

## **ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Tuesday, March 16, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.**

**Meeting held electronically under Ministerial Order No. M192/2020 and the  
current Order of the Provincial Health Officer - *Gatherings and Events***

### **MINUTES**

#### **VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ken Bourdeau	- Chair, Community Member
Anthea Darychuk	- Community Member
Margaret Fairweather	- Community Member
Andrew Feltham	- Community Member
Tasha Henderson	- Community Member
Kseniia Latek	- Community Member
Christa MacArthur	- Community Member
Angel Manguerra	- Community Member

#### **REGRETS:**

Christopher Lumsden	- Community Member
---------------------	--------------------

#### **GUESTS:**

Hugh Forster	- Aboriginal Land Trust
--------------	-------------------------

#### **STAFF:**

Jacque Killawee	- City Clerk
Nicole Ludwig	- Assistant City Clerk
Lynn Roxburgh	- Senior Policy Planner
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Ken Bourdeau, Chair, provided a statement regarding the process and procedures of the meeting, and Jacque Killawee, City Clerk, reviewed the instructions for viewing the meeting.

#### **1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

There were no additions.

#### **2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

There were no items.

### **3.0 INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS**

There were no items.

### **4.0 REZONING**

#### **4.1 823 – 841 Sixth Street: Proposed Affordable Housing Project Official Community Plan Amendment**

Lynn Roxburgh, summarized the staff report dated March 16, 2021, regarding an Official Community Plan (OCP), rezoning and Development Permit which have been submitted on behalf of the Aboriginal Land Trust Society (ALT) to allow an affordable rental housing project.

Ms. Roxburgh reviewed the details and requested relaxations within the application, noting the location, site context and policy context of the application, along with the following details:

- The development review process for the project; and;
- The required public consultation and notice that has occurred.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Roxburgh provided the following information:

- The proposed project will have been available for public feedback at the following meetings:
  - Applicant-hosted open house;
  - Glenbrooke North Residents' Association meeting;
  - Advisory Planning Commission;
  - Public Hearing, if Council gives the proposal two readings; and,
- Staff proposed to bring the project to the Moody Park Residents' Association; however there was no uptake.

Hugh Forster, Aboriginal Land Trust, reviewed the following aspects of the application:

- The proposal would create an affordable, safe, and welcoming place in a way that reflects communal living and supports elders of the Indigenous and Swahili communities;
- The proposed location is ideal for the development, in that it would be located in the heart of the Uptown neighbourhood with amenities, parks and stores nearby;
- Provided a summary of the building, with unit breakdown, amenity room details, parking details and landscaped areas;

- Details of the suggested changes to the building in response to public consultation, including a reduction of the massing by reducing the building “sholders” to 4 storeys, and moving the building towards Sixth Street, thereby increasing the distance from the rear homes, reducing shadows and the optimizing the preservation of the existing trees; and,
- Details of a proposed Multi-use pathway (MUP).

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Roxburgh and Mr. Forster provided the following information:

- The process for potential residents to apply for housing would be partially dependent on the funding and input from upper levels of government;
  - The building was moved closer to Sixth Street early in the project’s timeline;
  - The project’s shadow studies are accurate, as they were completed for the building’s currently proposed position;
  - In response to concerns about congestion in the back lane, Bunt and Associates conducted a traffic study, which concluded that the use of the lane should not cause a great deal of impact or hardship to the community;
  - The proposed access to the parkade is as shown in the project drawings;
  - No consideration has been given to opening the green space at the rear of the building to the neighbouring area. In order to minimize security issues, the property would be fenced and only accessible to residents of the building;
  - Garbage pickup would occur from the lane behind the building, where there would be a loading bay for the containers to be picked up;
  - A decision about whether the proposed Multi-use Pathway (MUP) that feeds into the lane would be built is independent of the project and would be considered by the City in the coming year;
  - A letter of agreement has been signed with Modo car share for a car to be provided by the project, which would be available for community use;
  - The bike parking within the building has been reviewed by the City’s Transportation department, and provides for ample bike storage, as well as plug in of electric bikes, and a bike maintenance room;
  - Cyclists would need to ride out the parking ramps, which have slopes of 5 to 7.5% or go up the elevator;
  - The final routing of the MUP would be dependent on detailed design consideration, which would also take the City’s Uptown streetscape vision into account;
- 
- The City’s Transportation Department identified the MUP in its proposed position to the North of the project to enable a smooth connection to the lane;
  - The allocation of parking spots at just over 50% of the building units has been deemed sufficient by the transportation consultant, as there would be multi-generational tenants, including a significant amount of elders, and the

building would be sited within walking distance of transit and Uptown amenities;

- The Aboriginal Land Trust (ALT) and Lu'ma Development Management chose New Westminister for this project, as they have been expanding their reach into several areas in Metro Vancouver, and New Westminister is underserved to the aboriginal community in need of Indigenous housing;
  - When looking at locations within the city, the challenge was to find a dynamic place within a thriving city, and the proposed site was selected due to its proximity to the Uptown community and its amenities, including shops, park, theatre, schools and transit;
  - There are no other affordable housing units that provide Indigenous-specific housing in New Westminister;
  - The heritage houses on the site, which are in the range of 1911 to 1943 in age, would be available to move to another property, if there is interest in them;
  - As required by the Local Government Act, relevant Indigenous nations were consulted during the development of the OCP; however, very little feedback was received;
  - The City is currently building relationships with First Nations through a reconciliation process, and expects that future land use processes would incorporate and build on these relationships;
  - Currently, the Lu'ma Native Housing Society, which is the parent organization for ALT, has over 5000 names on waiting lists for affordable housing in Metro Vancouver;
  - Not requiring the retention of the on-site heritage buildings is a new recommendation specific to this project and in alignment with the City's reconciliation initiatives, as the houses are representative of settler history, and, in this context, prioritization is being given to the Indigenous community;
  - The building would be owned by ALT; however, units would also be offered to members of Swahili Vision, making it a multi-cultural building;
  - The funding mechanism by senior governments which would provide ALT the funding to build the project do not require that the occupants be Indigenous; however, given that it would be owned by ALT, and the housing demand from the Indigenous and Swahili communities, it is anticipated that the units would be rented to those two groups;
- 
- Given how much the City is projected to grow, staff are working with childcare providers and development applicants to ensure that programs are being delivered and that the City has sufficient amenities, such as park space, programs to support childcare providers, and education opportunities, to keep pace with the growth;

- The shadow study, which provides analysis at multiple times during the year, indicates that the impacts of the building’s shadow on neighbouring areas would be largely on the lane and garages to the rear, and not on the houses;
- Other locations within New Westminster that were considered for this project included the following:
  - Locations that were suitable for a six-storey building on a main street;
  - City-owned locations – none were suitable; and,
  - Sites on Sixth Street between Uptown and Downtown – many properties already had a larger building on them which would have displaced many tenants already in affordable buildings.

At this point in the meeting, Commission members passed the following motion:

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission receive the on-table correspondence circulated on March 12, 2021, and earlier in the day (March 16, 2021).*

**CARRIED.**

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

The Chair called for speakers from the public.

*Note: Unless otherwise noted, all speakers are residents of New Westminster.*

Don McLellan spoke in opposition to the application, noting that hundreds of Glenbrooke North residents and residents from areas across the city had expressed opposition to the proposed development and the deviation from the OCP, which is a plan that taxpayers helped to develop. He noted that the proposed multi-unit building does not comply with the current zoning and that it is not best planning practice to place such a building in a residential neighbourhood. Mr. McLellan further noted that the building design does not comply with the City’s guidelines for massing and setbacks requirements and the parking reduction request exceeds the City’s parking bylaw. Lastly, the building will be far from a skytrain station and located on a very congested bus route.

Kathy McLellan, spoke in opposition to the application, noting that it does not comply with the current zoning or OCP designation, and gave details of a petition that had been signed by over 1200 residents demonstrating opposition to the project. She advised that the building will not have a successful transition to adjacent properties and the rear lane will not be able to support the associated traffic. Ms. McLellan also advised that residents rely on the OCP in choosing where to live, and when the OCP was approved, the neighbourhood had agreed that the Residential - Infill Townhouse (RT) designation was most suitable for the area. Finally, Ms. McLellan reiterated that the project should reduce the size of the building or find another location.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. and Ms. McLellan provided the following information:

- There are no parking restrictions on Fifth Street; however most of the houses have suites whose residents park on the street. They also pointed out that property owners are able to build laneway homes, which would further reduce parking in the area and traffic in the lane; and,
- The building design does not meet the City's requirements in regards to massing and setbacks at the front, side and back, and in regards to recesses in the front wall.

Chris Weltens spoke in opposition to the application, noting that if the building is constructed in the proposed location, the shadow study indicates that most of his backyard will be in shadow for seven to eight months of the year, which does not seem acceptable for his quality of life, and would also impact his privacy. Lastly, Mr. Weltens noted that the application should not be approved unless the size of the building is reduced and brought into conformity with the OCP or moved to another location.

Don Hauka asked the Commission not to support the application, noting that it is not good planning to allow a multi-unit building to be built next to a single-family residential neighbourhood, with no transitions, a lack of parking and limited road access. Mr. Hauka further noted that the proposal does not conform to the current zoning and OCP designation and, given its magnitude, should be subject to a City-wide consultation process rather than a developer-led process, especially during a pandemic.

Romeo Bordignon spoke in opposition to the application and asked that the City respect the approved OCP, noting that when he built his home on Fifth Street he had followed all of the zoning guidelines, including setbacks and height restrictions, and that had he known about this project, he would have re-considered building his home. Mr. Bordignon further noted that the proposed building does not fit in to the residential neighbourhood, and the small lane will not be able to accommodate the traffic of 96 more residents, nor provide an adequate turnaround for garbage trucks. Lastly, he discussed the loss of trees that would occur if the building is allowed and noted that the building's height would affect his garden.

Lana Bordignon spoke in opposition to the application, noting that local residents had built homes with the knowledge that future development on Sixth Street would be in the form of townhouses, as planned in the OCP. She noted that the proposed building will dramatically change the OCP and the landscape of the neighbourhood, while there are empty sites elsewhere in the city where the building could fit. Lastly, Ms. Bordignon discussed the hand-delivered petitions signed by 1250 residents demonstrating opposition to the project and asking for the City to respect the OCP.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Bordignon provided the following information:

- Data was not gathered about whether residents who signed the petition were renters or homeowners; and,
- The opposition to the building lies in the height of the building behind single-family dwellings, not that it would bring changes to the residents in the neighbourhood.

Ashley Bordignon spoke in opposition to the application, noting that she is a transit user and cyclist and has a strong understanding of the Glenbrooke North neighbourhood from that perspective. Ms. Bordignon expressed concern with the routing of the MUP, with cyclists using the laneway and with an increase in cars turning from the lane onto Eighth Avenue, which is a walking route for high school students. In addition, she noted that although the proposed building will have a bus stop out front, it is geographically the farthest away from a skytrain station, which is not very convenient, and there has been an increase in traffic on Sixth Street during school drop off and pickup time since the new high school was built. In regards to the proposed height, Ms. Bordignon noted that it is uncommon to see a six-storey residential building near detached homes or a high school, whereas townhouses are more common and, in this case, are aligned with the OCP. Lastly, Ms. Bordignon emphasized that resident opposition to the building does not equate to opposition to low-income housing; however it is difficult to overlook the negative implications of the height and the safety concerns.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Bordignon and Ms. Roxburgh provided the following information:

- The observed increase in traffic on Sixth Street is due to the installation of a pedestrian-controlled street light, which only allows one car per stop light to turn onto Sixth Street from the street in front of the high school, and has meant an increase in traffic on Sixth Street opposite to the high school;
- The opposition to the MUP is in regards to its proposed location, not that bike routes form part of the OCP; and,
- The MUP is contained in the November 2020 Streetscape Vision, and it is identified in the OCP that Sixth Street is a Great Street and that the City is working to make that vision a reality.

Melissa Roth expressed support for the project, noting that she lives in the Downtown and so she understands that a loss of sunlight is a hardship; however, this is a worthy project. She suggested that the community think of the 5000 people on the list who are waiting for a home and that it's important to make room for them.

In response to a question from the Commission, Ms. Roth noted that, with regards to accessing the underground parking areas, congestion in the downtown lanes could be difficult during the time that several downtown buildings were constructed; however it never took an unreasonable amount of time to maneuver, even in rush hour.

Maya Russell spoke in favour of the application. She noted that affordable housing is desperately needed in the region and in the city and that rental vacancy rates remain very low. She offered her support of Indigenous and Swahili families who would particularly benefit from the project, noting that they are an under-served group of people in the New Westminster community. As a School Trustee, Ms. Russell has heard from school staff leads who advise that Indigenous families are unable to afford housing in the City and are being driven out of the community, as well as facing significant barriers to housing, such as racial discrimination. Lastly, Ms. Russell noted the developer's solid record of delivering housing and asked the Commission to consider that affordable housing faces massive objections, but is greatly needed.

Robert Hughes, spoke in favour of the application, noting that members of his extended family have benefited from living in Lu'ma developments and he has worked with many African refugee claimants for whom affordable housing is a critical need. He referred to letters sent to the Commission's attention discussing housing in the context of indigenous human rights and the right to adequate housing as an internationally recognized human right. Mr. Hughes noted the right to be heard in public settings, but emphasized that neither the loudest nor the largest number of voices should determine the outcome of the proposal. Rather that the approval of this housing proposal should reflect an accepting and inclusive community, actively working on reconciliation.

**Procedural Note:** The Advisory Planning Commission meeting recessed at 7:57 p.m. and reconvened at 8:07 p.m.

Wil Chan noted that the OCP process showed there was a clear need for townhouses and row homes in the city, and that this project's alignment with reconciliation commitments does not merit a departure from the OCP. He noted that the development of affordable townhouses would be family friendly and childcare is desperately needed in the area, which would also affect the residents of the proposed building. Finally, Mr. Chan asked that the Commission oppose the application and recommend that City staff explore alternative design forms that give deference to the OCP, including discussions with churches along Sixth and Eighth Street.

Angela Inglis expressed her opposition to the project in its current design, noting that while affordable housing projects are critical, and can exist with single detached neighbourhoods, the proposal is a significant departure from the community feedback during the OCP process regarding housing choice. Lastly, Ms. Inglis encouraged the City to reconsider the design of the project to better fit with the intent of the OCP, such as townhouses or rowhouses which would better foster community relationships.

In response to a question from the Commission, Ms. Inglis noted that although the ground units of the proposed building would have entrances similar to townhouses, it does not change her opinion, because the massing of the building will not foster community interaction and the overall design is not in keeping with the original OCP vision.

Hugh Forster, ALT, noted that it would be likely that single level townhomes in the proposed area would start at \$1.5 million, and would therefore not be feasible as affordable housing units. He further noted that the proposed type of building provides the density to bring the cost per unit to a point that the upper levels of government providing the funding are able to provide for.

Gordon Lamont spoke in opposition to the application, noting that hundreds of Glenbrooke North residents, and residents from areas across the City, had also expressed their opposition to the proposed development, and its deviation from the OCP. Mr. Lamont noted that he is not in opposition to affordable housing, but rather to the size and location of the proposed development. He advocated that while the need for affordable housing is great, the guidelines within the OCP for multi-unit housing should be adhered to, because it was created in conjunction with the community.

Mike Folka spoke in favour of the proposal, noting that he lives in a mixed density area within Glenbrooke North, which includes townhouses adjacent to rental buildings, single-family residences and a school, and the mix of housing allows people from varying backgrounds to live in the neighbourhood, with little traffic, parking or lifestyle impacts. Mr. Folka further noted that creating this type of affordable housing will give security to vulnerable people in the community, upholding the values of being inclusive and welcoming, and encouraged the Commission to support the project.

In response to a question from the Commission, Mr. Folka replied that there is no transition between the single-family houses and the five-storey rental building in the area where he lives, and there is very little impact on the residents in terms of traffic and parking.

Louiza Zlatovic, expressed opposition to the application, noting that the proposed amendment to the OCP would be disregarding the document that is supposed to lead the development of the city, and was developed by the City with much community consultation. She also stated that the massing of the building is inappropriate for the adjacent neighbourhood, violates urban design principles in general, and noted that there are more suitably zoned sites for such a building elsewhere in the city. Lastly, Ms. Zlatovic asked that the loudly demonstrated opposition and feedback from the neighbours be listened to.

Erica Sagert, Vancouver resident and Policy Manager of BC Non-Profit Housing Association (BCNPHA), gave background on the BCNPHA and voiced the organization's support of the proposed project due to the desperate need for affordable housing in the area. Ms. Sagert presented statistics on housing expenditure and affordability in the region, noting that New Westminster has stark over-representation of black and indigenous peoples who are experiencing homelessness, and therefore the project will provide homes to community members who need it. She commended the proposal for its transit-friendly location and its alignment with the City's strategic plan, which supports innovative and courageous policies to combat the affordable housing crisis. On behalf of the BCNPHA, Ms. Sagert encouraged the Commission to support the application moving to the Public Hearing stage.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Sagert provided the following comments:

- She would echo Mr. Forster's earlier comments that it is challenging to provide affordability with the provision of townhouses, and particularly in New Westminster and the region in general;
- In the absence of affordable housing, renters have the ability to access rental supplements to help supplement their income to pay for housing, so that market units can be accessed; and,

- All BCNHPA members who support indigenous clients have a mix of housing and services they provide to clients and help clients to access.

Elliot Rossiter spoke in favour of the application and asked that the Commission support the amendment of the OCP so that this proposal can be built. Mr. Rossiter noted that he respects the petition process, but has serious concerns with the petition that has been put forward, in that approval of such an important proposal should be decided on the principles of reconciliation and equity, in order to safeguard against the majority, who may be more resourced, and prevent harm against marginalized groups. He noted that the petition is misrepresentative, in that the single-family demographic is over-represented, it does not give voice to those who are affected by housing affordability, or evaluate whether the OCP should be amended based on the merits of the application.

Rick Vugteveen, spoke in favour of the proposal due to many reasons, including the desperate need for housing affordability, the advancement of reconciliation, support for the revitalization of the Uptown retail area and for the completion of a cycling connection. Mr. Vugteveen noted that the City's policy goals drive the OCP and that the OCP process allows for thoughtful revisions, as previous examples of OCP changes such as schools, the Queen's Park heritage conservation area, development of childcare spaces and rental housing have shown. Lastly, Mr. Vugteveen quoted several OCP policy statements that would be supportive of the OCP change for this proposal and stated that given that the proposed location is near amenities and within an excellent neighbourhood, the change to the OCP is more than warranted.

Anne Lamont expressed opposition to the application due to the changes to the OCP that are required. She stated support for affordable housing, reconciliation and diversity in the Glenbrooke North neighbourhood, and recognized that townhouses are not a viable option from an affordability perspective. She suggested that a four-storey building with two-storey shoulders, which may be a better option to provide for a smoother transition to the neighbourhood than the proposed building.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission provide the opportunity for additional first time speakers.*

**CARRIED.**

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

Kate Meow expressed support for the application, noting that she agrees with past speakers' comments in favour of the development, and she urged the Commission to recommend that Council send the application to a Public Hearing.

Tanya Denowa expressed support for the application, noting that she feels empathy for people who need affordable housing.

Alex Johnson stated support for affordable housing and reconciliation; however, expressed opposition due to many of the same reasons already presented. Mr. Johnson noted that many of the people who had spoken in favour do not live in the surrounding neighbourhood and will not be directly affected by the proposal, whereas he has spent a great deal of time and resources renovating his house, and the proposed development could negatively impact the enjoyment of his property.

Tammy Dewar expressed gratitude for living in Glenbrooke North. She noted that she does not think it is her place to close the door to those who are not as fortunate as her and to those who so desperately need affordable housing. She described the ease with which she uses her bike and transit in her neighbourhood and strongly supports the project's goals of providing affordable housing that meets the City's values of reconciliation and diversity.

Robert Iantria expressed support of this project if it was three storeys rather than six storeys and inquired whether the City's recently approved policies regarding renovictions would apply to this proposed development.

In response to Mr. Iantria's question, Lynn Roxburgh noted that the City's policies in regards to renovictions only apply to multi-family buildings, so would not apply in this context. She noted that, in this case, City staff would work with the developer and ask them to be mindful of tenants in the buildings that would need to be demolished. The developer would need to adhere to the Residential Tenancy Act in terms of giving notice and do more than the minimum requirement in order for tenants to be able to find housing.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Forster and Ms. Roxburgh provided the following information:

- A key consideration in building affordable housing is in getting government funding, therefore it is important to make a proposal that meets government objectives, including specific unit sizes, bedroom types, all of which would only be available in apartments;
- An OCP amendment would be needed no matter the height of the building, and ALT's mandate is to provide cost-effective opportunities for funding by upper levels of government;
- As there is no available land being provided by the City, the economics are such that the building needs to be maximized in order to get affordable housing funded by upper levels of government;
- When the City was preparing the 2017 OCP, staff were focused on providing opportunities for housing choice rather than accommodating growth, therefore not a great deal of land was designated for new multi-family buildings, assuming a context of seeing new market condo developments; therefore, there are very few locations where an existing building does not already exist;

- In most cases, the City does not re-zone in advance, as it is best to have applications progress through the development process to allow for community consultation and allow the City to negotiate for amenities; and,
- There are very few other locations in the City that have the OCP designation and zoning for the type of building as proposed in this application.

Britu Ramos expressed opposition to the application due to the required changes to the OCP, its proximity to the high school, and the inadequate space in the rear lane. Mr. Ramos noted that the developer should honour the OCP process and situate the project where the OCP and zoning allows it.

Ruby Campbell spoke in favour of the application, noting that it provides an opportunity to amend the OCP to benefit racialized communities and follow the correct OCP process. She underscored the opportunity to provide housing in walking distance of amenities, schools, businesses, a senior centre and transit. Lastly, Ms. Campbell encouraged the Commission to support the project, and prioritize the community benefit.

Susanne Bell spoke in favour of the project, noting that Sixth Street, and Eighth and Tenth Avenues are major corridors and they are the types of locations that should be used to support the OCP and the regional growth strategy. She emphasized that this is the right project in the right location due to the 106 bus, which is a very successful rapid transit route, as well as delivering on the goals and objectives of the OCP, the City's goals of diversity, and development of social housing.

In response to a question from the Commission, Ms. Roxburgh noted that throughout the OCP process, the City received support for growth and increased density on Sixth Street, aligning with principles for where growth on bus routes; however, there was also support for townhouse locations, especially near to schools. Through that conversation, the two blocks on Sixth Street between Eighth and Tenth Avenues landed with a designation of Infill Townhouses (RT) to facilitate the desire for townhouses in the area.

The Commission members thanked the public for their participation in the meeting and made the following comments in regards to the proposed application:

- The application supports the City priorities of providing affordable and family-friendly housing, advancing reconciliation and diversity, and ensuring density is located near to rapid transit networks and local amenities;
- The Local Government Act allows Council to amend an OCP providing that a clearly defined process is adhered to, including consultation with the public, review by relevant City Committees, public hearing and deliberation by Council; therefore the request by this applicant to amend the OCP is not in contradiction to any policy, but rather it is following the correct process;

- The OCP is a living document and it is important to look at the designations within it, but also to look at it holistically and whether an application to amend it accomplishes other goals;
- The location of the proposed building is supportable in terms of livability and access to amenities and transit;
- The housing crisis presents an urgent need to take bold action and look at creative ways to increase affordable housing and support marginalized populations in the City, and this proposal appears to present an opportunity to address both of these needs;
- This proposal would support a culture of inclusiveness and the City’s efforts to prioritize reconciliation and diversity;
- The rendering of the proposal shows a sufficient landscape buffer of evergreen trees between the rear of the proposal and the neighbouring houses which would address direct privacy issues;
- As there are multi-unit towers all the way up Sixth Street, the proposed form of density makes sense along the corridor;
- The MUP suggested for connecting to the Seventh Ave Greenway and routing through the lane may warrant further consideration and public input;
- It may be a consideration to allow public access to the proposal’s greenspace;
- It is important to consider the comments presented by the developer in terms of funding and affordability of constructing townhouses or a lower storeyed building; and,
- It is important to provide public opportunities for people to voice their concerns regarding the height of the building, parking and lane access, as the impacts on personal property are tangible; however, it is important to weigh these concerns against the opportunity for 96 families to find housing.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission support the Official Community Plan amendment and rezoning application for the proposed affordable housing project at 823-841 Sixth Street.*

**CARRIED.**

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

**5.0 NEW BUSINESS**

There were no items.

**6.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION**

There were no items.

**7.0 CORRESPONDENCE**

There were no items.

**8.0 NEXT MEETING**

April 20, 2021, Location to be confirmed

**9.0 ADJOURNMENT**

**ON MOTION**, the meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Certified Correct,

**Original Signed** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Ken Bourdeau**  
**Chair**

**Original Signed** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Carilyn Cook**  
**Committee Clerk**