

PRESENT: Mayor Forster
Councillor Anderson
Councillor Coleridge
Councillor Ferguson
Councillor McLean
Councillor Peddemors

REGRETS: Councillor Todd

STAFF: P. Clark, City Manager
T. Penney, Director, Corporate Services
S. Richardson, Director, Development Services
S. Kurylo, Director, Financial Services

2007-415 Agenda

1. AGENDA APPROVAL

RESOLVED THAT the Agenda for The Corporation of the City of White Rock Special Council Meeting scheduled for October 1, 2007 be adopted as circulated.

M/S/C

2. COMBINED PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC MEETING

2.1 BYLAW 1816 AND DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 290 – 1406, 1416, 1426 JOHNSTON ROAD AND 15241 THRIFT AVENUE

The Mayor introduced the Bylaw and Permit and read the following descriptions of the Bylaw and Permit:

BYLAW NO. 1816

The purpose of this bylaw is to amend the existing CD-17 Comprehensive Development 17) Zone of White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 1999, No. 1591, as amended, to allow for the incorporation of an additional thirty-one (31) residential units, and a reduction in the number of parking stalls from 242 to 211 at 1406, 1416, 1426 Johnston Road and 15241 Thrift Avenue.

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 290

The purpose of the permit is to allow for review of form and character amendments to Development Permit No. 276 associated with minor design modifications to both buildings at 1406, 1416, 1426 Johnston Road and 15241 Thrift Avenue.

The Director of Development Services provided a review of the proposed zoning bylaw amendment and development permit.

Correspondence/Submissions:

The Director of Corporate Services reported that the following submissions were received:

- Councillor Todd – General Comments
- White Rock Ratepayers' Association – Negative

Hard copies of the correspondence were provided to members of Council and made available to the public.

The Mayor then called for speakers from the public.

SPEAKERS' LIST:

The record notes that every effort has been made to verify the correct spelling and addresses of the speakers; however, we apologize if any person's name or address has been incorrectly recorded.

(a) Jacqueline Twa, 863 Maple Street, White Rock

Ms. Twa indicated that she is a member of the City's Advisory Design Panel and as such she has tried to stay away from public comment. She argued that most negative elements of this application could be fixed, and emphasized that since the City has approved high rises for the downtown core, there needs to be careful livability considerations regarding the buildings surrounding the Bosa development. Ms. Twa pointed out issues with the directional facing of the proposed building, and said that there is now an opportunity to have buildings face one another and create a plaza. She suggested that the developer has ignored the livability discussion in favour of affordability and maximizing density, making particular note of the amendment proposal to remove street-level townhomes in favour of boxed-in apartments. She compared this style to the more open Yaletown townhomes with street-level entrances. She indicated that adding apartments and removing parking is not a positive change, and that the City should ensure that the Town Centre is a positive environment that people are proud to live in. She disagreed with removing the parking and emphasized the importance of livability.

(b) Kenneth Jones, 15761 Goggs Avenue, White Rock

Mr. Jones fully supported Ms. Twa's comments. He referenced a previous proposal from the same developer that had been previously rejected by the community and the Council due to its

density, and said that he was glad to see the current proposed amendment has not returned to that level of density. He indicated that 146 units are going to be incorporated into the space, which itself is an area that should be transitioning down to three stories. He indicated that the City's OCP has identified a need for jobs and office space in the Town Centre and that more density is not needed. Mr. Jones argued that the developers should be rethinking this proposal, and that they must think Council and the community are "fools."

(c) **Mike Kovacsics, 14877 Buena Vista, White Rock**

Mr. Kovacsics reiterated the concerns of the previous two speakers. He argued that if the proposal is approved, the area will be turned into a high-rise ghetto; there is nothing to be gained and it will not make the place vibrant. He claimed that if Council approves the proposal, White Rock will be known by developers as a "push-over" city.

(d) **Michael Von Hausen, Architect, 14562 16A Avenue, Surrey**

Mr. Von Hausen indicated that he was working on behalf of the project proponents and he was present to answer any questions.

(d) **Susan Potzold – 943 Ash Street**

Ms. Potzold expressed her shock at the proposal. She indicated that she visits a doctor in the area, and that it is already difficult to find parking; she is very worried about what parking accessibility will be like if parking spaces are reduced. She referenced the similar proposal presented in the fall of 2006, and expressed her great disappointment at the street-level entrance apartments being gone.

Following the conclusion of the formal speakers list, the Mayor called three times for additional speakers and hearing none, the Mayor declared the public hearing for Bylaw No. 1816 and the public meeting for Development Permit 290 closed.

**2.1.1 BYLAW NO. 1816 AND DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 290
RECOMMENDATIONS**

The City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw No. 1816 is presented for third reading and final adoption. The bylaw received first and second readings on September 17, 2007 and was the subject of a Public Hearing held this evening under Item 2.1.

Development Permit No. 290 is recommended for issuance, and was the subject of a Public Meeting held this evening under Item 2.1

The Director of Development Services provided additional comment on parking, confirming that it meets the zoning bylaw requirements. He further clarified that the two-level townhouse units would be retained in the first phase of the project.

Council discussed this zoning bylaw amendment and requested clarification on the reduction of parking stalls, the bonus density policy relative to whether it was still viable in terms of return to the community, and the increase in proposed units. Council further commented on the livability factor.

2007-416 Bylaw 1816

RESOLVED THAT the City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw No. 1816 be given third reading.

M/S/C

AGAINST: Councillors Coleridge, McLean

2007-417 Bylaw 1816

RESOLVED THAT the City of White Rock Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw No. 1816 be finally adopted.

M/S/C

AGAINST: Councillors Coleridge, McLean

2007-418

SUBSEQUENT MOTION #1:

RESOLVED THAT Council directs the administration to review the density bonus criteria and bring forward changes as part of the OCP process.

M/S

NOT VOTED

The Director of Development Services observed that if a comprehensive review was to take place, additional resources would be required.

2007-419

SUBSEQUENT MOTION #2:

RESOLVED THAT the Subsequent Motion #1 regarding a density bonus review be referred to staff for a cost estimate and report back.

M/S/C

2007-420 DP 290

RESOLVED THAT staff be authorized to issue Development Permit No. 290.

M/S/C

AGAINST: Councillors Coleridge and McLean

3. PUBLIC MEETINGS

3.1 DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 291 – 1122 VIDAL STREET

The Mayor introduced the Permit and read the following description of the Permit:

The purpose of this permit is to allow for review of the form and character of a proposed four (4) storey mixed-use development consisting of 250m² (2690ft²) of commercial space and six (6) residential units at 1122 Vidal Street. This permit also allows a maximum permitted height of 11.8m (38.7ft), a front and exterior side yard setback of 0.6m (2ft), six (6) residential parking spaces and three (3) commercial parking spaces.

The Director of Development Services provided a review of the proposed development permit.

Correspondence/Submissions:

The Director of Corporate Services reported that the following submissions were received:

- Councillor Matt Todd – Support
- Doug E. Lachance – Support
- White Rock Business Improvement Association – Support
- Sharon Deveau, Owner/President, Assist 2 Sell, New Options Realty – Support

Hard copies of the correspondence were provided to members of Council and made available to the public.

The Mayor then called for speakers from the public.

SPEAKERS' LIST:

The record notes that every effort has been made to verify the correct spelling and addresses of the speakers; however, we apologize if any person's name or address has been incorrectly recorded.

(a) Paul Rust, 19579 5th Avenue, White Rock

Mr. Rust identified himself as the architect for the project. He indicated that he was at a huge disadvantage this evening since technical difficulties prevented him from being able to present his material. He requested that the matter be postponed until the technical problems could be resolved. He indicated that they have a model and boards, but these do not do justice to the project. He emphasized that he, as requested, went back to the people

regarding the review of the design changes, and claimed that without the presentation material, he would prefer to cancel it because he is not in a suitable position to address concerns and arguments against the project.

(b) Larry Anshell, 1122 Vidal Street and owner of Turtle Recording Studios

Mr. Anshell indicated that he and the other proponents of the project feel at a disadvantage because they are unable to make their prepared presentation to Council and therefore they believe there is a great deal of misinformation. He expressed his desire for the meeting to be reconvened when they can present their material. He then indicated that the project commenced in February 2007, with an open house that was attended by 13 people. Four letters were received at that time, three of which were from Gordon Hammond, Martin Jevans, and Peter Johnson. Mr. Hammond's letter said that the proposal was attractive in appearance and an asset to neighborhood and with a maximum height of 35 feet it will not affect others. Mr. Jevans congratulated the proponents on cleaning up the corner and expressed appreciation of the parking solutions. Mr. Johnson's letter indicated that the proposal appears to be an improvement to White Rock and that he liked the green roof and parking. Mr. Anshell indicated that after the open house, the next step was the Advisory Design Panel in April 2007, where they were given unanimous support for the design. The next step, which took place on June 11, 2007, was a Public Hearing where a number of people commented that their views would be blocked. Mr. Anshell emphasized that the proposal is at 38.5 feet and that is lower than the Boathouse (Restaurant) and that the development would therefore not block views. He referenced concerns that no building should be allowed to go over height, and pointed out that the property is zoned CS1, which allows 35 feet. All the other zoning in the area is for a maximum height of 30 feet. He indicated that the proposal is behind the Boathouse parking lot and for parking to be included they would need to construct parking underground. He argued that the building is aesthetically pleasing, and to off-set the parking four floors are required. He indicated that when the proposal was turned down last year, it was without an opportunity to make a presentation to Council. He and the other proponents arranged a meeting with neighbours and contacted everyone on the speakers' list. Mr. Anshell also obtained access to 14954 Beach View (owned by Jay Hutchinson) and a property across the street (owned by Pierre Jourdenais), and he noted that the proposal was not blocking their views. A public meeting was

held at Turtle Recording Studio, but Mr. Anshell expressed regret that he couldn't get the neighbors involved; he would have liked more input. He then stated that the building was redesigned; it was lowered a couple of feet, and the mechanical works were removed from the roof. Mr. Anshell again expressed his concern that he and the other proponents are at a disadvantage because they cannot show their presentation. He emphasized that the building is a high-quality, aesthetically pleasing design, and it is the gateway to Marine Drive. He again requested that Council delay the decision.

(c) **Richard Main, 14967 Victoria Avenue, White Rock**

Mr. Main indicated that when he moved to White Rock he was advised of the building guidelines. He argued that the developers know what they are allowed to build, and expressed his frustration that the issue has come before Council again. He emphasized that he opposes the proposal.

(d) **Al Campbell, 1156 Vidal Street, White Rock**

Mr. Campbell expressed his surprise at this proposal, since in 2006 Council had given a clear message that the proposal needs to adhere to the 35-foot limit in the zoning bylaw. He argued that the proposal is really 38.9 feet, and suggested that the developer is a "variance predator." He claimed that every developer wants more density, but that developers of single-family residences have to abide by the requirements. Every building around the proposal is zoned to a maximum of 30 feet, and Mr. Campbell argued that the developers are incorrect when they claim the proposal is 38 feet, since there are items on the roof. He referenced the Boathouse height variance, and indicated that the only other building above 30 feet in the area, which is the muffler shop at 35 feet. He urged the developers to build three floors instead, and claimed that the developers are taking advantage of C2 zoning and looking for 6 parking spaces for 4 units. He emphasized that they have to abide by the requirements, like the other buildings in the area. Mr. Campbell referenced the picture on-screen and indicated it was not clear enough and that the pictures are not adequate to portray the proposal. He urged the developers to build at 35 feet, and expressed his frustration at having to come to this Council meeting and defend the City against the "variance predator." He again emphasized that the requirements need to be adhered to, and urged Council to deny the proposal unless the proponents can build within 35 feet.

(e) Rosie Bratovenski, 14946 Buena Vista, White Rock

Ms. Bratovenski indicated that she gave public input at a meeting in June regarding this property, and is now surprised that the proposal is proceeding when Council had directed the developer to design the building according to the requirements in the zoning bylaw. She emphasized that she will lose part of her view, and questioned why the building hasn't been redesigned since that was Council's direction at the initial meeting. She said that the aesthetics of the building should not have an effect on whether or not the bylaw is followed, and that the whole situation has been driven by profits. She argued that since the developer knew the requirements, he should build somewhere else, and that citizens should not have to "beg" Council to enforce the zoning bylaw. Ms. Bratovenski indicated that parking is a concern, since she has to park on the street already, and with the increasing density it will become more difficult to obtain parking. She concluded by emphasizing that she has nothing against the building itself, but that it should not be built on this lot because it contravenes the restrictions of the zoning bylaw.

(f) Ingo Herysz, 14960 Buena Vista, White Rock

Mr. Herysz expressed his opinion that the line of sight and the view of Marine Drive are both important. He would like to see balloons floated in order to get a sense of the proposed height. He indicated that the Boathouse has already impacted his view, as it has for many of his neighbours, and emphasized that buildings should adhere to the zoning bylaw.

(h) Jacqueline Twa, 863 Maple Street, White Rock

Ms. Twa said that she and her husband keep track of all additional development in the beach area. She indicated that the beach is very significant to them, as it is to everyone else in White Rock. She finds the "flatiron" building beautiful, and compared the proposed development to the flatiron buildings in New York or Chicago. She expressed her view that the gain of this beautiful building with large suites outweighs the issue of the additional 3 feet and the "loss" of view of the back of the Boathouse. She indicated that the additional feet and pleasing building are far better than "another ugly box."

(i) Pierre Jourdenais, 1119 Vidal Street, White Rock

Mr. Jourdenais questioned whether the proposed building really is as beautiful as the developers are claiming, since they do not have their presentation available. He indicated that CS1 is 4994 square

feet and the proposed 4800-square feet and two feet of additional height is too much. He referenced the high-density peat soil in the area, and issues of parking. He indicated that the developers entered his residence and said that the development would not block his view. He said the developers are requesting CS1 zoning and contravening the bylaw. He suggested that they could build in CS2 zoning, as others have, and stated that they are saving money by building to four storeys. He expressed his disagreement with the developers' idea of introducing tinted bronze windows, since that reflective wall will shine directly into his residence and down to Marine Drive, thus impacting his privacy. He expressed his view that parking is problematic already. Mr. Jourdenais argued that they are not proposing a development, they are "imposing" a development illegally in order to make more money and inflict a burden on taxpayers. He questioned whether the City has a designer, and why such a project would be accepted. He again reiterated his opinion that the project should be zoned CS2. He argued that already there is no parking and that the streets are dirty, and questioned what the taxes are going towards. He concluded by claiming that many citizens are annoyed at the "over-sizing" of White Rock.

(j) Mary MacDonald, 14877 Buena Vista, White Rock

Ms. MacDonald expressed her concerns that the proposal will negatively affect views because it is too tall. She referenced the Boathouse development and does not want to see such amendments made again in the community. She stated that the new building should be the same height as the Boathouse, so as not to affect views.

(k) Geoff Lloyd, 7 – 14985 Victoria Avenue, White Rock

Mr. Lloyd indicated that he is the owner and broker of Seaside Realty, and expressed his view that the project should be turned down. He stated that it was ridiculous for Council to allow three extra feet, and argued that this proposal was simply a way to make money "on the backs of White Rock residents." He stated that the property was purchased for \$279,000.

(l) Rod Comris, 14981 Victoria Avenue, White Rock

Mr. Comris indicated that although he lived in Coquitlam, he was one of the landlords of 14981 Victoria Avenue and felt it was important to travel to White Rock this evening to voice his opinion on the proposal. He indicated that he visits the rental property on a regular basis, and his issues are related to the view, since the

proposal will affect the sight lines. He stated that if he was building, he would have to abide by the guidelines. He then emphasized that parking is also an important issue, since there is no driveway and residents therefore have to rely on street parking. He argued that the lack of City parking enforcement in the area places creates competition for parking among residents. Due to this problem, he expressed his belief that requests for parking variances should never be given. He further suggested that variances on the setback would lead to fire, access, and garbage collection issues in the narrow corridor. He then stated that the height will impact his sight line.

(m) Mike Kovacsics, 14877 Buena Vista, White Rock

Mr. Kovacsics expressed his regret that the public was not able to see the full presentation, but felt that the picture projected on the large screen would suffice. He referenced Council's approval of the Boathouse's height several years ago. He expressed his view that the current proposal looks like a big square block, and that it should stay within the 35 foot height limit. He argued that money is the main motivation for the height increase, and urged Council not to "roll over" and give in to a proposal that would ruin the lifestyle in the neighbourhood. He indicated that Council has never addressed a view-blockage bylaw and that Council abolished the hedge bylaw on some legal advice. He concluded by emphasizing that Council should be protecting citizen lifestyles and respecting the environment by adhering to the rules.

(n) Paul Rust, Architect, 19579 5th Avenue, White Rock *(the record notes that Mr. Rust's disk was now working and the presentation was shown)*

Mr. Rust explained that their guiding principle was to design a building of the highest quality and one never seen before. The first presentation was not satisfactory, and Council asked them to consult with the public and redesign. He further explained that after public consultation, they concluded that the original design was the best for the site with the following modifications: a reduced height variance, mechanical units were removed from the roof, and a green roof was introduced. Furthermore, the plinth has been reduced and the retail floor level has been made level with the sidewalk. Mr. Rust also referenced the lantern shape at the corner, which is an important building strength, and the use of real stone on the lower walls and the tower of the lantern and brick veneer in the other wall areas. His presentation showed the following features: elevations in relationship to the Boathouse; various 4-story residences; an 11-foot retaining wall; the site plan with a rebuilt walkway and access to parking elevator. Mr. Rust explained

that underground parking was affected by two factors: the peat soil (to be removed) and the small size of the site (which makes a ramp impractical). He further indicated that the underground parking will have an 11-foot ceiling and 6-parking spaces equipped with underground hoists (a stacking car system). There are two 1600-plus square foot suites per floor with access from the lobby, and all suites are wheelchair accessible. The roof plan is for a clean green roof with a skylight, elevator shaft and chimney, and an atrium will be created. There are 9-foot ceilings, thick concrete slabs that contain the vent systems for washer, dryer and a sprinkler system for fire suppression. A concluding slide depicted Beach View currently, and what the height difference would look like, which Mr. Rust argued is minimal. The sightlines on Vidal Street were also shown. Mr. Rust concluded by requesting support of the revised design, since they do not believe that the neighbors' views will be impacted.

(o) Jay Hutchinson, 14954 Beach View, White Rock

Mr. Hutchinson expressed his surprise that the proposal is back before Council, and reiterated his previous position that he is against the proposal because it still does not conform to the zoning bylaw. He argued that the developers have not followed Council's direction; even though they made some revisions, they are still not within City guidelines. He said he appreciates that the developer and architect feel it is a good building, but from his perspective it is too high and too close to the property perimeter. He indicated that he shares Mr. Campbell's concerns and would like to see the developer do what he was directed to do last June.

(p) Ed Flatly, 14965 Marine Drive, White Rock

Mr. Flatly argued that the precedent set by this proposal could be repeated all along Marine Drive, and to allow this height will negatively impact the view up the hill, since half faces the water and half faces the town. He indicated that at the moment, one can barely see the water, and if one more storey is added they will lose the view up the hill. He urged Council to deny the proposal.

(q) Linda Pazold, 14919 Beach View, White Rock

Ms. Pazold indicated that she has lived in White Rock for 40 years and has always loved the view, the ocean, and the City. She expressed her opinion that citizens don't want big towers.

(r) Perry Serron, 14934 Beach View, White Rock

Mr. Serron expressed his surprise that the proposal is back before Council, and reiterated his previous position that the developer should be held to the requirements of the zoning bylaw. He indicated that the proposed building will impact him, as will the lack of parking in the area. He argued that parking in the area is already problematic, and that there needs to be more parking. He expressed his disagreement with the proposal.

(s) Lee Loveridge, 1155 Vidal Street, White Rock

Mr. Loveridge pointed out that out of the past ten speakers, nine have been against the proposal, and questioned why it was before Council again when it is still contravening the zoning bylaw. He indicated that the parking situation is extremely problematic as it is, and if more parking is eliminated and a building is added, the area will be in chaos. He suggested the developers review the parking bylaws, since there is currently not enough parking in the area and they cannot afford to lose more. Mr. Loveridge expressed his view that the proposed development is “just a block” and is not attractive. He again questioned why the developers keep coming back if they are not adhering to the rules, and indicated that it shouldn’t be coming before Council.

(t) Ken Fairweather, 1230 Oxford, White Rock

Mr. Fairweather stated that he is a developer and a relative newcomer to the City. He indicated that he chose his place of residence and paid good money for it, and he is satisfied with the height in the area. He argued that the proposal comes down to profit. He indicated that he did not understand the project’s approach to parking, and expressed his opposition to it.

(u) Andy Hoenisch, 14878 Buena Vista, White Rock

Mr. Hoenisch stated that there is little information on the City’s website regarding the entire development process. He indicated that he heard about this application from neighbours, and that even though he lives slightly west, the added height will restrict his view of Blaine. He requested that Council direct that the height be reduced. He then suggested that the people who buy the property will have two cars each, and that this will have a much heavier impact than the application acknowledges. He urged the developers to respect the OCP and provide more information about what is being built, so as to inform citizens adequately.

- (v) **Pierre Jourdenais, 1119 Vidal Street, White Rock**
Mr. Jourdenais reiterated his concerns about height and parking. He expressed his belief that due to the chimney and the elevator room, the total height will be over fifty feet.
- (w) **Susan Potzold, 943 Ash Street, White Rock**
Ms. Potzold indicated that her view is not impacted by the project, but she is concerned on behalf of others. She expressed the view the developer's motivation is profit, and suggested that Council is taking the developer's perspective more seriously than the citizens'.
- (x) **Moti Bali, 14933 Beachview, White Rock**
Mr. Bali stated that he was a member of the OCP Task Force, which is a body that must adhere to City rules. He emphasized the importance of parking, and indicated that regardless of the possible financial gain of the project, the views of citizens must be taken into account. He stated that the people should be assured that their views/sight lines will not be negatively impacted. He expressed his wish that Council make a decision for the good of the people.
- (y) **Linda Pazold, 14919 Beachview, White Rock.**
Ms. Pazold urged Council not to destroy the peace of White Rock.
- (z) **Mr. McLeod, 15025 Victoria Avenue, White Rock**
Mr. McLeod indicated that many of his concerns have been stated already, and suggested that as a resident of Victoria Terrace, his comments could be made on behalf of the other residents in that building. He expressed concern about the impact on views, and suggested that Council instruct staff to do a visual impact analysis of the whole area.
- (aa) **Rod Comris, 14981 Victoria Avenue, White Rock**
Mr. Comris stated that the building height will be 40.7 feet, including the top of the elevator shaft. He expressed several concerns regarding the availability of parking for residents and visitors, including the problem of the stackable system and whether larger vehicles would fit into it.
- (bb) **Barry Bateman, 14986 Beach View, White Rock**
Mr. Bateman stated that houses were built beside his, and this restricted parts of his view. He indicated that he enjoyed the White

Rock atmosphere when he first moved, but with the encroachment of commercial buildings along Marine Drive, the trees and residential units are disappearing.

(cc) Dave Chesney, 1080 Martin Street, White Rock

Mr. Chesney stated that he has known Larry Anshell for 25 years and that the proposal will not affect his view. He emphasized that Mr. Anshell has made many attempts to engage in dialogue. He expressed his belief that the building will revitalize the area. He acknowledged that parking may be a problem, but suggested that this is no different from the neighbouring areas. He argued that sightlines and views will not be impacted, and said that it is a beautiful building. He further indicated that the developers have tried to work with the community, but it appears that citizens would rather engage in debate here (in the Council meeting) and “gang up” on the developers. He was under the impression that a notice was sent to the neighbors. Mr. Chesney then acknowledged that the height increase of three feet may set precedent, and made reference to the OCP and the Bosa development. He concluded by reiterating that the building is beautiful and will bring life to the area.

(dd) Al Campbell, 1156 Vidal Street, White Rock

Mr. Campbell stated that the only people invited to attend the developer’s meeting were the people that spoke against it at the previous meeting. He questioned why they should negotiate with the developer when he had already heard their unanimous concerns. He reiterated his position that the development should remain within the 35 foot limit.

(ee) Perry Serron, 14934 Beach View, White Rock

Mr. Serron indicated that he was contacted by the developer but did not attend an open house. In looking at the architectural rendering, he expressed his belief that the building would be very attractive. He indicated that he does not oppose it if it stays within existing parameters.

(ff) Tory Niments, 1468 Prospect Avenue, White Rock

Mr. Niments indicated that he is new to White Rock, and that his view will not be severely impacted and that he is satisfied with parking. He expressed concern about the variance itself, and stated that the requirements of the bylaws should be met. He further indicated that when he built his house, he had to comply with the requirements and therefore believes that businesses can and will

adjust to meet those same requirements. He reiterated that if he, as a resident, has to follow the rules, then the developers should as well.

(gg) Larry Anschell, 1122 Vidal Street, White Rock

Mr. Anschell clarified that he was requesting the height variance in order to build a high quality building that is upscale in style and aesthetics. He argued that the height has already been reduced as much as possible, and clarified that the property was purchased in 1998 for twice the amount that was quoted earlier in the evening (see Speaker (j)). He emphasized that they knew that the building was flawed when they purchased it, but they believed they could make it last an additional ten years before developing. He then stated that it has now been ten years, and the present building needs to come down. He suggested that if the City prefers a parking lot instead of an attractive building, then they (Mr. Anschell and the developers) could construct that. He indicated that he has done his best, and wants to improve the area for retail businesses. He concluded that he and the developers have presented all the facts, and that they have a vision for the area. He respects the fact that others have a different viewpoint, but hopes that the vision will be shared by White Rock's citizens.

Following the conclusion of the formal speakers list the Mayor called three times for additional speakers and hearing none the Mayor declared the public meeting for Development Permit No. 291 closed.

The Director Development Services provided clarification on the following issues: general parking; limitations on height; whether the lifting of a parking option can be enforced; commercial parking; and the impact of the ocean floodplain.

SUBSEQUENT MOTION #3

2007-421 DP 291

RESOLVED THAT the issue be tabled for two weeks to consider what the people have said tonight.

M/S

DEFEATED

**AGAINST: Mayor Forster, Councillors McLean,
Coleridge, and Peddemors**

2007-422 DP 291

RESOLVED THAT staff be authorized to issue Development Permit No. 291.

M/S

DEFEATED

**VOTING AGAINST: Mayor Forster,
Councillors Coleridge, McLean,
Peddemors, and Ferguson**

2007-423 DP 291

SUBSEQUENT MOTION #4

RESOLVED THAT Council recognize and appreciate the input by residents and the developer to air the concerns;

AND THAT Council encourages the developer to bring forth a development with all the concerns met.

M/S/C

2007-424 Agenda Amendment

SUBSEQUENT MOTION #5

RESOLVED THAT Item 3.3 (Development Permit No. 293) be brought forward;

AND THAT the meeting be extended to 11:00 p.m.

M/S/C

**3.3 BROUGHT FORWARD: DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT
NO. 293 – 13808 MARINE DRIVE**

The Mayor introduced the Permit and read the following description of the Permit:

The purpose of this permit is to vary White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 1999, No. 1591, as amended, to permit a proposed accessory building to be located to the front of the principal building on the lot at 13808 Marine Drive.

The Director of Development Services provided a review of the proposed development variance permit.

Correspondence/Submissions:

The Director of Corporate Services reported that no correspondence or submissions had been received.

The Mayor called three times for speakers and, hearing none, declared the public meeting for Development Variance Permit 293 closed.

2007-425 DVP 293

RESOLVED THAT staff be authorized to issue Development Variance Permit No. 293.

M/S/C

3.2 DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 292 – 14955 VICTORIA AVENUE

The Mayor introduced the Permit and read the following description of the Permit:

The purpose of this permit is to allow for review of the form and character of a proposed six (6) storey mixed-use development consisting of 74.7m² (804 ft²) of commercial space and nineteen (19) residential units at 14955 Victoria Avenue. This permit also allows a driveway width of 3.6m (12ft) and a fascia sign to project 20.32cm (8 inches) from the building face.

The Director of Development Services provided a review of the proposed development permit.

Correspondence/Submissions:

The Director of Corporate Services reported that the following submissions were received:

- Councillor Matt Todd – General Comments

Hard copies of the correspondence were provided to members of Council and made available to the public.

The Mayor then called for speakers from the public.

SPEAKERS' LIST:

The record notes that every effort has been made to verify the correct spelling and addresses of the speakers; however, we apologize if any person's name or address has been incorrectly recorded.

(a) Richard Main, 14697 Victoria Avenue, White Rock

Mr. Main stated that he has lived in White Rock since 1989 and that he followed the requirements when he built his property. He argued that the elevations being used for the height of the building are only estimates, and clarified that the Building Code means natural grade (prior to any alteration) as determined by a BC Land Surveyor. He questioned how to obtain the correct topography and claimed that the natural grade is flawed. He then indicated that his property will be "buried" by this building. He referenced lower height limits in surrounding properties (30 feet or 35 feet). He objected to the use of archived elevation estimates and emphasized that 30 feet should be the height limit, according to the bylaw, but that the bylaw is too ambiguous. He compared his diagrams to the developer's, and questioned the accuracy of the developer's. He concluded by offering to answer any questions.

- (b) **Moti Bali, 14933 Beach View Avenue, White Rock**
The public hearing was advised that he had departed.
- (c) **Julie Lefever, 15015 Victoria Avenue, White Rock**
Ms. Lefever indicated that many of her concerns have been stated already. She stated that she has been a White Rock resident for 35 years and bought a Marine Drive property because she loves the view. She indicated that she has been amenable to the 30 foot height restriction in the beach area, and at first thought that the proposed four storeys of this application would not be too bad. However, she reconsidered this opinion after learning about average natural grade and the six storeys.
- (d) **Susan MacDonald, 15015 Victoria Avenue, White Rock**
Ms. MacDonald stated that she is president of a strata on Victoria Avenue. On behalf of the strata, she expressed her opposition to the height because of the impact on views and the precedent-setting nature of such a variance.
- (e) **Al Campbell, 1156 Vidal Street, White Rock**
Mr. Campbell stated that the property in question is zoned C2, which is unique in the City. He expressed his understanding that the intent of C2 zoning is to mix commercial and residential and that the buildings shall not exceed 30 feet. He referenced the Boathouse, and compared the flat lot to the flat parking lot on Victoria; he indicated his belief that this similarity is why the property was zoned C2. He emphasized that the proposal should stay within the 30 foot height limit of C2 zoning.
- (f) **Rosie Bratovenski, 14946 Buena Vista, White Rock**
Ms. Bratovenski felt she and others had not been sufficiently informed of these development applications. She questioned why the City has bylaws, if so many developers are contravening them. She stated that she did not want to live in a place like West Vancouver, and emphasized that she is very opposed to this application.
- (g) **Ingo Herysz, 14960 Buena Vista, White Rock**
Mr. Herysz stated that this proposal will impact his view, which has already been restricted by trees. He expressed his strong opposition to the application.
- (h) **Pierre Jourdenais, 1119 Vidal Street, White Rock**
The public hearing was advised that he had departed.

- (i) **Mary Macdonald, 14877 Buena Vista, White Rock**
Ms. MacDonald expressed her opinion that a six storey building is “terrifying” and that the precedent is a slippery slope.
- (j) **Kenneth Jones, 15761 Goggs Avenue, White Rock**
Mr. Jones expressed his concern about the aesthetics of this proposal, and how it would look with the surrounding buildings. He argued that the project will block all the views from the hill, since it rises for six storeys then flattens out. He questioned why Council has not demanded that development be of a similar design all the way to the bottom in order to allow everyone to have a view. He suggested that driveways will be hazardous, and expressed the opinion that this project is “deplorable.” He also raised issues of accessibility for persons with visual impairment.
- (k) **Rod Comris, 14981 Victoria Avenue, White Rock**
Mr. Comris reiterated the height concerns, and argued that six storeys are totally out of character for the neighbourhood. He indicated that parking will be an issue and that the development will have a negative impact on his property.

SUBSEQUENT MOTION #6

2007-426 Meeting extension

RESOLVED THAT Council move to extend the time for another thirty minutes.

M/S/C

- (l) **Jay Hutchinson, 14954 Beach View Avenue, White Rock**
Mr. Hutchinson stated that he lives directly behind this development and if it is approved, his property will face the back of the building. He expressed disbelief that the City’s bylaws would allow a 76-foot building on this lot, and concern about the precedent that could be set if the development is approved. He argued that the building is out of character with the area, and indicated that the density is too high. He also referenced parking problems and expressed his overall frustration with the application.
- (m) **Perry Serron, 14934 Beach View Avenue, White Rock**
Mr. Serron expressed his agreement with the previous speakers. He indicated that he will be directly impacted by the building and that it will remove his view. He expressed his strong opposition.

- (n) **Rod MacLeod, 306 Victoria Terrace, White Rock**
The public hearing was advised that he had departed.
- (o) **David Vernon, 501 15025 Victoria Avenue, White Rock**
Mr. Vernon expressed his opposition to the application, since the project will result in property increase only for one owner – the developer. He further argued that views will be impacted, thus resulting in a lower market value for other properties. He expressed concern regarding the precedent that will be set, and contended that Council should be consistent and fair in protecting sea views.
- (p) **Mark Ankenman, Architect, 13102 – 13th Avenue, Surrey**
Mr. Ankenman, the architect for the project, indicated that he would not comment on height, since that was done by a surveyor. He stated that he used what he was given and followed all the bylaws; all of the development is within the zoning bylaw's height, width and density provisions. With respect to form and character, Mr. Ankenman acknowledged the public's concerns but pointed out that many people had not seen the building (an image of the area was then shown on the screens). Mr. Ankenman argued that currently there is nothing in the area conducive to a positive pedestrian experience, and that this proposal would correct that by incorporating trees and decorative paving. He indicated that his organization had received positive comments on the building when it was last presented, and that some design modifications have been made to improve the driveway and walk-in areas. He addressed concerns regarding views by referencing the portrayal of surrounding building elevations in comparison with this one. He indicated that the roof will be green.
- (r) **Andy Hoenisch, 14878 Buena Vista, White Rock**
Mr. Hoenisch stated that the building does not fit into the character of the neighbourhood, and expressed his disbelief that the application has proceeded this far. He indicated that this process is a slippery slope, and that he cannot believe Council is considering it. He then suggested that, due to the late hour and speakers having left, the meeting should be adjourned and reconvened on Tuesday, October 9.
- (s) **Mike Kovacsics, 14877 Buena Vista, White Rock**
Mr. Kovacsics stated that "the community said that the development on Marine Drive would be 3-story." He then argued that properties behind the building will experience market value

losses due to the impact on views, which should be compensated by the developers. He emphasized the importance of views, and questioned the value of the proposal.

(t) Susan Potzold – 943 Ash Street, White Rock

Ms. Potzold stated that before the previous election, Councillor Anderson and Mayor Forster advocated for the Bosa development, but she (Ms. Potzold) felt worried because of the potential impact on residents through loss of views and lack of sunlight. She indicated that she was told views would be not in jeopardy, and emphasized how important views are. She expressed her opposition to the six storey building.

(u) Bob Yearsley, Owner of Applicant Property

Mr. Yearsley argued that this development will not affect anyone's views, and expressed his opinion that many of the comments made are not relevant to what has been presented to Council. He referenced the average grade issue and indicated that the original parts of the lot are still there, and that they have made every effort to adhere to the rules.

SUBSEQUENT MOTION #7

2007-427 Adjournment

RESOLVED THAT the public hearing for Development Permit No. 292 be adjourned and reconvened on October 9, 2007.

M/S/C

5. CLOSURE

The Chair declared the meeting closed at 11:20 p.m.

Mayor Forster, Chair

Tina Penney
Director, Corporate Services