

**Regular Council Meeting for the purpose of Public Hearing/
Meeting of White Rock City Council**



Minutes

March 2, 2026, 4:00 p.m.

Gallery Room, White Rock Community Centre Council Chambers
15154 Russell Ave, White Rock, BC, V4B 0A6

PRESENT: Mayor Knight
Councillor Chesney
Councillor Cheung
Councillor Lawrence
Councillor Trevelyan
Councillor Bains
Councillor Manning

STAFF: Guillermo Ferrero, Chief Administrative Officer
Tracey Arthur, Director of Corporate Administration
Anne Berry, Director of Planning and Development Services
Wayne Berg, Deputy Director, Chief Building Official
Neethu Syam, Manager of Planning
Debbie Johnstone, Deputy Corporate Officer

PUBLIC: 60 (approximately)

1. CALL HEARING TO ORDER

The Public Hearing was called to order at 4:03 p.m.

**BYLAW NO. 2511 - OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW, 2017, NO. 2220,
AMENDMENT NO. 3, 2025, NO. 2511**

PURPOSE: Bylaw 2511 proposes amendments to Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, to update estimates and projections, demonstrate how the bylaw aligns with the Metro Vancouver Regional District's Regional Growth Strategy, and expand on and introduce housing policies to align with the City's interim Housing Needs Report findings to accommodate a 20-year supply of new housing in order to comply with the *Local Government Act*. In addition, Bylaw 2511 also provides a revised land use framework for the North Bluff Road

Corridor Plan Area, including revised land use designations, associated policies, and development permit guidelines. All lands within the City of White Rock are subject to this Bylaw.

2. DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION READS A STATEMENT REGARDING THE PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING

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

- Notice was published in the February 19 and 26 editions of the Peace Arch News.
- A copy of the notice was placed on the public notice posting board on February 17, 2026.

4. THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO PRESENT THE PROPOSED BYLAW

Note: Public Information Package can be viewed [HERE](#).

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

As of 8:30 a.m. on February 25, 2026, there have been **TEN (10)** submissions received.

Author	Date Received	City of Residence	Status	Item #
G. Worters	Various Dates	White Rock	Comments / Questions	C-1
F. MacDermid	February 18, 2026	White Rock	Opposed with comments	C-2
P. Byer	February 18, 2026	White Rock	Comments	C-3
M. Currie	February 21, 2026	White Rock	Opposed	C-4

D. Bower	February 21, 2026	White Rock	Comments	C-5
M. Rossetti	February 22, 2026	White Rock	Opposed with comments	C-6
BC Hydro	February 23, 2026	N/A	Comments	C-7
Fraser Health	February 12, 2026	N/A	Comments	C-8
TransLink	February 12, 2026	N/A	Comments	C-9
T. Kawaguchi	February 24, 2025	White Rock	Opposed	C-10

Note: Submissions received between 8:30 a.m. on February 25, 2026 and 12:00 p.m. (noon) on March 2, 2026 will be presented "On Table" at the Public Hearing.

- **Ten (10)** submissions were included in the agenda package, four (4) not in support, and six (6) with comments
- On table there were **twenty-two(22)** submissions received:
 - Four (4) in support;
 - Four (4) with comments; and,
 - Fourteen (14) not in support.

6. THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THOSE IN ATTENDANCE TO PRESENT THEIR COMMENTS

- J. Yu, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendments, stating concern with safety for the community in regard to affordable and supportive housing being considered. Stated it would require accountability and safety measures to be put in place for nearby residents. White Rock is a small city, with limited services. Would like to ensure continued community safety and the keeping of the current character of White Rock.
- A. An, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendments, stating currently they feel safe, peaceful and that there is a strong sense of community. Noted concern with how this will change and the residents will be impacted should there be

supportive and affordable housing permitted to be built. Noted that White Rock does not have a lot of land, road space and extra services; already traffic, parking and the hospital services are busy and there is concern with additional density of the potential impact on these items. If more density were to occur it would need to be done in a responsible way, want to see the community remain safe, caring and livable for everyone.

- Y. Gao, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendments, stating currently they are safe and their neighbourhoods are quiet and family oriented. Concern without clear rules and safety measures, the potential impact over time should supportive and affordable housing be permitted along with additional density and heights these will bring. Concern of impact on community schools, library and how the residents will be protected. Noted there are already concerns with parking and services and adding density will put additional pressure on the services.
- G. Hedberg, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendment, stating it is not workable with areas the OCP highlights as environmentally protected (including ravine sites and old growth tree areas). Would prefer these areas have no maximum heights and they be considered as to their individual environmental needs. Climate change needs to be taken into account (potential for hillside slides).
- S. Xiao, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendment, noting concern with supportive and affordable housing and some of the issues the additional density will bring. White Rock is known for the beach, and it is a tourist destination. There are a number of seniors in White Rock who may be vulnerable, they need to feel safe.
- L. Wei, White Rock, not support the OCP amendments, noting White Rock is a small community with limited land and charm and there are many seniors who live here who need to feel safe. There is limited parking, roads and services; the impact of added density is of concern. Stated that density will bring more need for parking and services (including health care, police, bylaw and fire services). Lower scale buildings will protect the views and allow sunlight. Additional density along with supportive and affordable housing is a concern including impact on community safety and would require clear accountability and safeguards and protection of the surrounding community.
- M. Mitrovic, Surrey, not in support of the OCP amendments, concern noted with proposed height, density and supportive housing and impact on parking, health care services and change of character of the neighborhood that supportive housing brings. It must come with proper support and planning. Safety is a concern, would like to continue to have a walkable and peaceful community. Stated that the proposed amendments will have an impact on safety, traffic and livability. Growth

must be responsible in order to preserve the quality-of-life White Rock currently has.

- S. Reid, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendments, concern noted in regard to the corner of North Bluff and Johnston Roads and the adding of density bringing in additional pedestrian traffic to an already busy intersection. Suggested instead to stretch some height along North Bluff to Stayte Road (up to 10 stories buildings where King George Hwy is closer than onto Johnston Road). Would like to see the height capped especially at the noted intersection.
- R. Johnston, White Rock, not in support of the OCP Amendments, stating concern with reduced citizen involvement for planning of development, the City needs to push back with the province. Changes in population growth as an impact of permanent resident and temporary resident levels needs to be considered. Current vacant housing stock is available, concerned with additional density in White Rock (one of highest in the country). Proposed heights are too high, the density count does not include the new recent buildings.
- N. Yarmshuk, Peace Arch Hospital Foundation, Chairperson, spoke in support of the OCP amendments in regard to the Health District objective with the dedicated Hospital Zone. Stated they need space and room to grow, and this would ensure the hospital is able to expand and modernize having quality care close to home and giving them a secure future in the community.
- S. Kristjanson, White Rock not in support of the OCP amendments, stating the provincial housing targets do not mandate building height, questioned how much the City can responsibly absorb. From the 2021 OCP public consultation(s) it was found that residents support growth but with limits. Noted that the City must plan for housing targets, but it is not mandated to do so with high-rises. Form, scale and phasing are all something Council maintains discretion on. Noted that the approvals already in place are ahead of market absorption.

Councillor Chesney departed the meeting at 5:12 p.m. just as Mr. Neal started to speak and returned at 5:14 p.m., prior to Mr. Neals conclusion of comments.

- D. Neal, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendments, residents through the consultation process indicated support for gentle densification and density for the hospital zone. Concern that the North Bluff Corridor Plan was expanded south. Stated that building heights should be reviewed with capacity of existing infrastructure and community expectations. Changes in immigration and the population impact should be considered. Asked Council to pause and reconsider this and ensure that any changes reflect the need of community (allowing for growth in a managed way).

- Mr. Garmine, Surrey, in support of OCO amendments, noted that he does not see a negative impact of the current high-rises in the town centre. However stated the previously known area as the East Lot Area, that the land development economics has not been thought through. There is no market at 12 stories, they are not economically viable to build.
- H. Stack, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendments, questioned the City's processing of projects being approved and how long it takes developers to move forward (not being made to develop). Stated that there appears to be a stop gap in what is occurring and at this time there is no supportive and affordable housing, and this is what is needed. What is being built the general public cannot afford it.
- D Sohei, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendments, stated the City should be mindful of the current population and desire to preserve the identity and character of White Rock, manage infrastructure and over densification. Other municipalities have done so (managed density, keeping a walkable community and ensuring infrastructure upkeep).
- T. Valtri, Business Owner in White Rock, would like to see the City focus instead on the beach area/ Marine Drive for potential development.
- M. David Seidel, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendments, noting concern with the process the OCP has taken to get to this point by conducting two (2) components separately and then merging them, stating this was not understood by the public. Would like to see the North Bluff Corridor removed and asked Council to ignore the urgency being put forth by the province, stating that White Rock has already met provincial requirements,
- S. Matheson, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendments, stating the Foster Martin development is overbuilt for the area (scale is important), concern with further nearby density that views will be blocked. White Rock has much to offer, the views are important. Higher buildings also impact the sunshine for current residents and nearby parks. Density along North Bluff Road won't have the impact on White Rock residents, but larger development south of Russell Avenue is a concern.
- Gentleman from White Rock, who has also developed in White Rock, in support for OCP amendments noting that there should be more density along North Bluff Road where the height could be accommodated, and stated there is a shortage of rental vacancies (his experience is there are more applications than what they can build).

- L. Ying, White Rock, not in support of the OCP amendments, noting concern with the water quality at this time and asked if there was further density how would it be accommodated.

7. **IF REQUIRED, THE CHAIRPERSON INVITES THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO SUMMARIZE THE PROPOSED BYLAW**

None

8. **CONCLUSION OF THE MARCH 2, 2026 PUBLIC HEARING**

The Public Hearing for Bylaw 2511 was concluded at 5:30 p.m.

Mayor Knight



Tracey Arthur, Director of Corporate Administration

Unapproved