

**Public Information Meeting Summary
14989 Roper Avenue, White Rock, B.C.****Introduction**

The purpose of this report is to summarize the Public Information Meeting held by the City of White Rock and Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership Architects Designer Planners on August 26th, 2020. The intent of the meeting was to present the development proposal for 14989 Roper Avenue to the public and to address the attendee's comments and concerns.

Location and Time

The meeting was held on line from 5:30pm to 7:00pm.

Meeting Format

The meeting was held on line via Teams having the proposed development information presented multiple times that included all related information for attendees to review. The City of White Rock took questions from any attendees wish to do so and having the applicant respond.

Representatives of the City and the Developer

Greg Newman – Planner, City of White Rock
Athena von Hausen – Planner, City of White Rock
Curtis Brock – Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership Architects

Sign-in and Feedback

Roughly eight resident attended the on line meeting with questions & answers being provided, see below summary. An additional comment with no objection coming from an owner via email, see below. There were a few questions raised regarding the parking variance but none expressing concerns regarding the parking variance impact to tenants or local residence.

The meeting format via on line question & answer format and not in an in person open house; it is harder to access the attendees for either support or objection of the variance or proposed renovation. I feel the attendees either support or had no objections to the variance as there were no objections to the variance, with most questions being more building code or developer related.

Questions & comments from parties attending or responding to the application & public information meeting with response provided:

1. Are any of the existing units to be upgraded?
 - a. Response: No, not as part of this application
2. How much would the total be for in lieu of parking for this?
 - a. Response by city planner: Payment in lieu of parking would not be applicable to this proposal
3. Why does the developer feel he can be exempt from existing parking requirements? That is quite a big difference in parking stalls required no as opposed to what is now?
 - a. Response: The three proposed additional parking stalls for the two proposed suites meet the current bylaw ratio requirements. The parking shortfall variance is related to the parking bylaw requirements that have changed in the bylaw updates. The request for parking relaxation is based upon observed used of parking on the site over the years. The owner & tenants have found there is sufficient parking, and believes the original ratio to be sufficient for tenant use.
4. Is there to be any increases in rent over the next few years?
 - a. Owners response: Rental increases will be per government regulated standards
5. Is parking included in the unit rent or is it charged extra?
 - a. Owners response: No, parking stall rent is separate from the suite rent
6. Why only two units?
 - a. Response: The spaces identified to be converted are underutilized and there is an opportunity to provide rental units to the community, thus better using the space with no additional building foot print being required.
7. Is there a utility aerial service on frontage adjoining the site and will this be placed underground as required by bylaw ?
 - a. Response: No not unless required by the city bylaw. This item will be reviewed further in the building permit process.

8. Do you have to bring electrical and fire up to code?
 - a. Response: The electrical & fire code requirements will be addressed in the building permit construction documents as required to meet the BC building code & city bylaws
9. What sort of interior finishes will these two units have?
 - a. Response: Interior finishes have not yet been selected & will be selected during the construction document building permit phase
10. At the south end, at Roper and Blackwood lane, there's a tree that is in an odd place and not well pruned or cared for. Would you consider removing that tree and putting a parking spot at the end of the row of existing spots?
 - a. Response: There is a 6 meter setback from the south property line, within which parking would not likely be permitted. This existing tree is within that setback. The tree minimizes the appearance of parking from the street. Locating a new parking stall here would also necessitate moving the existing signage. The development team has worked with the city planner & engineering department in finding suitable parking stall locations.
11. Are these units equipped with sprinklers, smoke, & CO alarms?
 - a. Response: Sprinkler, smoke & CO alarm requirements will be addressed in the building permit construction document phase & will be addressed per the BC building code & city bylaws
12. What is the square footage of each new unit ? What is the square footage of the existing apartments?
 - a. Response: The area of the proposed Studio is 274 sq.ft., and the proposed one bedroom is 613 sq.ft. Existing units on site are roughly 580 sq.ft. or more.
13. What has been the existing use of these spaces to be converted?
 - a. Response: Unused storage
14. Would they have kitchen spaces?
 - a. Response: Yes both units will have kitchens
15. Would there be any issues with proper ventilation since they are so close to the existing parking?
 - a. Response: We don't see any ventilation issues, if any they will be addressed in the building permit construction document phase & will be addressed per the BC building code & city bylaws
16. Do either of the proposed units exit into a parking area?
 - a. Response: No

17. Where is the exit on the northerly unit?
a. Response: Both units exit via a half flight of stairs to the existing grade level.
18. Looks like 2 units side by side in north unit, one highlighted ,the other not
a. Response: There will only be one new unit in the north building.
19. Is the wall between the electrical room and studio concrete?
a. Response: Yes
20. If there is a fire in the electrical room, what chance do the studio occupants have to get out, especially if they are sleeping?
a. Response: The existing electrical room consists of concrete walls which carry a fire rating. The door will remain closed. If the study entry door was blocked, the occupant may exit through the slider window on the south wall, adjacent to the bed. Note: The proposed units will be fully constructed to meet the BC building code & cite bylaw.
21. Is any additional height to the building being proposed?
a. Response: No additional height is proposed or required, as the proposed units will be within the existing building envelope structure.

Comment 1:

We are owners in Seapark East NW2154 (1350 Vidal St) at the south end of our property, adjacent to, and looking directly over, the lot affected by the proposed development. We wish to express my opinion now in writing that we have no objection to the project- assuming that it is construction to be undertaken inside the extant structures. No additions, to either building, no new buildings. We also would like it known that I expect that construction will take place only during City approved hours. We have included a small diagram showing our unit relative to the lot with the development application: You can see that we are one of the adjacent owners the most affected by this proposal. We are on the top floor of our building, far above any fence which might deflect some of the noise. Please register our opinion of no-objection in advance of the meeting.

Conclusion

We have made our best effort to review interpret and address each comment received. If any clarification is required related to our proposal or our responses please let us know and we will ensure to responds accordingly.