
Shivraj Johal

[REDACTED], BC V4B 0C1.

Tel: [REDACTED]

Email: [\[REDACTED\]](#)

20th December 2022.

City of White Rock

Miss Neethu Syam, City Planner
15322 Buena Vista Avenue,
White Rock, BC V4B 1Y6.

Dear Neethu:

**Re: Public Information Meeting for 15052 Buena Vista Avenue held at
White Rock Community Centre, Russell Avenue, White Rock**

Firstly let me express our heartfelt gratitude to you and Ms. Anne Berry for attending and monitoring the meeting on December 14th. It was a pleasure working with you and Anne. In addition, I would also like to thank you for providing me with the feedback forms received from the public members that attended.

Here is the summary of the feedback forms received:

Feedback	Supportive	Opposed	Undecided
12	5	4	3*

Comments related to the support of the project:

The positive response to the proposal included that there is a need for more housing in the City. The increased density by turning one lot into two lots, would increase density and therefore affordability that is needed in the City. The proposed project would also add beauty to the area. There also is support for the quality of the workmanship of a previous project in the neighborhood.

Several people who supported the initiative without any comments, we can only assume that they fully support both Variances requested. In fact, of all the public members that attended, none were concerned about the setbacks along the East and the West rear sides from the property lines.

Comments related to the opposition of the project:

The most common negative response was for the variance relief requested related to roof decks access involving the building height restriction. There was a significant opposition to the Variance relief to allow the structure of Stairwell cover for the access to the roof deck. Even though the protrusion for Stairwell cover was only about 16 square feet.

There were comments about Secondary Suites, retaining and railing concrete wall height along the East PL for the south lot.

There were also some comments about tree planting along the front and also along the East retaining wall of the property on the south lot.

Response to The concerns:

As a result of input from the public at the meeting, I would like to retract the Variance relief for the height restriction. We would submit a plan that will comply with the City's guidelines for the allowable building height. We would utilize one of the commercially available structures to obtain access to the open roof deck. These are Thermally broken and multi-pane glazed structures. The height of these structures is equal or lower than the handrails around the roof decks. These are all low profile, clean looking, attractive and available in various designs.

There are several options to choose from and some images of these available roof access doors are attached below.





The matter of Secondary Suites is not relevant in this case as plans do not include Secondary Suites in any of the proposed houses.

The concrete retaining wall along the South East corner of the South lot, will be kept to a minimum in height to the normal grade level. This will be supplemented with a glass railing so that it adds beauty to the local area and also does not impede the neighboring view.

Sincerely,

Signed

Shivraj Johal

*The attendees that did not offer a decision to support or oppose the project, however all did provide comments and offered their input. Their comments and concerns have been acknowledged and also addressed in our response.