

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

STAFF: P. Clark, City Manager
S. Campbell, Committee Clerk
S. Kurylo, Director, Finance
S. Richardson, Director, Development Services

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

Procedural Note: Items 1, 2, 2.1, 2.1.1, 3, 3.1, and 3.3 were dealt with at the Special Meeting of City Council held on October 1, 2007.

1. AGENDA APPROVAL

Completed on October 1, 2007

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**

Completed on October 1, 2007

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

Completed on October 1, 2007

3. PUBLIC MEETINGS

3.1 DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 291 – 1122 VIDAL STREET

Completed on October 1, 2007

**3.2 DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 292 – 14955 VICTORIA
AVENUE**

The Public Meeting for Development Permit No. 292 was adjourned on October 1, 2007, and was reconvened this evening in order to ensure that all those on the Speakers' List have the opportunity to speak. The Mayor re-introduced the Permit and read the following description:

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.

Additional correspondence was received from:

- White Rock Business Improvement Area – Support
- Danny G. Boyd – Negative
- Julie LeFevre – Against
- Bob Yearsley – Support

Copies of the correspondence were provided to members of Council and, in the case of the first three items, made available to the public meeting. All items are filed with the original minutes.

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) **Moti Bali, 14933 Beach View Avenue, White Rock**
The meeting was advised that he was not present.
- (b) **Pierre Jourdenais, 1119 Vidal Street, White Rock**
Using pictures on the overhead projector, Mr. Jourdenais expressed concerns regarding a future loss of views and privacy if the project goes ahead.
- (c) **Rod MacLeod, 306 Victoria Terrace, White Rock**
Mr. MacLeod indicated that he wished to speak specifically to the request for six storeys. He stated that when he purchased a property in Victoria Terrace, he was assured that nothing over three storeys would be build in front, but that this is now appearing to change. He urged Council to consider that approval of this development may encourage businesses to rebuild at six to eight storeys, which would impact the views.
- (d) **Richard Main, 14697 Victoria Avenue, White Rock**
Mr. Main stated that he, like Mr. MacLeod, had been reassured about the height limitations of C2 zoning. He expressed his belief that approval of this project would have long-term repercussions that would “come back to bite Council” since the estimated topography levels are not robust. He indicated that the City cannot be run on

estimated heights. He urged Council to deny the permit because it contravenes the height restrictions in C2 zoning.

(e) **Bob Yearsley, 1185 Oxford Street, White Rock – Owner of Applicant Property**

Mr. Yearsley indicated that he is proposing to develop the property according to the law and the zoning bylaw. He stated that since the adjourned public meeting on October 1, they have floated some balloons to estimate heights, and provided results to the Main Sail Strata Council. He stated that there was erroneous information presented on October 1 and expressed his wish to correct it. He indicated that he and the developers have been working on the proposal for a long time and believe the development will not adversely affect the neighbors. He further indicated that neighbors to the north have been forewarned for many years about this development, and that the property to the east will be redeveloped shortly and is zoned for higher density in the OCP; as such, those views will be changing. Mr. Yearsley then emphasized that his proposal does not request any major variances. He indicated that they are considering making the ramp access smaller so as to remain within the bylaw's constraints and reduce the total overall frontage parking access. The traffic will be controlled by traffic lights and the garage doors will be discretely covered. Overall, he emphasized that the building meets all requirements and regulations of the bylaws and the OCP. He referenced the height concerns and indicated that he had provided Council with an opinion poll and a letter of support from the BIA.

(f) **Jacqueline Yearsley, 1185 Oxford Street, White Rock – Co-Owner of Applicant Property**

Mrs. Yearsley stated that the proposed development is a wonderful building on BC's "Riviera". She indicated that their lot is unique and that they have had several problems to overcome. She emphasized that the design meets all requirements, and that the pedestrian experience near this "gateway to the beach" will be unique.

(g) **Allan Campbell, 1156 Vidal Street, White Rock**

Mr. Campbell disagreed that the proposed building could be said to meet form and character requirements, since this is decided after approval. He reiterated the height concerns, and the Boathouse variance. He referred to the "archived elevation" and questioned whether it was

accepted by the City and how the 30-foot height limit was doubled. He stated that the proposed building is massive and could not be a gateway to the waterfront. He indicated that he would resort to legal means to resolve the issue if there is a glitch or loophole in the zoning bylaw. He concluded by urging Council to deny the application.

(h) Mary Macdonald, 14877 Buena Vista, White Rock

Ms. MacDonald reiterated the height concerns and her disagreement with a roof garden. She also expressed concern regarding the public process and lack of communication, since there has been anxiety around what they don't know.

(i) Nigel Chivers, 402 – 15025 Victoria Avenue, White Rock

Mr. Chivers indicated that he was speaking on behalf of his mother. He quoted from the OCP, noting that one of the goals was to preserve the character of the White Rock waterfront. He referenced the high taxes in the area, and expressed concern that approval of the proposal would create precedent. He expressed his view that the proposed development is motivated from business interests.

(j) Mark Ankenman, 13102 – 13th Avenue, Surrey – Architect for the Property

Mr. Ankenman apologized for not having the opportunity to explain this project in detail to Council earlier, and to the residents for not communicating adequately. A package of information was circulated on table, which included a photograph of the actual scale of the footprint. A site section with the height of the balconies of the houses directly behind the development was also included. Mr. Ankenman pointed out that the balconies can see over the top of the development. He showed several more photos and hypothetical plans in order to demonstrate that the proposal will improve the pedestrian environment and that it complies with all zoning regulations. He concluded by emphasizing that the owners have gone the extra mile to meet the all the requirements of the Planning Department.

(k) Susan Potzold, 943 Ash Street, White Rock

Ms. Potzold reiterated concerns about height and what the real requirements of the zoning bylaw are. She questioned whether the public is being told the truth.

The Director of Development Services clarified that height is taken above the average natural grade and this definition has been accepted by officials in the City for many years. The measurement of height was illustrated on a contour map.

(l) Jay Hutchinson, 14954 Beach View Avenue, White Rock

Mr. Hutchinson stated that the height and size of the proposed development does not fit with the form and character of the surrounding area. He expressed concern that if the project is approved, it will have a catastrophic affect on the area and will undermine the community's connection with the sea and the sky. He expressed concern about a precedent being set.

(m) Amber Bruce, 14791 Victoria Avenue, White Rock

Ms. Bruce expressed concerns about the precedent being set if the project is approved, and the potential future shape of the city. She also referenced traffic concerns.

(n) Denise Grant, 14955 Beach View Avenue, White Rock

Ms. Grant referenced the high taxes she pays for her views, and emphasized that she followed the height restrictions when she rebuilt her property. She indicated that this proposal would look great at the top of the hill.

(o) Johan Sandstrom, White Rock

Mr. Sandstrom expressed the view that the proposal is financially motivated, and that it should be justified to Council before it is approved.

(p) Bud Gardner, 14495 Marine Drive, White Rock

Mr. Gardner stated that he liked the proposed building, but that it should be 3 storeys instead of six. He referenced previous comments made by the Mayor regarding no high rises in the waterfront area.

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

Mr. Jourdenais expressed concern about the "character of the mountain" over the next ten years.

(r) Danielle Fisher, 1119 Vidal Street, White Rock

Ms. Fisher stated that the proposed development will take away from the character of White Rock.

- (s) **Julie Lefevre, #504, 15015 Victoria Avenue, White Rock**
Ms. Lefevre submitted a letter which will be attached to and filed with the materials from the public meeting. The letter was against the proposal.
- (r) **Councillor Coleridge**
Councillor Coleridge reported that five emails were received from Mr. Yearsley, and that these were forwarded to all members of Council.

The record notes that these emails will also be filed with the original minutes.

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 292 closed at 8:09 p.m.

2007-432 DP 292

RESOLVED THAT staff not be authorized to issue Development Permit No 292.

M/S/C

AGAINST: Councillors Ferguson, Anderson

2007-433 DP 292

RESOLVED THAT staff review this area within the context of the Official Community Plan review and bring back options for amendments to City Council and the neighborhood.

M/S/

NOT VOTED

2007-434 DP 292

RESOLVED THAT the above motion be tabled.

M/S/C

AGAINST: Councillors Todd, Coleridge, Peddemors

2007-435 DP 292

RESOLVED THAT because of the concerns raised by the residents and the developer around this development on communication that staff review the process and report back on how to better involve and inform the residents on developments in neighborhoods.

M/S/C

2007-436 DP 292

RESOLVED THAT the issue of measuring height on this property be referred back to staff and look at the issues raised by the public and report back to the Council.

M/S

2007-437 DP 292

AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION:

RESOLVED THAT the phrase “on this property” be deleted and that the phrase “in the C2 zone” be substituted.

M/S/C

The Question was called on the Main Motion as Amended:

CARRIED

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

Completed on October 1, 2007

4. CLOSURE

The Mayor declared the meeting closed at 9:05 p.m.

Mayor Forster, Chair

Tina Penney
Director, Corporate Services