

PRESENT: Mayor Walker
Councillor Chesney
Councillor Fathers
Councillor Johanson
Councillor Kristjanson
Councillor Manning
Councillor Trevelyan

STAFF: D. Bottrill, Chief Administrative Officer
T. Arthur, Director of Corporate Administration
J. Gordon, Director of Engineering and Municipal Operations
C. Johannsen, Director of Planning and Development Services
C. Isaak, Manager of Planning
J. Nyhus, Manager of Buildings and Bylaw Enforcement
S. Lam, Deputy Corporate Officer

Press: 1
Public: 76 (approximately)

The Chairperson called to order the public hearing regarding *Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2210, Amendment No. 1 (1300 Block Johnston Road), 2019, No. 2289* at 7:00 p.m.

The Deputy Corporate Officer read a statement regarding the purpose of Bylaw 2289 and the public hearing / meeting procedure to be followed for both items scheduled for the evening, and advised that the Public Hearings (both) were publicized in the following manner:

- 798 notices mailed to properties within a 100 metre radius of the subject sites;
- Notice was published in the March 1 and 6 editions of the Peace Arch News;
- A copy of the notice was placed on the public notice posting board on February 26, 2019.

The notice included details of **BOTH** Public Hearings for proposed Bylaws 2289 and 2290.

#1) PUBLIC HEARING

BYLAW 2289: **OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW, 2017, NO. 2210, AMENDMENT NO. 1 (1300 BLOCK JOHNSTON ROAD), 2019, NO. 2289**

SUBJECT PROPERTY: **1300 Block of Johnston Road**

The Chairperson invited the Director of Planning and Development Services to introduce the proposed Bylaw amendment.

The Deputy Corporate Officer advised that there were **twenty-eight (28)** submissions received. All submissions were given to Council with respect to Bylaw 2289:

Included in the agenda package for March 11, 2019:

Author	Date Received	Item #
V. Mair	February 17, 2019	C-1
C. Fast	February 19, 2019	C-2
P. Glabush	February 19, 2019	C-3
D. Rothstein	February 13, 2019	C-4
J.B. and M.L Trahan	February 22, 2019	C-5
J. Kline	February 22, 2019	C-6
A. McMullen, UDI & HAVAN	February 22, 2019	C-7
R.M. Hudson	February 24, 2019	C-8
A. Frigon	February 24, 2019	C-9
D. Cox	February 25, 2019	C-10
R. Kirkpatrick	February 25, 2019	C-11
J. Hilts	February 25, 2019	C-12
L. Bjorkinas	February 25, 2019	C-13
T. Herath	February 25, 2019	C-14a
T. Herath	February 25, 2019	C-14b
S. Nightingale	February 27, 2019	C-15a
S. Nightingale	February 27, 2019	C-15b
M. Everaars	February 28, 2019	C-16
M. Aujla	March 4, 2019	C-17
Dr. A G Self & Ms. SDH Di Menna	March 4, 2019	C-18
M. Hamson	March 4, 2019	C-19

Received/presented On Table between 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 6, 2019 and 12:00 p.m. (noon) on Monday, March 11, 2019:

Author	Date Received	Item #
Ram	March 9, 2019	C20
A. Sweet	March 10, 2019	C-21
K. Breaks	March 11, 2019	C-22
J. Moffat	March 11, 2019	C-23
A. Fong	March 11, 2019	C-24
E. and E. Bruaer	March 11, 2019	C-25
L. Walkiw	March 11, 2019	C-26
M. MacDonald	March 11, 2019	C-27
R. Colombin	March 10, 2019	C-28
T. Casola	March 11, 2019	C-29

The Chairperson invited those in attendance to present their comments.

- P. Randhawa, owner of property 1310 Johnston Road, not in support of the proposed bylaw stating there appears to be a rush to amend the Official Community Plan (OCP) for this one (1) city block and stated that the 1310 Johnston Road project is being targeted because the OCP review could have been done without singling out this one (1) block.
- T. Casola, 1310 Johnston Road Architect, Calgary, outlined the approved Development Permit (DP) and reviewed a twelve (12) storey massing, view cone and shadowing impact compared to a six (6) storey massing, view cone and shadowing impact (Power Point presented and is noted as submission No. C-29).
- T. Reid, Calgary, Urban Design Institute (UDI), not in support of the proposed bylaw, stating it sends the wrong message to developers/land owners. The project was approved by a previous Council the approval process must be fair and trusted. Land is purchased according to the OCP. The OCP was adopted less than two (2) years ago and the noted DP was approved less than one (1) year ago. The Applicant worked with the City and amended their proposal thus taking longer to getting their building permit completed for submission.
- G. Wolgemuth, White Rock, not in support of the proposed bylaw, stating concern with the process. The Applicant went through the process and was already approved.
- S. Greyson, Surrey, not in support of the proposed bylaw, stated the applicant went through the City's Advisory Design Panel (ADP), she was a part of the ADP at the time. The applicant worked with the ADP toward their final product and public input was obtained. Concern noted with what is decided now will impact the Community for the future. Stated that population growth is healthy for the community and as there is little space for expansion height is important. Commercial is important too as currently there is not enough useable or rentable space.
- S. Christie, White Rock, in support of the proposed bylaw, participated in the recent OCP process, not clear what happened to the vision, density and west coast styling that was discussed at that time. The public should see what they were informed they would get.
- R. McGuire, White Rock, spoke in support of the proposed bylaw, height in the Town Centre and below Thrift Avenue is of continued concern.
- R. Tracy, White Rock, not in support of the proposed bylaw, Town Centre should permit higher buildings (higher than proposed) giving more opportunity for affordable housing. The OCP is a plan for the future (50 years) to accommodate not just now but foreseeing future needs. Zoning should be the same on both sides of the street.
- L. Atitlan, White Rock, in support of the proposed bylaw would like to see four (4) to six (6) stories below Thrift Avenue (no high-rises) to help with livability. Quality building is also important.
- K. Jones, White Rock, in support of the proposed bylaw, stating less development is needed, the OCP is not what the public were asking for. Concern noted with excavation that is required going below the ground more than one (1) storey. Would like to see a restriction south of Thrift Avenue to two (2) stories - one (1) commercial and the second more commercial or residential thus permitting the

keeping of views. Concern also noted with having high-rises being able to overlook elementary school playgrounds.

- D. McGuire, White Rock, in support of the proposed bylaw, there are a number of high-rises already and there has not been a decrease in property taxes. It is not how many stories built the design without height with the help of a consultant can achieve the needed result.
- S. Greene, White Rock, not in support of the amendment, stating she participated in the City's OCP process and believes she was heard through the process. Stated it was a detailed process and many opportunities for public input and following all of that Council approved it. This process sets the stage for the long term vision of the community, and the vision must be sustainable. The City has a small footprint, the only place to go is up.
- B Chow, Surrey, not in support of the proposed amendment, works for a general contracting company and noted concern with this decision for this process. Stated this is a matter of precedent.
- V. Fulnera, White Rock, in support of the proposed amendment, stating the City does not need more towers. Less density and a vibrant community is important, higher towers does not promote this.
- M. Woods, White Rock, not in support of the amendment noting concern with the process. Not in agreement with variances to the OCP in general. However the previous Council endorsed "pre-zoning" in the Town Centre area, there are fourteen (14) high-rise projects approved it does not make sense to consider removing one (1) project after approval has been given, there needs to be a compromise so the project (1310 Johnston Road) can be a fit into the block.
- J. Schouw, Vancouver, discussed working in the past on the 1310 Johnston Road project with residents, business owners of White Rock, the City's ADP, staff and Council within the 1300 block (1310 Johnston Road) stated it was a long process to determine the right fit for the Lower Johnston Road area. The OCP process undertaken was a long process and not everyone can be made happy. From a design perspective when working with applicants and going back and forth on decisions can result in owners not knowing what they are going to get (uncertainty).
- S. Watkins, White Rock, in support of the proposed amendment, and commended Council for making this effort to move forward in a direction that many in White Rock have been asking for over the years. Concern noted with building on / near the aquifer (impact on the City's water supply). Would like to see three (3) to four (4) stories in the area.
- A. Grey, White Rock, in support of the proposed amendment, would like there to be a limit of height (no high rises) below Thrift Avenue.
- S. Marples, White Rock, BC, not in support of the proposed amendment, stated that she sees this action as going backward, the process has already been completed.
- P. Marek, consultant for the proposal of 1310 Johnston Road, not in support of the proposed amendment, stated that City should be asking how to promote growth. It has been his experience that having more people does generate business for the community. Stated the process appears to be abrupt, within the 1300 block is the proposal for 1310 Johnston Road, it is inappropriate to consider a change that will impact one (1) previously approved proposal.

- B. McGill, White Rock, in support of the proposed amendment and downzoning the remainder the 1300 Block of Johnston Road, stated he'd like to see the height preserved below Thrift Avenue as much as possible.
- K. McIntyre, White Rock, in support of the proposed bylaw, would like to see occupancy as noted in the plans from 2016 be undertaken for the area, does not want high density and stated concern with higher density in regard to water quantity, parking, construction noise and access issues, would like to see a sense of community strengthen and does not think high density promotes that.
- K. Coske, White Rock, in support of the proposed bylaw, noted concerns in regard to higher density with parking, construction and garbage from construction. Stated higher density does not build community and it not necessarily affordable housing and that shopping / commercial is more important / needed than more residential.

Second time speakers:

- G. Wolgemuth, White Rock, not in support of the proposed amendment, commented on the Town Centre already being "pre-zoned" for high rise building. Stated a vacancy tax could satisfy concerns on empty high-rises and noted that the technical information should have come in with the building permit and thus there does not appear to be concern from this perspective.
- D. McGuire, White Rock, in support of the proposed amendment, stated the Town Centre permits high-rises so there should be no further need for additional height below Thrift Avenue.
- K. Jones, White Rock, in support of the proposed amendment, high density is not required in this circumstance does not see an issue with amending the OCP to go down in density / height.
- R. Tracy, White Rock, not in support of the proposed amendment, stated that community high-rises do not take away from community, it is up to people within the community to communicate with each other. Development should occur in the City's Town Centre, development brings the amenities that otherwise may not be available.

The Chairperson called for further speakers to the application / proposed Bylaw 2289 and there was no further response.

As there were no further speakers, the Chairperson **concluded** the Public Hearing for *Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2017, No. 2210, Amendment No. 1 (1300 Block Johnston Road), 2019, No. 2289* at 8:56 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING #2)

The Chairperson called the Public Hearing regarding *White Rock Zoning Bylaw, 2012, No. 2000, Amendment (CD-61 Amendment – 1310 Johnston Road) Bylaw, 2019, No. 2290* to order at 9:04 p.m.

BYLAW NO. 2290 **BYLAW NO. 2290: WHITE ROCK ZONING BYLAW, 2012, NO. 2000, AMENDMENT (CD-61 AMENDMENT – 1310 JOHNSTON ROAD) BYLAW, 2019, NO. 2290**

SUBJECT PROPERTY: **1310 Johnston Road**

The Deputy Corporate Officer read a statement regarding the purpose of Bylaw 2290 and again the public hearing / meeting procedure to be followed.

The Chairperson invited the Director of Planning and Development Services to introduce the proposed Bylaw amendment.

The Deputy Corporate Officer advised that there were **forty-one (41)** submissions received. All submissions were given to Council with respect to Bylaw 2290:

Included with the agenda package for March 11, 2019:

Author	Date Received	Item #
C. MacIntosh	February 19, 2019	C-1
C. Fast	February 19, 2019	C-2
P. Glabush	February 19, 2019	C-3
V. Mair	February 17, 2019	C-4
D. Rothstein	February 13, 2019	C-5
J.B. & M. L. Trahan	February 22, 2019	C-6
J. Kline	February 22, 2019	C-7
A. McMullen, UDI & HAVAN	February 22, 2019	C-8
R. Hudson	February 24, 2019	C-9
A. Frigon	February 24, 2019	C-10
D. Cox	February 25, 2019	C-11
R. Kirkpatrick	February 25, 2019	C-12
K. Wushke	February 25, 2019	C-13
J. Hilts	February 25, 2019	C-14
L. Bjorkinas	February 25, 2019	C-15
T. Herath	February 25, 2019	C-16a
T. Herath	February 27, 2019	C-16b
S. Nightingale	February 27, 2019	C-17
M. Everaars	February 28, 2019	C-18
C. and H. Simard	February 28, 2019	C-19
M. Aujla	March 4, 2019	C-20
Dr. A. G. Self & Ms SDH Di Menna	March 4, 2019	C-21
G.A. Rowbotham	March 5, 2019	C-22
M. Hamson	March 5, 2019	C-23

Received/presented On Table between 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 6, 2019 and 12:00 p.m. (noon) on Monday, March 11, 2019:

Author	Date Received	Item #
J. Souza	March 6, 2019	C-24
Sundeeep	March 7, 2019	C-25
J. Hamilton	March 7, 2019	C-26
B. OMalley	March 7, 2019	C-27
D. Nickel	March 8, 2019	C-28
H. van Schothorst	March 9, 2019	C-29
Ram	March 9, 2019	C-30
D. Levert	March 10, 2019	C-31
Tim	March 10, 2019	C-32
C. Levert	March 10, 2019	C-33
M. Dosanjh	March 11, 2019	C-34
Petition containing 21 signatures with the following statement "In support of 1310 Johnston Rd – Lady Alexandra Development as currently permitted."	March 11, 2019	C-35
P. Cross	March 11, 2019	C-36
E. and E. Bruaer	March 11, 2019	C-37
A. Fong	March 11, 2019	C-38
M. MacDonald	March 11, 2019	C-39
L. Walkiw	March 11, 2019	C-40
R. Colombin	March 10, 2019	C-41
T. Casola	March 11, 2019	C-42
B. Toderian	March 11, 2019	Video available under: Agenda on the City Website

The Chairperson invited those in attendance to present their comments.

- P. Randawa, applicant for 1310 Johnston Road, spoke against the proposed amendment, not in agreement with the process, noted that eight (8) months ago they were given approval for the DP. This was done following months of review and preparation. It was a long process, that included much consultation. Four (4) years to get an approved Development Permit (DP) and believed they had a two (2) year window to begin construction. They were taking the time to ensure the plans were done well and they were complete. A small developer so when the motion from this Council was raised he worked toward getting the finalized permit in. Consulted with the former Chief Planner with the City of Vancouver asking he do an independent assessment of the site as this was not expected. Information from B. Toderian will be noted this evening through video submission.
- Kermack, Edmonton, presented a video from B. Toderian, former Chief Planner, City of Vancouver, who is not in support of the proposed Bylaw and its process.
(Video available under: Agenda on the City Website)
- S. Sandu, Surrey, presented a second video from B. Toderian, former Chief Planner, City of Vancouver, who is not in support of the proposed Bylaw and its process.
(Video available under: Agenda on the City Website)
- T. Reid, Calgary, presented a third video from B. Toderian, former Chief Planner, City of Vancouver, who is not in support of the proposed Bylaw and its process.
(Video available under: Agenda on the City Website)
- T. Casola, 1310 Johnston Road Architect, Calgary, discussed the design inspiration, direction of height and FAR, reduced roof massing, simplification of overall architectural expression and refined contemporary language, Maritime inspired palate of materials, and improved street corner presence/street activation (Power Point presented and is noted as submission No. C-42).

Council requested clarification regarding the proposed project and it was noted that the subject of the Public Hearing is regard to the CD-60 zone (12 to 6 stories, 4.8 to 3.5 FAR). It was clarified that the project outlined in the speaker's presentation would require a new Development Permit (DP) application to be submitted and considered by Council. DPs address form and character. This is the Applicant noting they would be willing to work with Council on a new design for the building – with the same zoning.

- C. Blacklaws, White Rock, in support of the proposed amendment, stating the decision of approval was made without vision and contrary to the OCP. Respect of the property in White Rock is important and there should be a focus of two (2) to three (3) stories in the area, not concerned if there are legal ramifications.
- G. Wolgemuth, White Rock, not in support of the amending bylaw, stating high-rises due to “pre-zoning” is still permitted in the Town Centre. This application has received approval already and stated concern of possible legal ramifications if council were to proceed with downzoning and urged Council to approve the permit (original design).

- H. Van Scholshorst, Calgary, not in support of the amending bylaw, suggested that a taller model would have less impact on the area. A shorter design could mean less available commercial space. Suggested that either designs (6 or 12) could still hold 30 units. Stated project height would not impact water supply and stated there are financial implications, requested Council honour the approval of the DP.
- R. Tracy, White Rock, not in support of the proposed amendment, noted there was a long process with regard to adopting the new OCP. It is not right to consider density when the development has been approved, and is concerned with potential law suits. This should not be considered at this point. This is the City Centre, development is expected in the City Centre.
- M. Aujila, White Rock, stated if the City downsizes the project the City could be wrapped-up in the litigation, and is not in agreement with the proposed bylaws. This project was approved and at the final stage. To change the rules following approval sets a bad precedent and noted the rules must apply.
- S. Marples, White Rock, not in support of the proposed amendment, reported that there could be consequences of not following through with the existing rules in place. Suggested the project could bring people to businesses. Downzoning is a mistake and there are ramifications. Local people have invested in the project which has 30 units.
- S. Green, White Rock, not in support of the proposed amendment. Spoke in support of B. Toderian's comments of taller and thinner buildings being a good design and good land use. Stated that the property owner should not be punished for a decision of the former Council.
- L Atitlan, White Rock, BC, in support of the proposed amendment, advising that residents were not listened to in regards to development, especially below Thrift Avenue. Does not see more than six (6) stories below Thrift Avenue, and four (4) to six (6) for the block. Stated that high-rises do not create community, the residents are here for our quality life and asked Council to decide for the residents.
- C. Sinha, Vancouver, not in support of the proposed amendment, stating concern with the process for an already approved project and questioned how someone can trust a Council who rescinds projects that have been approved. The same can apply with cultural activities - once approved there should be no uncertainty the event should be able to be trusted to be able to go ahead.
- K. Jones White Rock, BC, in support of the proposed amendment, does not agree that towers bring business – suggesting that Bosa Towers (Miramar) did not bring business, spoke to the height of six (6) to four (4) stories (at Roper), this property should be four (4) stories.

2019-PH-001

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council endorses the Public Hearing meeting continue past 10:30 p.m.

CARRIED

- B. Hagerman, White Rock, BC, not in support of the proposed amendment, stated that Council should not have proceeded south of Thrift Avenue. However reliability, consistency and fair dealings are important. Change is inevitable, adding that the DP has been issued and the proposed Bylaws should be permitted to proceed.

- F. McDermid, White Rock, not in support of the proposed amendment, stating the application was approved, and does not want to see tax funds going toward a law suit.

Speaking for a second time:

- G. Wolgemuth, White Rock, not in support of the proposed amendment, stating this action is a mistake, the DP is issued a process has been followed.
- P. Randawa, applicant for 1310 Johnston Road, not in support and does not understand how the proposed Bylaws would be of benefit. Reported there would be \$1.6M in Community Amenity Contributions, which would take years to come from property taxes. The project would anchor the corner of Johnston Road and Roper Avenue, adding that downzoning the project makes it no longer viable. If the bylaws are approved, this case will be fought which no one wants. There is a willingness to work with Council and the community, asked to rethink the proposed bylaws - would like to work together.

It was clarified that if Council were to entertain a revised project, as presented this evening by the applicant, the existing zoning would need to remain in place and a Development Permit application would need to be considered/approved with regard to the design. Bylaw 2290 is with regard to CD-60 height and density. Staff reiterated that the existing permitted zone would support the revised project; however, a new DP application would need to be submitted for Council's consideration of form and character.

- S. Marples, White Rock, not in support of the amendment, stating legal costs could be costly. Advised that it is the right, fair and legal thing to do to permit the project to move forward as approved by previous Council.

The Chairperson called for further speakers to the application / proposed Bylaw 2290 and there was no further response.

As there were no further speakers, the Chairperson concluded the Public Hearing for Bylaw 2290 at 10:48 p.m.



Mayor Walker



Tracey Arthur, Director of
Corporate Administration