

### On table Correspondence

## **BYLAW 2387 – - Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 2387**

June 21, 2021

Author	Date Received	Civic Address	Status	Item #
M. Bennett	June 16, 2021	502 14955 Victoria Ave. White Rock, BC	Comments	C-11
R. Odynski	June 16, 2021	15048 Victoria Avenue White Rock, BC	Comments	C-12
P. Kealy	June 17, 2021	932 Maple Street White Rock, BC	Comments	C-13
C. Anderson	June 17, 2021	208-15025 Victoria Avenue White Rock, BC	Support	C-14
V. Mair	June 17, 2021	305-1369 George Street White Rock, BC	Support	C-15
R. Colombin	June 17, 2021	14852 Beachview Avenue White Rock, BC	Comments	C-16
D. Thompson	June 17, 2021	Undisclosed	Comments	C-17
K. Diane Petersen	June 17, 2021	Lee Street, White Rock	Comments	C-18
K. Zilke	June 17, 2021	15900 Roper Ave White Rock, BC	Comments	C-19
L. Maynard	June 17, 2021	943B Ash Street White Rock, BC	Comments	C-20
M. Venables	June 18, 2021	1127 Elm Street White Rock, BC	Opposed	C-21
L. Aittlan	June 18, 2021	15445 Pacific Ave White Rock, BC	Comments	C-22
T. Westgard	June 18, 2021	201–15272 Croydon Drive Surrey, BC	Support	C-23
T. Bishop	June 18, 2021	White Rock resident	Comments	C-24
C. Bergeron	June 18, 2021	15025 Victoria Ave White Rock, BC V4B 1G2	Support	C-25
C. Westgard	June 18, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-26
K. Hemphill	June 18, 2021	1152 Elm Street	Support	C-27
J. Ogden	June 18, 2021	#201 - 15272 Croydon Drive Surrey, B.C. V3Z0Z5	Support	C-28
T. Westgard	June 18, 2021	Undisclosed	Support	C-29
M. MacDonald	June 18, 2021	14877 Buena Vista Avenue	Comments	C-30
W. Low	June 18, 2021	#203 - 15025 Victoria Ave	Support	C-31
R. York	June 18, 2021	Undisclosed	Comments	C-32

D. Riley	June 19, 2021	Undisclosed	Comments	C-33
R. Alto	June 20, 2021	15318 Victoria Ave	Support	C-34
S. Schubert	June 20, 2021	1420 Johnston Road	Support	C-35
D. Reeve	June 20, 2021	1420 Johnston Road	Support	C-35
J. Mackillop	June 20, 2021	203-15025 Victoria Ave White Rock, BC V4B 1G2	Support	C-36
F. Carrey	June 20, 2021	403-15025 Victoria Ave White Rock, BC V4B 1G2	Support	C-37
P. Henry	June 20, 2021	205-1458 Blackwood Street White Rock, BC	Support	C-38
C. Fast	June 20, 2021	1130 Finlay Street	Comments	C-39
L. Kanuka	June 21, 2021	1156 Elm Street White Rock, BC V4B 3R9	Support	C-40
J. Lefever	June 21, 2021	504-15015 Victoria Avenue White Rock, BC	Support	C-41
L. Ducharme	June 21, 2021	1464 Finlay Street White Rock, BC V4B 4L5	Opposed	C-42
T. Leigh	June 21, 2021	1148 Elm Street White Rock, BC	Support	C-43
L. Laycock	June 21, 2021	1148 Elm Street White Rock, BC	Support	C-43
G. Worters	June 21, 2021	Blackwood Street White Rock, BC	Comments	C-44
G. Parkin	June 21, 2021	14921 Buena Vista Avenue White Rock, BC	Opposed	C-45
J. Hollis	June 21, 2021	1474 Finlay Street White Rock, BC V4B 4L5	Opposed	C-46
T. Erwin	June 21, 2021	504-15025 Victoria Avenue White Rock, BC V4B 1G2	Support	C-47
K. Jones	June 21, 2021	White Rock, BC	Comments	C-48
H. Schreier	June 21, 2021	1120 Martin Street White Rock, BC	Opposed	C-49

**From:** [Michelle Bennett](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387 ( Height and Density Review)  
**Date:** June 16, 2021 11:25:21 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.*

Michelle Bennett  
502 14955 Victoria Ave.  
White Rock, BC  
V4B 1G2

I just moved to White Rock again earlier this month. I have lived around or in White Rock for the past 20 years.. I strongly oppose changing the Height of the buildings. I am all for growth and change however disrupting the views of so many homeowners is still not the way to go (I know this has been brought forward in the past). White Rock residents are living on the hillside for a reason to enjoy their beautiful ocean views which comes at a premium. If this goes through now who is to say in another 5-10 years that height restrictions are not increased again for future developments? Where is the security on our property investments, and how will this impact Buyer's when they look at homes on the Hillside in the future...The view is great now but they changed the Height restrictions once...

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing this email.

Kindly,  
Michelle Bennett

**Michelle Bennett - Real Estate Specialist Keller Williams Realty Van Central C.**  
**604 240-8160 O. 604 262-1581**  
My business is built on referrals; please share my name with your friends and family.



**From:** [Robson Thermal Mfg. Ltd.](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387  
**Date:** June 16, 2021 3:21:10 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.*

Honourable Mayor and Council,

May I offer my 100% support of Bylaw 2387 and changing the land use for properties on the south side of Victoria Avenue between Martin and Finlay.

I would ask you to consider increasing the density for the lots from 15046 Victoria Ave to the walkway beside 15108 Victoria Ave to more than 1.5 FAR. This would allow more creative and complete use of these lots considering their proximity to the pier and Memorial Park.

For example, these 15 lots could be combined with Marine Lane and the commercial lots on Marine Drive to build tourist oriented mixed use building(s) that cover the entire area (including Marine Lane) from Victoria Ave down to Marine Drive. Perhaps a boutique hotel, a high quality age-in-place condo complex with a la carte services for seniors, and/or tourist attractions.

Or Council could consider carving out these lots for special use such as live/work units for people in the creative, engineering, and tech industries.

Respectfully yours,

Robert Odynski, GSC

15048 Victoria Avenue  
White Rock, BC  
Canada V4B 1G3

Tel: +604.538.6681  
[robo@robsonthermal.com](mailto:robo@robsonthermal.com)



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

**From:** [Patsy/Roger Kealy](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Re: OCP Bylaw 2017, #2220, Amendment #2, (Height and Density Review), No. 238  
**Date:** June 17, 2021 9:36:38 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 writing to express my overall approval of the proposed changes to the Official Community Plan. I am not in support of the inclusion of the east side of Elm Street in the Waterfront Village. If left in this designation, the century-old houses on the east side of Elm Street can be replaced by three-storey multi-unit/commercial buildings, destroying one of the last vestiges of White Rock's original street and destroying the neighborhood.

Patricia Kealy  
932 Maple St  
White Rock, B.C.  
V4B4M5

**From:** [Helga Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** BYLAW 2387  
**Date:** June 17, 2021 12:00:05 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 Sir

We are in complete support of Bylaw 2387 changing West Beach Area at the waterfront village to 3 storeys

Respectfully

Clifford Anderson

Apt 208-15025 Victoria Ave

White Rock, BC

**From:** [valmair@shaw.ca](mailto:valmair@shaw.ca)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Re Elms Houses  
**Date:** June 17, 2021 12:31:00 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 accept my support for the Elms Houses to be treasured and I support whatever measures have to be taken.

thank you, valerie mair 305, 1369  
George Street, White Rock

V4B 4A1 tel.

**From:** [Roberta Colombin](#)  
**To:** [Darryl Walker](#); [Helen Fathers](#); [David Chesney](#); [Erika Johanson](#); [Scott Kristjanson](#); [Anthony Manning](#); [Christopher Trevelyan](#); [Clerk's Office](#); [Carl Isaak](#)  
**Subject:** ByLaw 2387 Official Community Plan Public Hearing June 21, 2021  
**Date:** June 17, 2021 1:46:08 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.*

To: Mayor and Council et al,

Re: Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 238

I am writing to express my overall approval of the proposed changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP).

**However, I am not in support of the inclusion of the east side of Elm Street in the Waterfront Village. If left in this designation, the century-old houses on the east side of Elm Street can be replaced by three-storey multi-unit/commercial buildings, destroying one of the last vestiges of White Rock's original street and destroying the neighbourhood.**

To quote a plaque on the promenade at the foot of Elm Street, "Elm Street, White Rock's oldest streetscape, can be seen across Marine Drive. Along with the 1912 train station, these cottages are among the most historically significant structures in White Rock."

**Please respect White Rock's heritage and move these houses into the "Mature Neighbourhood" designation in the OCP so that it will match with its RT-1 Zoning that limits heights on these properties to two storeys.**

For the love of all that is holy, (whatever faith you adhere to or none), please save this neighbourhood and the Trees for which it was named.

Roberta Colombin  
14852 Beachview Avenue  
White Rock, BC V4B1N7



**From:** [Denice Thompson](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#); [White Rock Council](#); [Carl Isaak](#)  
**Subject:** Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 238  
**Date:** June 17, 2021 4:31:41 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 writing to express my overall approval of the proposed changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP). I am not in support of the inclusion of the east side of Elm Street in the Waterfront Village. If left in this designation, the century-old houses on the east side of Elm Street can be replaced by three-storey multi-unit/commercial buildings, destroying one of the last vestiges of White Rock's original street and destroying the neighbourhood.

To quote a plaque on the promenade at the foot of Elm Street, "Elm Street, White Rock's oldest streetscape, can be seen across Marine Drive. Along with the 1912 train station, these cottages are among the most historically significant structures in White Rock."

Please respect White Rock's heritage and move these houses into the "Mature Neighbourhood" designation in the OCP so that it will match with its RT-1 Zoning that limits heights on these properties to two storeys.

Sincerely,

Denice Thompson

**From:** [Diane Petersen](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#); [White Rock Council](#); [Carl Isaak](#)  
**Subject:** SAVE ELM STREET CENTURY-OLD HOUSES  
**Date:** June 17, 2021 9:23:35 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.

Re: Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 238

Hello, current WR city hall "residents",

I am writing to express my overall approval of the proposed changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP). I am not in support of the inclusion of the east side of Elm Street in the Waterfront Village. If left in this designation, the century-old houses on the east side of Elm Street can be replaced by three-storey multi-unit/commercial buildings, destroying one of the last vestiges of White Rock's original street and destroying the neighbourhood. To quote a plaque on the promenade at the foot of Elm Street, "Elm Street, White Rock's oldest streetscape, can be seen across Marine Drive. Along with the 1912 train station, these cottages are among the most historically significant structures in White Rock."

Please respect White Rock's heritage and move these houses into the "Mature Neighbourhood" designation in the OCP so that it will match with its RT-1 Zoning that limits heights on these properties to two storeys.

Thank you,

K. Diane Petersen

Constituent on Lee Street

**From:** [karen zilke](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#); [White Rock Council](#); [Carl Isaak](#)  
**Subject:** Elm Street homes  
**Date:** June 17, 2021 9:50:39 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.

Re: Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 238

I am writing to express my overall approval of the proposed changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP). I am not in support of the inclusion of the east side of Elm Street in the Waterfront Village. If left in this designation, the century-old houses on the east side of Elm Street can be replaced by three-storey multi-unit/commercial buildings, destroying one of the last vestiges of White Rock's original street and destroying the neighbourhood.

To quote a plaque on the promenade at the foot of Elm Street, "Elm Street, White Rock's oldest streetscape, can be seen across Marine Drive. Along with the 1912 train station, these cottages are among the most historically significant structures in White Rock."

Please respect White Rock's heritage and move these houses into the "Mature Neighbourhood" designation in the OCP so that it will match with its RT-1 Zoning that limits heights on these properties to two storeys.

Karen Zilke  
15900 Roper Ave  
White Rock

**From:** [Liam S Maynard](#)  
**To:** [Erika Johanson](#); [Christopher Trevelyan](#); [Anthony Manning](#); [Helen Fathers](#); [David Chesney](#); [Scott Kristjanson](#); [Darryl Walker](#)  
**Cc:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** ByLaw 2387 Official Community Plan Public Hearing June 21, 2021  
**Date:** June 17, 2021 11:20:35 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 & Council,

Re: Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 238

I am writing to express my overall approval of the proposed changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP).

**However, I am not in support of the inclusion of the east side of Elm Street in the Waterfront Village. If left in this designation, the century-old houses on the east side of Elm Street can be replaced by three-storey multi-unit/commercial buildings, destroying one of the last vestiges of White Rock's original street and destroying the neighbourhood.**

To quote a plaque on the promenade at the foot of Elm Street, "Elm Street, White Rock's oldest streetscape, can be seen across Marine Drive. Along with the 1912 train station, these cottages are among the most historically significant structures in White Rock."

We did not vote for the current mayor and council to decimate such heritage "mature neighbourhoods" with more eyesore out of place objects.

**Please respect White Rock's heritage and move these houses into the "Mature Neighbourhood" designation in the OCP so that it will match with its RT-1 Zoning that limits heights on these properties to two storeys.**

If you care at all for the character and aesthetics of the city you claim to serve please save this neighbourhood and the Trees for which it was named.

Liam Maynard  
943B Ash St  
White Rock, BC  
V4B-4J9

**From:** [M. VENABLES](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw changes  
**Date:** June 18, 2021 10:12:46 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.*

I replied to the ad in the paper voting for the bylaw changes. It has been brought to my attention that a change in designation could affect Elm street in the future. I do not want any changes to Elm Street. Leave the street alone. It has charm. Margaret R. Venables, 1127 Elm Street, V4B 3R9

**From:** [Luva Lynne Atitlan](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** The 3 Elm Street Century Old Houses  
**Date:** June 18, 2021 10:13:12 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.

To: [clerksoffice@whiterockcity.ca](mailto:clerksoffice@whiterockcity.ca)

Re: Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 238

I am writing to express my overall approval of the proposed changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP). I am not in support of the inclusion of the east side of Elm Street in the Waterfront Village. If left in this designation, the century-old houses on the east side of Elm Street can be replaced by three-storey multi-unit/commercial buildings, destroying one of the last vestiges of White Rock's original street and destroying the neighbourhood.

To quote a plaque on the promenade at the foot of Elm Street, "Elm Street, White Rock's oldest streetscape, can be seen across Marine Drive. Along with the 1912 train station, these cottages are among the most historically significant structures in White Rock."

Please respect White Rock's heritage and move these houses into the "Mature Neighbourhood" designation in the OCP so that it will match with its RT-1 Zoning that limits heights on these properties to two storeys.

Respectfully,  
Luva Lynne Atitlan  
15445 Pacific Ave,  
White Rock  
V4B1R4

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Chris Magnus](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Public hearing OCP amendment - support  
**Date:** June 18, 2021 10:32:53 AM

---

---

**From:** Tayla Westgard <tayla@beechwestgard.ca>  
**Sent:** June 18, 2021 10:32 AM  
**To:** White Rock Council <whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca>  
**Subject:** Public hearing OCP amendment - support

*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 Mayor and Council,

I am writing to you today as to show my support of the new OCP amendment up for discussion this Monday at the public hearing. I believe it is important to maintain growth through new development while upholding the preservation of this that can be supported through our council and residents. Looking forward to the hearing on Monday. Thanks,

Tayla Westgard  
Beech Westgard Developments Ltd.  
#201-15272 Croydon Drive  
Surrey, BC V3Z 0Z5  
604-538-3525



**From:** [TRUDY BISHOP](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#); [White Rock Council](#); [Carl Isaak](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 238  
**Date:** June 18, 2021 10:52:44 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.*

I am writing to express my overall approval of the proposed changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP). I am not in support of the inclusion of the east side of Elm Street in the Waterfront Village. If left in this designation, the century-old houses on the east side of Elm Street can be replaced by three-storey multi-unit/commercial buildings, destroying one of the last vestiges of White Rock's original street and destroying the neighbourhood.

I believe it's important to keep the century-old houses on the east side of Elm Street as Mature Neighbourhood (two storeys only) also for a personal reason of mine: One of those houses was owned for a long time by a woman I knew well, as did many people. We all knew she was kind and considerate of others. She rented suites in the house; one suite was rented by my son for a while.

Please respect White Rock's heritage and move these houses into the "Mature Neighbourhood" designation in the OCP so that it will match with its RT-1 Zoning that limits heights on these properties to two storeys.

Sincerely,

Trudy Bishop  
White Rock Resident



**From:** [Bergeron Carole](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387  
**Date:** June 18, 2021 11:49:06 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 in favor of the bylaw 2387.

Carole Bergeron  
15025 Victoria Av.  
White Rock

[Envoyé à partir de Yahoo Courriel sur Android](#)

**From:** [Chris Magnus](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Public Hearing OCP amendment  
**Date:** June 18, 2021 1:46:43 PM

---

**From:** Chuck Westgard <chuck@beechwestgard.ca>  
**Sent:** June 18, 2021 12:27 PM  
**To:** White Rock Council <whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca>  
**Subject:** Public Hearing OCP amendment

*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 Mayor and Council,

I am one of the land owners of 1164 Elm Street and am sending this email to express my support for the upcoming public hearing item for the OCP amendment. I am aware that a lot of time and effort has gone into gathering input from both the citizens of White Rock and staff in order to make the best decisions regarding land use designations. Due to this, I am confident that the new OCP will support a shared vision of the City and its citizens for years to come.

I am also aware of some of the concerns local residents have voiced regarding our previous proposal for 1164 Elm Street. We know that it is important to have the surrounding residents support in a situation like this, which is why we have redesigned our proposal in a way that fits in well with the existing neighborhood as well as satisfies the existing OCP land use designation.

I hope to see the approval of this new OCP amendment, and I look forward to developing a building on 1164 Elm Street that fits in well with the neighborhood and has both the council and surrounding residents support.

Chuck Westgard

---

**From:** Ken Hemphill <hemphillken65@yahoo.ca>  
**Sent:** June 18, 2021 12:15 PM  
**To:** White Rock Council <whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca>  
**Subject:** OCP Plan Amendment Feedback

*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 Council,

I would like to thank Councillors Manning and Trevelyan for discussing the OCP Plan with residents and owners of Elm and Beachview streets yesterday. I appreciated hearing everybody's input, and the variety of views expressed. I was impressed with owners of 1164 Elm Street's vision to incorporate community feedback into their building plans. In particular, when compared with their initial plan, they have reduced height of the proposed building, and added character elements to fit the overall neighbourhood look.

I would like to reiterate my support for the OCP Plan amendment to keep Elm Street in the Waterfront Village designation, consistent with the street's current mix of townhouses, businesses, and single family homes.

Sincerely,

Ken Hemphill  
Owner  
1152 Elm Street

**C-28**

**From:** Jamie Ogden  
**Sent:** June 17, 2021 8:40 PM  
**To:** White Rock Council <[whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca](mailto:whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca)>  
**Subject:** Public hearing OCP Amendment

*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 Evening Mayor and Council,

As a land owner of 1164 Elm Street, I am emailing in support of the upcoming public hearing item for the OCP amendment as amended and passed for first and second reading on May 31, 2021.

I know you have all worked so hard with staff and the citizens of White Rock to get input from as many as possible. This process will make sure that the land use designations in the soon to be current OCP align with a supportable vision for everyone for many years to come.

It is so important for the OCP to align with the vision of Council so that White Rock planning staff have clear guidelines on how to advance development and rezoning applications to be supported by Council and surrounding residents and not end up being the "Nightmare On Elm Street". Admittedly the previous proposal did not fit in with the neighbourhood, but went through a two year design process, overcame many obstacles, and was ultimately designed to meet the existing OCP land use designation without any required variances.

I look forward to working with a new architect on a new proposal which will fit in nicely with the neighbourhood, meet the new guidelines in the OCP, and allow early input from the immediate Neighbours to ensure a successful development application which hopefully gets to see the Council in the current term.

I will be tuning in to the public hearing on Monday, and you will likely hear from myself as well.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Jamie Ogden  
Project Manager  
**Beech Westgard Developments Ltd.**

#201 - 15272 Croydon Drive  
Surrey, B.C. V3Z0Z5  
[Jamie@BeechWestgard.ca](mailto:Jamie@BeechWestgard.ca)

---

**From:** Ty Westgard  
**Sent:** June 18, 2021 10:49 AM  
**To:** White Rock Council <whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca>  
**Subject:** Public Hearing OCP Amendment

*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 Mayor and Council,

I am emailing in support of the new OCP amendment. I believe that these new land use designations will allow the city of White Rock to move in a direction that is consistent with the future vision of the City.

Ty Westgard

From: Mary Macdonald  
Sent: June 15, 2021 12:15 PM  
To: White Rock Council <whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca>  
Subject: Elm st apt.

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

I am very pleased the property at Beachview and Elm st has been named a "Waterfront Village". I see 3 elm trees in front of the property on city land. I wonder how the elm trees will be affected by a 3 storey building. How many suites are allowed in a 3 storey apt.? I live at 14877 Buena Vista ave and i can see the roof of the present apt. So i am keen to know how my view will be affected.

Yours truly  
Mary MacDonald

Sent from my iPad

## Additional Correspondence

**From:** [Mary Macdonald](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Meeting re height and density  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 10:42:35 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. Mayor and council

Please vote to keep new buildings reduced in height from 21 storeys to 6 . Please keep most new buildings above Thrift ave.

Yours truly  
Mary MacDonald

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [wendy low](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** BYLAW 2387 (Height & Density Review)  
**Date:** June 18, 2021 2:07:01 PM

---

**C-31**

*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 support amendments that the maximum heights along the West Beach area of the Waterfront Village (Marine Drive) designation to a maximum of 3 storeys & the amendments for reduced maximum heights in the Town Centre and Transition areas.

Thank you,

Wendy Low  
#203 - 15025 Victoria Ave  
White Rock



**From:** [Rio Yorck](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387  
**Date:** June 18, 2021 8:49:20 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.*

Concerns with increased height of buildings:

- Impacts homeowner's views
- Impacts homeowner's investments
- increased density
- increased wear & tear on the infrastructure:
  - sewage
  - H2O use
  - electricity
  - roads
- increased congestion will put increased strain on the :
  - environment
  - infrastructure (roads, schools, hospital, policing, paramedics, traffic etc.)
  - noise levels
  - pollution levels

I also feel it is important to maintain & keep our heritage buildings; as they do in Europe. They provide history as well interest in the architecture and landscape.

Old/older trees are also important as these can not be replaced. Another tree planted in it's place will take years to mature and cannot replace what was taken away. As well as disturbing the wildlife that may live/use the tree.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Rio K Yorck

**From:** [David Riley](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** To: Re: Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 238 I am writing to express my overall approval of the proposed changes to the Official Community Plan (OCP). I am not in support of the incl...  
**Date:** June 19, 2021 6:35:26 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.*

To: [clerksoffice@whiterockcity.ca](mailto:clerksoffice@whiterockcity.ca)  
[whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca](mailto:whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca)  
[Cisaak@whiterockcity.ca](mailto:Cisaak@whiterockcity.ca)

**Re: Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 238**

I have been involved in saving via intelligent renovation many older buildings in White Rock. The greenest buildings are the ones that already exist. A tiny exception to teardown culture is in order here.

Please respect White Rock's heritage and move these houses into the "Mature Neighbourhood" designation in the OCP so that it will match with its RT-1 Zoning that limits heights on these properties to two storeys.

Thanks for your time.

David Riley

**From:** [Ron](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Cc:** [Scotti Alto](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387 (Height and Density Review)  
**Date:** June 20, 2021 8:18:05 AM

---

**C-34**

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 2387 (Height and Density Review)

Ron Alto  
Residence: 15318 Victoria Ave

I would like to be on record as being STRONGLY in SUPPORT of reducing the building height restrictions as stated in the OCP Plan Bylaw 2017, No. 2220 Amendment No.2 (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 2387

As stated in Section 22.5.1 Buildings  
Waterfront DPA Guideline 22.5.1a

“Ensure buildings are compatible with or complimentary to adjacent developments in terms of height, density and design. Vary heights, roof lines, and massing to minimize impacts to views and solar exposure enjoyed by adjacent buildings and open spaces”

Respectfully:  
Ron Alto

Sent from my iPad "Paddy"

**From:** [Sheldon](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387 (Height and Density Review)  
**Date:** June 20, 2021 11:41:04 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.*

To the Mayor and Council:

We are **in favour** of this bylaw. White Rock does not have the infrastructure to support tall structures with large numbers of people moving here. Please keep the buildings to as few stories as possible.

Thank you,

Warm regards,  
Sheldon Schubert  
and Dixie Reeve

1420 Johnston Road  
White Rock, BC

SS e-mail: [ssschubert@shaw.ca](mailto:ssschubert@shaw.ca)  
DR e-mail: [drtutoring@shaw.ca](mailto:drtutoring@shaw.ca)

**From:** [John MacKillop](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387 (Height and Density Review)  
**Date:** June 20, 2021 12:15:53 PM

---

**C-36**

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 am writing to indicate my support of Height restrictions along Marine Drive (3 story limit), and in the Town Centre and transition area height restrictions as well.

John MacKillop  
15025 Victoria Ave #203  
White Rock, BC  
V4B 1G2

**From:** [Fiorenza Carrey](#)  
**To:** [Darryl Walker](#); [David Chesney](#); [Helen Fathers](#); [Anthony Manning](#); [Scott Kristianson](#); [Erika Johanson](#); [Christopher Trevelyan](#); [Clerk's Office](#); [Guillermo Ferrero](#); [Carl Isaak](#); [Greg Newman](#); [Jim Gordon](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387 density and height review  
**Date:** June 20, 2021 7:45:06 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.

Hi there, I am mostly in favor of your recent OCP review and the proposed changes, but a bit hesitant on some of the revisions.

You wish to change the designation of some properties, namely the Silver Moon and The Montecito complexes from Waterfront Village to Urban Neighborhood.

This I am opposed to as both buildings are in full view from Marine Drive, and would be part of the ambiance of the waterfront. Both buildings should remain as Waterfront Village designation.

Thank you,

Fiorenza Carrey

15025 Victoria Ave, unit 403

White Rock

**From:** [Susan MacDonald](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#); [Christopher Trevelyan](#); [David Chesney](#); [Darryl Walker](#); [Helen Fathers](#); [Erika Johanson](#); [Anthony Manning](#); [Scott Kristjanson](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387 Height and Density Review  
**Date:** June 20, 2021 10:58:43 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

I would like to express my thanks and appreciation for all the hard work it took in bringing forward the draft proposal for Bylaw 2387 Height and Density Review.

I wish to advise that I **Approve Bylaw 2387** amendments to the OCP.

Thank you as well for giving the White Rock residents a voice.

Regards

Phyllis Henry  
205 - 1458 Blackwood Street  
White Rock, BC

Sent from [Outlook](#)

**From:** [C. Fast](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Cc:** [White Rock Council](#); [Carl Isaak](#)  
**Subject:** Re: JUNE 21 OCP PUBLIC HEARING - Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2220, Amendment No. 2, (Height and Density Review), 2021, No. 238  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 7:51:41 AM

---

cafasttelus.net@gmail.com appears similar to someone who previously sent you email, but may not be that person. [Learn why this could be a risk](#)

*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

Please save the Elm Street historic homes and respect White Rock's heritage. As a White Rock property owner who cannot make the June 21 Public Hearing, I ask that these properties be deemed a "Mature Neighbourhood" designation as provided in the OCP thereby matching the **RT-1** Zoning that limits heights on these properties to two storeys.

Regards

Charles Fast

1130 Finlay Street

--

*If you forward this email, **please delete the forwarding history** which also includes my email address. When sending emails, **please BCC** so as to hide all addresses. Thanks for helping to prevent Scammers and spammers from mining addresses and spreading viruses.*



**From:** [Anthony Manning](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: OCP Plan Amendment Management Feedback  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 5:39:30 AM

---

---

**From:** Lynn Kanuka <lynnkanuka@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** June 19, 2021 12:14  
**To:** White Rock Council <whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca>  
**Subject:** OCP Plan Amendment Management Feedback

*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 Council Members,  
As per the message from my neighbour Ken below, I too appreciate all views expressed at our meeting on Thursday, as well as the proposed new development plans for 1164 Elm St. So I too would like to reiterate my support for the OCP Plan Amendment in keeping the Waterfront Village designation. It makes sense with the street's current mix of townhouses, businesses, and single family homes.  
Thank-you,

Lynn Kanuka  
Owner - 1156 Elm St, White Rock, BC V4B 3R9

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Ken Hemphill <[hemphillken65@yahoo.ca](mailto:hemphillken65@yahoo.ca)>  
**To:** [whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca](mailto:whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca) <[whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca](mailto:whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca)>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 18, 2021, 12:14:31 PM PDT  
**Subject:** OCP Plan Amendment Feedback

Dear White Rock Council,

I would like to thank Councillors Manning and Trevelyan for discussing the OCP Plan with residents and owners of Elm and Beachview streets yesterday. I appreciated hearing everybody's input, and the variety of views expressed. I was impressed with owners of 1164 Elm Street's vision to incorporate community feedback into their building plans. In particular, when compared with their initial plan, they have reduced height of the proposed building, and added character elements to fit the overall neighbourhood look.

I would like to reiterate my support for the OCP Plan amendment to keep Elm Street in the Waterfront Village designation, consistent with the street's current mix of townhouses, businesses, and single family homes.

Sincerely,

Ken Hemphill  
Owner  
1152 Elm Street

--

**Lynn Kanuka (she, her)**

**From:** [Anthony Manning](#)  
**To:** [Julie Lefever](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Bylaw 2387  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 5:41:41 AM

---

Hello, Julie! Thanks for taking a moment to share your opinion on the OCP.

Yours sincerely,

Councillor Anthony Manning

---

**From:** Julie Lefever <julie.lefever100@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** June 18, 2021 06:09  
**To:** White Rock Council <whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca>  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387

*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 Walker and Council:

I am writing to express my thanks to you for the work you are doing to keep our City by the Sea a special place. These are not easy times.

Second, I want to support your work on the OCP in general.

My cautions to you are concerning those areas that are suggested as Urban Neighbourhoods, such as the Silver Moon property, which may encourage development not in harmony with the Waterfront village area with additional building heights and utilization options.

Please go very cautiously with these designations. We need to keep our City by the Sea special.

Regards,

Julie Lefever  
15015 Victoria Avenue, Unit 504  
White Rock

**From:** [LEANNE DUCHARME](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387 (Height and Density Review)  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 8:04:57 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! Please submit this email in regards to the public hearing on the above subject.

Public Hearing Item 2387  
Leanne Ducharme  
1464 Finlay St, White Rock, BC V4B 4L5  
I am NOT in support of this bylaw.

Thank you,  
L.Ducharme

**From:** [LEANNE DUCHARME](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387 (High Density Review)  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 11:38:55 AM

## Additional Correspondence

*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 2387 (High Density Review)  
Leanne Ducharme  
1464 Finlay Street  
I am NOT in support of the bylaw

Good Afternoon Mayor and Council.

My name is Leanne Ducharme and have been a resident of 1464 Finlay Street for 17+ years. Currently this lot houses a small rancher on a 9540 square foot lot.

I am NOT in support of changing the zoning of 1400 Block Finlay Street from East side Large Lot Infill to Mature Neighbourhood.

From the OCP this block has been designated as Large Lot Infill for many years and we have watched the neighbourhood change to include a 13/8 story high rise to the North and High Density homes to the south. Heading West we have also seen Goggs street turn into high density homes as well. These types of developments have caused parking/congestion issues as most do not have underground parking or substantial parking spaces.

Changing the 1400 block zoning to mature neighbourhood would only bring 'MEGA HOMES" which do not conform to the area. Many will house at least one legal suite, potentially a few illegal suites which will only add to the parking problem we already face.

Aesthetically going from a 13/8 storey high-rise to the North to changing to a two storey structure on the 1400 block Finlay Street will make the high rise look out of place. The remaining north half of the 1400 that is not developed would be better suited as a transitioning area from the high rise (1500 block Finlay) to the carriage houses to the south.

Thank you,

Leanne Ducharme

**From:** [Anthony Manning](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: OCP Plan Amendment Feedback from 1148 Owners  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 5:40:05 AM

---

---

**From:** Tara Leigh <tara@lotuspedal.ca>  
**Sent:** June 19, 2021 16:22  
**To:** White Rock Council <whiterockcouncil@whiterockcity.ca>  
**Subject:** OCP Plan Amendment Feedback from 1148 Owners

*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 Council,

On behalf of myself, Tara, and my husband, Lane, as well as our five year old son, Asher, we would like to thank Councillors Manning and Trevelyan for discussing the OCP Plan with our neighbors (the residents and owners of Elm and Beachview streets) yesterday, who were able to attend the afternoon meeting time.

We are grateful for your time and listening to the concerns of our community voiced through them.

At this time we would like to restate our request to to keep Elm Street in the Waterfront Village designation. We support the OCP Plan amendment consistent with the street's current mixture of residents which include: townhouses, businesses, and single family homes.

We thank you for your attention on this matter.

Sincerely,

Tara Leigh,  
Lane Patrick Laycock  
& Asher Leigh  
Owners of  
1148 Elm Street

--

**Tara Leigh**  
**LotusPedal yoga + spin**  
**General Manager**  
[www.LotusPedal.ca](http://www.LotusPedal.ca)

**From:** [Chris Magnus](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Marine Drive  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 9:53:55 AM

---

**From:** Gary Worters <gworters@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** June 20, 2021 10:14 AM  
**To:** Darryl Walker <DWalker@whiterockcity.ca>; David Chesney <DChesney@whiterockcity.ca>; Helen Fathers <HFathers@whiterockcity.ca>; Erika Johanson <EJohanson@whiterockcity.ca>; Scott Kristjanson <SKristjanson@whiterockcity.ca>; Anthony Manning <AManning@whiterockcity.ca>; Christopher Trevelyan <CTrevelyan@whiterockcity.ca>  
**Cc:** bcassignment@bellmedia.ca; tips@globaltvbc.com; edit@surreynowleader.com  
**Subject:** Re: Marine Drive

*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 Mr. Mayor and White Rock Council.

Our local Newspaper, Peace Arch News has published a number of notices and requests for input regarding height restrictions.

The old adage, one picture is worth a thousand words. So Ill let you be the judge.

A year and a half ago my wife, 74 and I, 72 moved into an apartment on Blackwood Street. At the time we were concerned about having a patio with sunshine. To our surprise and disappointment, as the months went on the development of the two towers progressed. Now a third building is underway which will obliterate any view of our beautiful blue morning sky.

As you will see, there is no more sunshine on our balcony until the afternoon sunset.

So please keep in mind the lifestyle of seniors in White Rock.

As seniors a lot of us live on modest pensions and can't afford to uproot again. My wife has Dementia and moving would be very upsetting to her.

As you hold your meetings please try to keep this in mind, Living out our senior years, hopefully without any more huge towering buildings.

Thank you for your time,

Regards,  
Gary Worters

On Wed, 12 May 2021 at 08:19, Gary Worters <[gworters@gmail.com](mailto:gworters@gmail.com)> wrote:

An open letter to members of White Rock Council,

Oath of Office

I will faithfully perform the duties of my office and will not allow and ~~privet~~ interest to influence my conduct in public matters.

Based on the article published in the Surrey Now it would appear that Councilor Chesney it the sole councilor that is upholding the Oath of Office.

Since moving to White Rock thirteen months ago I have diligently followed movement of this council resulting in numerous concerns.

To date I have bitten my tongue, however this latest move by council shows the people of White Rock how little this council is prepared to address the whole of the citizens of our Town.

Would someone from council please explain how you have put the interests of a handful of businesses to mandate the safety of the residents of the downtown core?

We must assume that to protect the public there will be an installation of concrete barriers between the roadway and these now new patios. Will the downtown businesses association be picking up the bill?

Noted that the council states that you have consulted with the business community, however, where is the consultation of the residents who live in the area.

Please explain how the Fire Department or EMS vehicles are going to navigate this move of a one-way street.

How do seniors who depend on buses to get them around are going to be inconvenienced by the disruption of this rerouting?

With all due respect we are anxiously awaiting the future of the province about Mr. Dix and Ms. Henry's decision to review and hopefully lift indoor dining. This decision as you are all aware is to come after the long weekend.

Please provide correspondence from our local and Provincial Fire Marshal's office stating that they are in support of councils' decision. I would also like to see correspondence from our local bus line operators.

In closing, please re-read the Oath that you signed. This clause Private interests most definitely is being ignored by this council with the exception off Councilor Chesney who seems to be the only one prepared to uphold the Oath. He is also appears the only one on council who seems to be taking into consideration the total impact of your decision on the **residents of our Town.**

Thank you for your time. anxiously awaiting your written response.

Respectfully,  
Gary Worters  
White Rock, BC  
[gworters@gmail.com](mailto:gworters@gmail.com)

Cc'd

Peace Arch News [editorial@peacearchnews.com](mailto:editorial@peacearchnews.com)

Surrey Now [edit@surreynowleader.com](mailto:edit@surreynowleader.com)

Global News [tips@GlobalTVBC.com](mailto:tips@GlobalTVBC.com)

CTV News [bcassignment@bellmedia.ca](mailto:bcassignment@bellmedia.ca)







**From:** [Gillian Parkin](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** OCP comment  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 10:10:07 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.*

Hi there,

Just a note on the new OCP - I am not in support of the inclusion of the east side of Elm Street in the Waterfront Village and prefer it be left as mature neighbourhood designation.

Thank you,

Gillian Parkin  
14921 Buena Vista Ave

**From:** [Joanne Hollis](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** BYLAW 2387  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 11:10:09 AM

**C-46**

*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 Council regarding BYLAW 2387 (Height and Density Review)

My name is JOANNE HOLLIS and I am the owner/occupant of 1474 FINLAY ST, WHITE ROCK, B.C., V4B 4L5. I have lived at this residence for close to 30 years.

I am NOT in support of changing 1400 Block Finlay Street from East side large loft infill to mature neighbourhood.

From the OCP this block has been designated as LARGE LOT INFILL for many years and I have watched my neighbourhood change to now consist of a 14 STOREY HIGH-RISE to the north, High Density small lots to the west and High Density small lots with garage suites to the south. These types of developments have caused parking/congestion issues as most do not have underground parking or substantial parking spaces.

Changing the OCP to mature neighbourhood would only bring "MEGA HOMES" which would create more parking problems, illegal suites and would only benefit the very few who could afford such large homes.

Aesthetically going from a 14 storey high-rise to the North to changing to a two storey structure on the 1400 block Finlay Street makes the high rise look out of place. The 1400 block would be better suited as a transitioning block to provide affordable housing while maintaining visual conformity to the neighbourhood.

The 1400 Block Finlay already has public services such as transit running down Russell Street, Medical services right next door. According to White Rock Land Use and Planning Agenda 2019, the 1400 BLOCK FINLAY STREET is a good location to walk to shops and services.

The 1400 BLOCK FINLAY STREET, WHITE ROCK, B.C. needs to stay as LARGE LT INFILL.

THANK YOU, Joanne Hollis

**From:** [Tracey Erwin](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387 (Height and Density Review)  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 11:40:44 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.

Hi

I approve of limiting building height to 3 Stories at the waterfront area.

Tracey Erwin  
504-15025 Victoria Ave  
White Rock BC. V4B 1G2

Life is short go explore

**From:** [Kenneth Jones](#)  
**To:** [Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2387 (Height and Density Review)  
**Date:** June 21, 2021 11:41:12 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.*

Here are some of my comments on Bylaw 2387 OCP:

1. Change the designation on Maple Street and Lee Street, south of North Bluff Road, to Single Family Residential. This is the desire of the majority of residents and landowners in this area.
2. Remove the designation of "MATURE" neighbourhood from the East Side and Hillside residential areas. This degrades our neighbourhood and opens us up to Speculators who think they can get higher density in this area.
3. Lower the heights and density on North Bluff Road, east of Findlay Street, to a maximum of 4 stories and a density of 0.5 FAR.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth "Ken" Jones

**From:** Harry Schreier <[harry.schreier@gmail.com](mailto:harry.schreier@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, June 21, 2021 11:52 AM

**To:** Licences <[licences@whiterockcity.ca](mailto:licences@whiterockcity.ca)>

**Subject:** Bylaw 3287

*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.*

## **Public Hearing (via telephone) Bylaw 2387: Official Community Plan Bylaw (Height and Density Review)**

I wanted to express my feelings that I oppose the change to existing building height changes on the south side of Victoria Street. I live at the corner of Victoria and Martin Street (1120 Martin). The zoning here was put in place to protect the waterfront and the look. It makes no sense to increase building heights this close to the waterfront. If this is purely being pursued because a developer wants to raise the build to make more money, then the question asked should be how does this benefit any of the neighbouring properties or existing residents? Why even have an OCP if every rich developer can sway council away from the plan? Was there a reason the height restriction was put in place before? I bet there was. And do these reasons still hold up today? I bet they do.

Please record my disapproval of this building height change.

Harry Schreier

