13, 2021.
- On table Submissions were received up until 12:00 p.m. noon today (Monday, January 18, 2021). There have been **eighteen (18) on-table submissions** (8 in support/ 7 opposed/ 3 comments).
- For those who phoned in today not wanting to speak to the item but wanting to register their vote there have been **eleven (11)** votes

registered (5 in support/ 6 opposed), this is a new component we have added to the phone-in process.

6.4 THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THOSE IN ATTENDANCE TO PRESENT THEIR COMMENTS VIA TELEPHONE-IN PROCESS

- S. Wallace, White Rock, spoke in support of the application stating she as a tenant was given adequate time to move and that the compensation offered by the applicant is generous. It is appreciated how this has been handled.
- B. and B. Holm, White Rock, spoke in support of the application (previous owners of the building), stating there is a need for this type of development and the amenities it offers. The site has easy access and is walkable to many services. As the previous owners they noted they took the time to speak with each tenant that the building was being sold and why. The building requires upgrades, some are required to obtain insurance. Stated they are pleased the proposal is for a rental building which is needed in the area / this location.
- G. Wolgemuth, White Rock, not in support of the application, stating the building is a good design but stated the density is too high and concern that it requires an amendment to the zoning. Would like to see less height for the area, concern with additional traffic, changes the land use for the area and stated it offers no additional space for those that are not residents. Further concern noted for the current owners, would like to see affordable housing.
- A. Kyle, not a White Rock resident (Surrey business owner), spoke in support of the application, stating the development offers rental housing which is needed in the area (believes members of his staff would use it) to be close to his business location.
- P. Peaton, White Rock, spoke in support of the application, stated that the developer has gone over the detailed plans with the tenants and as to how the tenants will be financially compensated and moving arrangements, the compensation being offered is fair, and once the property development is finished plans to move back. Looks forward to the improvements being proposed (wants to age in place) and this development offers this for her. Rentals like this are needed the current situation needs improvement.

- S. Dhand, White Rock, spoke in support of the application noting it offers an affordable housing option for residents (rentals), the current building needs updating and the proposal will achieve this.
- S. Crozier, White Rock, not in support of the application, noted concerns with the application in regard to height, the OCP review is not complete - the review will likely note a maximum building height of four (4) stories, concerned with the precedent this sets for the area and that rents will go up - stated the proposed does not lend itself to affordable housing considering the living wage and minimum wage. Further noted he was pleased with the developer and how they have worked with the current tenants.
- D. Stonoga, White Rock, not in support of the application, concern noted that the OCP review is not complete, does not think building or making additions during COVID should be taking place (concern with the tenants having to move out during the pandemic), rents appear to be high, compensation package was increased but Community Amenity Contributions appear to be reduced.
- P. Petrala, White Rock, spoke in support of the application stating the use, height and density all work for the area, appreciate it is an age friendly project, the proposed height and design suits the community. Appreciates the proposed amenities and how the current tenants have been addressed with compensation and being worked with as well as their opportunity to return to the building once it is completed.
- M. Heidari, Applicant, noted that many White Rock buildings are expensive to run / upkeep, this offers a cost effective option with up-to-date amenities, underground secure parking and storage. The Applicant stated the rent charged at this building won't be as much as would be for new condo units going up in White Rock. It was noted that four (4) stories is not feasible (there is no financial help being offered for this project) the extra two (2) stories will not have a view impact.
- I. Middleton, not a White Rock resident, spoke in support of the application, stated he has been looking for rental building for his parents to move to the area. They want to move to White Rock as they retire. This project would work for them. Making it four (4) stories would mean the Applicant would need to increase the rental fees.

At 7:16 p.m. a call for additional phone-in speakers was made where the phone number and meeting ID number were provided for anyone wanting to speak again or who had not registered could call in:

- G. Wolgemuth, White Rock, speaking for a second time, not in support of the application, noting concern with the density (would like to see it lowered), infrastructure and rental rates. Further noted that for purpose built rentals there is financing that should be available to the developer for a project like this.
- T. McNally, White Rock, spoke in support of the project.
- P. Best, White Rock, not in support of the application, stated on her wage that most of her income now goes to rent, not sure how she will find a place / find something in White Rock, feels stressed about the potential move, not sure what will happen (been in the building for 3.5 years = 10 months compensation plus moving expenses) future below market rent will be 23% below market when it re-opens, does not want to move..
- R. Billard, Architect for the project, spoke about the project and how it has changed as it worked through the process.
It was noted that with landscape design, conditions can be made, benches within the green area can be requested for public use.

At 7:42 p.m. it was determined that there were no further speakers on the line.

6.5 IF REQUIRED, THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO SUMMARIZE THE PROPOSED BYLAW/ APPLICATION

None

7. CONCLUSION OF PUBLIC HEARING #2 - 1485 FIR STREET - BYLAW 2363

The Chairperson concluded the public hearing for Bylaw No. 2363 at 7:43 p.m.

8. CONCLUSION OF THE JANUARY 18, 2021 PUBLIC HEARING


In summary the Public Hearing meeting opportunity for January 18, 2021 for:

- Bylaw No 2358 was concluded at 6:12 p.m.; and

- Bylaw No. 2363 was concluded at 7:43 p.m.



Mayor Walker



Tracey Arthur, Director of Corporate
Administration