



CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NEW WESTMINSTER

PUBLIC HEARING

November 19, 2007 7:00 p.m.
Council Chamber
City Hall

NOTES

PRESENT:

Mayor Wayne Wright
Councillor Jonathan Cote
Councillor Calvin Donnelly
Councillor Bill Harper
Councillor Bob Osterman
Councillor Betty McIntosh
Councillor Lorrie Williams

STAFF:

Mr. Paul Daminato	- City Administrator
Mr. Rick Page	- Corporate Officer/Director of Legislative Services
Ms. Lisa Spitale	- Director of Development Services
Mr. Jim Lowrie	- Director of Engineering Services
Mr. Gary Holowatiuk	- Director of Finance
Ms. Judi Turner	- Assistant City Clerk

Mayor Wright read a statement regarding the conduct of the Hearing.

BUSINESS

1. [Heritage Revitalization Agreement \(215 Fifth Avenue\) Bylaw No. 7173, 2007 \[a bylaw to enter into a Heritage Revitalization Agreement with the Owner of Heritage Property\]](#)
 - i) The Director of Development Services summarized the intent of the bylaw and gave a description of the proposal.

- ii) The Corporate Officer advised about the written submissions received in response to the Notice of Hearing.
- iii) The Mayor invited persons having an interest in the above bylaw to address Council.

The Corporate Officer announced that, during the Public Hearing, first time speakers will have an opportunity to address Council for five minutes and may return to the podium to conclude their comments for a second period of five minutes after all first time speakers have spoken.

Robert Johnson, Architect, 821 Hailey Street, rose to respond to any questions.

Robert Jost, #401, 320 Royal Avenue, rose to support the proposed HRA for the historic area which deserves preservation. He noted the addition is to the rear of the house and will not affect the streetscape.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Heritage Revitalization Agreement (215 Fifth Avenue) Bylaw No. 7173, 2007 be forwarded to the November 19, 2007, Regular Meeting of Council for consideration of third reading.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

2. [Official Community Plan Designation Amendment Bylaw No. 7178, 2007 \[a bylaw to amend Official Community Plan Designation Bylaw No. 6476, 1998 re 200 & 220 Royal Avenue, 208 Cunningham Street, 201/205/207 Agnes Street and portions of St. Mary's Street and Cunningham Street\] \(tabled from October 15, 2007\)](#)

- i) The Director of Development Services summarized the intent of the bylaw and gave a description of the proposal.
- ii) The Corporate Officer advised about the written submissions received in response to the Notice of Hearing.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the following correspondence be received:

- [David Maidman voicing concern](#)
- [Paul Levy objecting to the proposal](#)

- [Christopher Bell opposing the proposal](#)
- *Garnet Hardy, 120 Second Street, expressing concern*
- *Virginia Bociek, 120 Second Street opposing the development*
- *Theresa Henry-Smith, 201 Clinton Place opposing the development.*

CARRIED.

All members of Committee voted in favour of the motion.

- iii) The Mayor invited persons having an interest in the above bylaw to address Council.

Neil Gibbard of 125 Peele Street, rose to voice concern that property values will drop for property owners in the area due to the development of high density residential.

Lila Wood of #603, 21 Elliot Street, spoke of the community as a small one with limited access or egress to a number of streets and to Patullo Bridge. She noted that adding high rises will further ghettoize the neighbourhood.

Garnet Hardy of 120 Second Street, stated that the proposed development will affect the entire core of the Downtown. He did not oppose high density for the site however he opposes the absence of a transition to buffer the Queens Park area. He urged that members review the OCP which shows three storey housing and no high rises and opposed development contrary to the OCP. He noted the City has planned to amend the OCP since 2004. He voiced concern that the project will set precedent.

Virginia Bocier, 120 Second Street, read her comments on the proposed development. She asked a number of questions, including:

- How will the heritage of the area be preserved
- Where will the children from the development attend school
- Where will recreation facilities be located
- Notices were not sent to many people who are affected.

Antonio Pascoa of 126 Second Street, noted he is renovating his home according to heritage criteria. He opposed development of three 27-storey high rise towers which do not relate well with the heritage of the area. With respect to density, he suggested that five 13-storey buildings could achieve the desired density and be finished with a heritage-like appearance.

Kathleen Langstroth 11 Seventh Avenue rose to oppose the high rises which are too high and too dense and will block views. She voiced concern over the added traffic, noting that Royal Avenue already suffers a serious traffic problem. This development will not add to parks or recreational facilities and cited another development near Sixth Avenue and McBride which does enhance its neighbourhood. High rises do not bring people onto the street to add to a sense of community. She urged that Council consider the positive developments and those which are not positive and that Council reject this proposal.

Christopher Bell of 1006 Nanaimo Street, rose to oppose the proposed development. Mr. Bell read a letter from Trudy Moore of 74 Richmond Street who was unable to attend the meeting and who voiced a number of concerns over the dearth of shopping in the city, the cost of transit and poor route selection, and the problems these represent for seniors.

Mr. Bell went on to note that tonight's Public Hearing is dealing with the OCP amendment for the site. He stated that the proposal will transform the neighbourhood.

Nathan Godfried of 215 Royal Avenue rose and commented that this proposal will amend the OCP for the whole neighbourhood, increasing the neighbourhood density. (Staff commented on the impact of the proposal noting the area is already designated for medium and high density use.) Mr. Godfried voiced concern that the buildings will be too high and that a precedent for more high rise development will be set.

Kathleen Mainstroth of 11 Seventh Avenue rose again and explained that the Queen's Park Residents' Association is not yet constituted and therefore cannot yet supply an official comment on this proposal.

Eric Smith of 210 Clinton Place rose to describe the high construction which already exists in the area. He suggested that allowing a 27 storey tower will be a precedent for even higher buildings. Such heights are contrary to the heritage character of the area. Although he is aware that growth will take place, he opposed the wall that this project will produce.

Robert Jost of 401, 320 Royal Avenue, commented that Vancouver has 50,000 people per square mile which is high density, but where personalized service is still possible and people are much friendlier. Mr. Jost urged that the towers be constructed. He noted there will be a buffer with four storeys on Royal Avenue. He supported preservation for the Queen's Park neighbourhood. He did not support the suggestion to build five 13-storey towers. With three towers, there will be an increase in

green space and the development will also address a safety concern at a nearby street. This project allows for the preservation of Queens Park at a lower density.

Virginia Bocier, 120 Second Street, rose again to read a letter from Mari-Lou Shoulak of 227 Queens Avenue, who was not able to attend the meeting but who opposes the proposal. Ms. Shoulak's concerns included the lack of community input, overcrowding, access from an already congested street, the impact on the visual appeal of the community, preservation of the river view, development of high rises among heritage homes. Ms. Shoulak's letter was submitted and will be added to the Agenda package.

Christopher Bell of 1006 Nanaimo Street rose again and asked why we are proceeding with this OCP when the city has not heard from any of those organizations who were included in the consultation on the OCP.

Mr. Bell raised concerns over:

- The future viability of the neighbourhood
- The OCP was developed in consultation with the community and does not allow high density towers
- Why is the permit area wording being changed from medium density to high density
- The proposed amendments will open the entire neighbourhood to high rise density, which is not currently allowed.

Bill Zander from Seventh Avenue in West End rose to ask for a definition of "high density". (Staff responded). Mr. Zander stated that the OCP did not contemplate high rises as proposed. He suggested that the complaint of insufficient notification is an issue. He asked why the city continues to deal with variances to allow for high rises despite opposition from citizens. These approvals represent piece meal development. He asked where the vision for the city has gone. He suggested there might be an institutional use for the site noting the West End has no location for a school. He suggested that the proposal be referred to staff for an option that is more acceptable to the community. He added that taxes generated from these developments will not result in reduced taxes for the whole city.

Robert Jost of 401 – 320 Royal Avenue rose again and noted that five developments in the area are four storeys or less. He added that many thousands of dollars have been spent to renovate existing buildings in the area which are therefore not being left to deteriorate. As well, Genesis House will save two heritage houses in the area. He noted that only one tower has been developed in 17 years. He suggested that the trolley

service which is expected might offer services to areas that are no longer served by Transit because of increased need due to increased density. He pointed out that Royal Avenue which is at the crest of a hill is the appropriate place for this development. This change is exciting for Columbia Street and amenities are arriving because of the development. A department store will only be developed in the city when there are 50,000 people. He urged that the proposal be approved.

Christopher Bell of 1006 Nanaimo Street rose again to comment on the notice of Public Hearing stating:

- That the map does not show the entire area that is affected by the proposed change to the permit area
- The location refers to the former Saint Mary's site but many dozens of addresses are affected by the OCP amendment
- The purpose of the notice does not include all the lands where high density will now be permitted
- All owners who live in the development permit area did not receive notices of the Public Hearing
- There is no signage in the area about the proposed OCP amendment.

Mr. Bell noted that the proposed change will allow 4000 more units in the area resulting in 8000 more people. He suggested that rental property maintenance will not continue in anticipation of future redevelopment.

RECESS

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Public Hearing meeting recess.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

The Public Hearing meeting recessed at 8:52 p.m. and reconvened at 9:03 p.m. with all members of Council present.

Mr. Bell asked why there has been no analysis on livability from permitting high density use, wear and tear on failing roads, sewer and water use, the need for parks and green space, massing and form, community space, the pressures of the high density, DCC's, commercial areas to support the new residents, what will happen to low income renters who will be displaced, whether some of the lands could have been dedicated for a school site, and what capital plans costs will be required to allow development.

Mr. Bell asked for the written policy for the sale of city streets. He challenged that the required consultation process has not been followed as responses from consulted organizations have not been received yet the Hearing proceeds. He stated that the proposal affects an entire neighbourhood not only the former Saint Mary's hospital site.

Mr. Bell went on to comment on conflict of interest noting that a councilor cannot participate in a hearing if that councilor has a pecuniary interest in the site. He suggested that if the OCP is passed then a councilor who is present at this hearing will be in a position to complete a transaction. (The Corporate Officer read an opinion from the City solicitor on the matter of conflict of interest.)

Mr. Bell concluded by stating that passing this OCP will change the neighbourhood and he challenged the acceptability of the notice.

Robert Jost of 320 Royal Avenue rose again and pointed out there are 11 high rises in the immediate area, therefore the proposed development is not inconsistent.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Public Hearing on Official Community Plan Designation Amendment Bylaw No. 7178, 2007 be adjourned and further consideration of Bylaw No. 7178, 2007 be tabled pending completion of the Public Hearing.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

ADJOURNMENT

The Public Hearing concluded at 9:03 p.m.

Certified as being a fair and accurate report of the Public Hearing.

Richard L. Page – Corporate Officer