

Tracey Arthur

From: Christine Mcgurrin <
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 6:28 PM
To: Clerk's Office
Subject: Bylaw 2434 (1453 Stayte Rd)

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 Council,

I have taken the time to look at the changes that the developer has made from the previous proposal and I don't see a change from the biggest complaint the neighbourhood has, which is the height of three stories with rooftop patios which will make them even higher once the stairwells are included. This developer is now trying for the third time to push through a development that is over height according to the community's feedback. The developer's desire to have three stories plus rooftop patios would increase the value of the townhomes because it would afford ocean views. It would also afford views onto all our patios/decks and household windows in the neighbourhood, causing a significant loss of privacy for the rest of us. It would also create a large shadow for the properties directly adjacent to it. This property is currently zoned single residential which matches the single home properties directly across from it on Stayte, on the Surrey side of Stayte/160th Street. Residents have agreed to increased density but not 3 stories. This does not fit in with our neighbourhood. I believe opposition to this project would drop if the developer listened to us and designed townhomes that were 2 stories with rooftop patios.

The planning department quite rightly commented that this location is situated between an elementary school and a high school and it has a bus stop in front of it for an express bus to Vancouver during work hours. Would this area be better suited for more moderately priced townhomes that can be filled with working families that presumably could not afford property with an ocean view. Who is the developer planning to sell the townhomes to? If it is investors or rich retirees are these the people White Rock needs to draw in? We have a plethora of high rise condos aimed at that demographic already; townhouses (if affordable) would hopefully attract more young families. Let's build something that will diversify our population and keep it a family oriented city with residents that are engaged in our community and view it as a home and not an investment.

I believe the planning department's assessment of traffic and parking are inaccurate. Having lived here 20+ years I can attest to increased traffic and parking issues especially on north/south roads exiting to 16th Avenue since the opening of the 16th Avenue interchange for highway 99. Traffic will increase on the surrounding streets as people "loop" around Thrift and Stevens to reach North Bluff rather than attempt a left hand turn onto Stayte Road. This entails cars crossing a crosswalk used by elementary students accessing the Peace Arch Elementary sports fields. We already see this with residents of the Arcadia next door to the proposed development. Also parking is increasingly becoming an issue as the neighbourhood turns over and younger residents try to make mortgage payments with helper suites as they move into the neighbourhood and new infill homes all seem to have secondary suites as well.

Regarding the praising of this development's climate improvements to lower GHG emissions, these are of course commendable factors but these improvements should be standard for all new builds in White Rock considering the climate crisis we all face. This in itself is not reason enough to accept this proposal. Our city should demand this environmental standard for any proposal that goes forward.

I disagree with the planning department's recommendation of this proposal. This is not a case of nimbyism but a community requesting, for a third time, that density should be reasonable and not impinge on the surrounding residents' enjoyment of their own property.

For these reasons I believe you should reject this developer's proposals until they accept that for this neighbourhood, three stories is too high, two stories would be more acceptable. I understand that they want to make money on their

development, but their desire to profit is not the problem of the local citizens and council and should not come at the expense of my neighbourhood.

Best regards,

Christine McGurrin

White Rock, BC