



## 1. Choice #1: Retain as a Ruin

### *I like this one because:*

- It respects the integrity of the historical structure.
- The operation cost is low.
- This is my first choice because the operating cost per year is low, despite initial upfront investment, and it still honours history/heritage.
- I would like the Woodlands (former residence) to benefit the community.
- The stories that are to be told about what happened there.
- It is the most accurate reminder of Woodlands and the most respectful to former residents.
- It keeps the heritage building; one of the oldest in New Westminster and BC.
- It honours all of the survivors, but the “inmates” when it was a mental asylum should be honoured too.
- Art and history, operating cost is lowest.
- It acts as a good centrepiece and explains the history.
- At least we can see and feel part of history. Because it’s closed, it will prevent homeless people from staying around.
- Preserves historical architecture. Bring a sense of art to the area.
- Keeps original building, history, etc.
- Architecturally relevant public art is a very good option as there is not too much available space for this in New Westminster.
- Heritage building should remain untouched.
- The look is retained; access would be preferred.
- It retains the tower - I believe it is historically significant.
- Has the lowest operating cost.
- Tells what happened in the past and at lower cost.
- I would like to see the Centre Block retained as a ruin because of its low annual operating cost. However, I would also like buildings on the parcel of land “C” and the parcel of land “E” surrounding the Centre Block to be kept at heights not higher than the Tower, as I am under the impression that the City is going to rezone and allow an extra one or two levels of parking under what is supposed to be a low-rise multi-family building. The main reason for rezoning is “much needed public parking” and if you were to take notice on weekends and during the day, street parking is available along “E.” Royal and Francis Ways, until families with a second car fill the street parking that is available in the evenings. These families should have bought



themselves a second parking spot within their own building. The Centre Block was burnt down by a suspicious fire even though there was security personnel around. If public parking is going to be built on Parcel "C" or "E," transient people can still set up house there especially if it is a sheltered area and residents of Victoria Hill would definitely not welcome another potential fire hazard.

- It would keep maintenance costs low; it provides some history to the site.
- It looks good, lots of garden - relatively cheap to operate.
- Retains the heritage structure, preserves feel of the Woodlands site; serves as a reminder, though some find memories painful; "marks" the site, similar to preserved buildings on BC Pen [sic] site.
- It costs less and it doesn't take away from the atmosphere.
- Second choice, like retention of building and its history told through interpretive panels; can have garden around it; preserves elements and mystery of ruin.
- First choice; it's practical; and would preserve an important icon. Window access a great idea.
- It retains the façade and the historic "flavour" of the architecture. If this is attached - appropriate attachment might be difficult; "peeking in" a great idea.
- First choice: the tower is retained - will resonate more as a reminder of what was here for people passing by.
- Retains original structure and views to the building as one enters the site; like the interpretation aspect.
- First choice: it saves the structure in its present entirety, and the window to the inside allows for the architecture to show through.
- It keeps the building intact and it tells a story.
- It retains some sense of history.
- Maintains viewscape/landmark; retains greatest amount of original buildings; can be fully restored in the future.
- Best of the three, retains historical and architectural integrity and honours the past - both are very significant.
- It honours Woodlands and its former residents and provides public access for current residents.



*I do not like this because:*

- Strongly opposed to this idea. It is way too expensive to restore and we don't need to look at a building that brings bad memories and resentful feelings as this scares buyers away. We should be trying to attract people to New West and not scare them away with a bad history.
- Provides not "useful" function for the site except as a "memory."
- It will become a target for graffiti.
- No public access to the building and the tower remains which may appear out of place depending on the development planned for the surrounding area.
- The high upfront cost.
- It reminds me of where I had my teeth pulled out. Keeping is against my wishes.
- Get rid of it!!!
- It should be destroyed.
- We don't need a reminder.
- Too sad.
- It would bring unpleasant memories.
- Destroy.
- Get rid of it, too costly, money can be better spent.
- Spend the money on the suffering.
- More expensive.
- It was a site of such a sad part of community living history - former residents want it gone.
- It is a reminder of what was not a promise of where we can go and we become an even more inclusive community.
- Creates a "memorial" that reflects a dark and horrific era of abuse.
- Long term it's not a good choice, will not consider future residents, disrespectful to former residents.
- The cost and the memorial garden does this job.
- It is a reminder to the "survivors" of Woodlands on the horrendous treatment they were subject to, particularly in the Centre Block.
- This is insensitive to our [former residents] concerns.
- Disrespectful and unsightly.
- It is a reminder of what happened.
- Waste of money; may not tell the story from former residents' perspective.
- No access, not enough change.



- Closing off building repeats history of no public access or view inside to see what was happening for residents - too symbolically like history.
- Too many bad memories.
- There needs to be public access.
- I don't support this option as this building has very bad memories for me as I was a former resident and the place still gives me nightmares!
- The building itself holds bad/negative feelings to former residents.
- Too cold.
- No public access.
- It's ridiculous.
- I do not like this one.
- You cannot use it.
- Heritage aspect compromised by north wall. Expensive, does not honour wishes of former residents.
- Might scare people away who don't know how to appreciate this heritage and the history behind it.
- Seems a waste of space.
- I feel that the amount of money spent does not justify the end results.
- Little use to the community 'empty' negative connotation represents 'the gate of hell.'
- Not worth it. Little future value.
- People will break-in as usual, dead space, enough already died here.
- Waste of space.
- Maintenance issues; couldn't protect Centre Block!!
- It would only be a relic - why not utilize the space in an area where space is limited for such things as meetings/art gallery, etc?
- (Third choice) wasteful to keep unused building - safety and vandalism issues.
- The building will not be accessible to the public.
- More of a ruin is being created and the large rear wall is particularly ugly.
- Bad memories, too small, waste of money - as other land to be developed nearby.
- I know a former resident and he never wants to see this building again.
- It serves no purpose and has a bad history.
- It would cost a fair amount of money for very little use.
- Too expensive - taxes are already high! Save the building for what?? Detracts from residential development.



- This would be a historical site that would rarely be used by the community. This tower should not be a tour site for negativity.
- Seems wasteful to maintain a non-functioning building.
- I don't want to pay for something I have no access to. It is an ugly structure and has no redeeming attributes.
- It is a useless eyesore; too expensive (raise our taxes?).
- No public access; no reuse possible.
- I work with several former residents of Woodlands - they all say "tear it down" and "I don't want to be reminded of what went on there."
- It shouldn't stand as is if people don't have access to it. Aesthetically, it will detract from the community.
- Who would want to live at this property and look at that? Get rid of hideously looking building; has too many bad memories for people.
- If it's not a positive use of space - it will degrade over time.
- It creates a "useless" monument for a million dollars. Who is going to come and look at it?
- A bit useless? Bound to be surrounded by new development.
- I do not like this one.
- I don't like this option! This wasn't the world's greatest orphanage. How many good memories are left?
- Cement wall to close off is an eyesore than pleasing. Capital cost is high.
- It is not wise to have an empty building.
- No public access.
- No public access; cement wall could be unsightly for neighbours.
- No public access; don't like the cost; is Onni responsible for all the costs? Who will maintain it?
- Not being able to go in entry, but good that views are afforded into the building.
- It would be a permanent statement of an unpleasant past for former patients and residents of Woodlands; affirmative no!
- It would not be an inviting place to visit; it may be a sad memory to former residents.
- Because it's an eyesore to residents of new area; waste of space.
- Buildings not fully restored; no access to interior; no re-use so now new memories are good memories.
- Scrap icon to Woodlands.
- Too costly a project to be retained as a ruin.
- It is not bad, but I prefer option #3.



## 2. Choice #2: Create Community/Reflective Garden

### *I like this one because:*

- It offers a space for residents to use (not just to look at), the tower is reduced in height, and the space will blend better with the existing community.
- This is my second choice, as it honours history, beautification, low up-front cost.
- I would like a community garden.
- (Former resident) likes the idea of the garden because it would look pretty.
- Less expensive.
- It gives positive thoughts.
- Great changes, very positive, tells the story.
- Similar to first but more visually appealing.
- Positive use.
- Good.
- Create a garden by all means, bulldoze the building first.
- I like this one because gardens are an asset to the community and having the roof removed allows much more public access. I would like to see the 12 foot wall option implemented. If for no other reason because it would cost Onni more money and I think they should have to use the full \$1.6 million that they pledged for heritage retention.
- It promotes people to walk.
- Comes closest to the wishes of former residents, lowest cost, best chance of integration with the new development.
- Not blocking the view to the river.
- Place to walk around, [already] too many buildings and parking spots.
- I like open landscaped space. On the other hand, we already have a memorial garden so just having a nicely landscaped space is preferable than another memorial garden.
- I like this one because of the use to the community, preserves historical significance, gives the feeling of the place to visitors, brings home the experience.
- This is #1, community garden is key.
- Useful space and nice to look at. Remembrance to old residents. Green space.
- (First choice.) Will merge best with residential development; price; deals best with concerns of former residents?
- Maintain more garden space and somewhere for people to reflect, where someone could teach the next generation so that nothing like this happens again.



- Does not evoke negative memories - building is gone.
- Project cost is low; gardens are good for communal space; if controlled, it would offer more green space to a very crowded development; helps to create transition to open field on park.
- Most respectful, least expensive.
- The garden would be useful and be a part of the community park. Useful in the sense that it would be used for walking and enjoyment.
- You can never have enough gardens; respects ex-residents request to remove tower.
- Openness of plan; suggest that gardens be developed as community gardens.
- It also looks good.
- This is the best one, but also should be reduced to the ground; memorial with minimal "costs" for upkeep.
- Could be an attractive space.
- Seems the obvious choice. Turn an ugly history into a peaceful place.
- Capital cost is most reasonable compared to other scenarios; greater opportunity for community enjoyment; cost covered by owner's commitment under Heritage Revitalization Agreement.
- First choice if safety could be guaranteed; it is reminiscent of European ruins made into public spaces. Beautiful design - nice way to retain footprint without competing with new buildings.
- Third choice: separation from new buildings is an advantage.
- Pro and con: people will be able to walk inside; may be better received by former residents; innovative idea - probably little else the same - the tower remains.
- It has a sense of healing and reflection; the building would not be such an eyesore; it could be promoted as a garden walk - linking up with the garden at the Glenbrook Community Centre and Queen's Park.
- Choose this option (no reason given).
- Makes a nice garden.
- Low expenses and garden access.
- At least something is physically saved.



*I do not like this because:*

- Out of all three options this would be my second to best option because it has as little as possible to do with a mental asylum and original look and plan. The building is ugly. There is already a Woodlands Memorial by Ross Street and no one needs to relive the nightmares that happened at the abusive institution. We would be violating the confidentiality and respect of patients.
- It replicates the “memorial garden” in terms of function.
- There is already a memorial garden nearby.
- The operating cost is high.
- High annual operating costs.
- It keeps part of the institution. Remove it all and put in a garden.
- It is not needed so get rid of it!
- It should be destroyed.
- We don't need another garden.
- Bad memories of my stay.
- Bad memories so get rid of it.
- Destroy, too costly.
- The structure still remains.
- We have the Woodlands Memorial Garden.
- We already have a memorial garden.
- Creates a “memorial” that reflects a dark and horrific era of abuse.
- Not sure what there would be representative of former residents? This could be accomplished in the cemetery area.
- Memorial garden does this.
- Again, survivors don't want a visual reminder of their traumatic experiences in the Woodlands Institution (walls). I am respectful of their wishes. There already is a memorial garden on the site.
- Don't like it.
- Waste of money; may not tell the story from former residents' perspective.
- Don't see the point of saving hall walls, unprotected outdoor space limits what can be displayed.
- I would not visit it!
- Reminder.
- Destroy what remains of a heritage building against heritage plan. Potentially Illegal.
- I don't think this is legal under heritage legislation. I would challenge it in the courts.



- It could be a place to congregate at night and be noisy - disturb the neighbours. There is lots of green space around the tower and a beautiful garden further west in Victoria Hill.
- You cannot use it.
- It duplicates existing memorial garden, meaningless. Might attract homeless people to hang around.
- Opportunity to track homeless people because it's open; why is there a high operating cost?
- Duplicating garden on the north site.
- Already have a site to the north.
- We already have a beautiful garden which respectfully represents the Woodlands era. We do not need another one.
- I see no negatives here.
- Why are recurring costs so high?
- Lose the architectural beauty of the building.
- No reference to heritage building and character of New Westminster.
- The issue is a heritage building, not a memorial garden. There already is one.
- The nature of the building is gone. The most important aspect is architectural and this would be lost.
- I don't see value in this. The memorial garden serves this purpose better.
- If it would upset former residents.
- Most of the tower will be lost.
- Too much maintenance and again, there is already a memorial garden.
- This scenario is more preferred of the three options, however, does not work to have an increase in strata fees.
- There is a garden like this: memorial garden.
- There already is one.
- Operating costs are quite high; could be a source of noise with youth using it for parties.
- Enclosed spaces provides area for night activity.
- We already have a reflective garden, we don't need any more. "Artwork and interpretive panels" put this in the memorial garden up the hill.
- It will attract the wrong kind of people (street people). We have a memorial garden already.
- Already have this in the memorial garden!
- If you want to honour heritage value, the whole tower must be retained.



- Too much operating cost.
- It is likely to be dwarfed by Onni properties.
- Same reasons as above: It creates a “useless” monument for a million dollars. Who is going to come and look at it? Although at a lower cost.
- There is already a memorial garden on the site; will be dwarfed by new development? Already lots of green space/garden space at this end of the site.
- I do not like this one.
- We already have a reflective garden.
- Third choice; does not preserve the tower and its elements (walls outside not enough); security issues; duplicates garden function already done in memorial garden.
- Third choice; I am concerned about security issues as a neighbour. Does not preserve enough of the building which still stands. We already have a memorial garden nearby.
- It lends itself to a place to “hang out” - could be difficult to manage; heights of 6’ and 12’ very limited, different levels may be safer, security wise. I don’t understand how this will fit in with another new building adjacent to it.
- Third choice: might get lost within the site - could become a hangout for teens (safety issues, etc).
- Security issues of having people access; will require more landscape maintenance.
- It may become a hangout for late night rowdies and, therefore, an annoyance for Victoria Hill neighbours. If it is this one, I would stagger the heights and angle them to make it look more like a natural ruin.
- It would be a permanent embellishment of an unpleasant past to former patients and residents of North Woodlands; affirmative no!
- It destroys the physical structure.
- There is already a ‘reflective’ area at the west end of the site. Do we homeowners need to be surrounded by memorials? Serves no purpose to current owners of condos.
- Destroys significant historical building and site history diminishes; creates an artificial ruin; lets the owner get out of commitments to restore; opportunity to fully restore later is lost.
- Scrap this one.
- Removes architectural significant community value of the site.
- The legacy and human lessons learned from the Woodlands period will lose their significance.
- It has no resemblance to the historical building at all.



### 3. Choice #3: Re-Use Building to Benefit Former Residents and/or the Community

*I like this one because:*

- It respects the integrity of the structure and its heritage historical value; it provides an “unusual” function for this site.
- Only if ownership is permanently transferred to a non-profit representing the community of individuals with development disabilities.
- I like for this area to be used as a fund generating property.
- Maybe but I do not want to be ever reminded about Woodlands experience.
- I would like to tell my story about living in Woodlands and how I like living in the community much better.
- I'd like to display my art and tell my story of living at Woodlands. I want to tell people that living in the community is better.
- It would give the history of what people went through.
- It is a way to remind people of a history that has a risk of being forgotten.
- If chosen, could be a museum to the lives of the individuals (former residents), maybe using the “inside out” display in conjunction with the cemetery.
- House a non-profit for people with development disabilities and interpretive area.
- It combines the old and new. If not this, then demolish.
- It allows historical displays and use for former residents and families, with promise that disability community would control and own.
- The story of the residents can be told.
- Use to benefit lower income groups.
- Retains heritage façade, public access.
- The building will resonate with the community, might generate some income. I like the back wall.
- I like this one for its uses, but the building is so deteriorated that the costs to “re-construct” it could be more effectively deployed.
- It promotes its history and you can use it.
- There are so many unknowns regarding the final use of it. You don't know what will happen.
- Benefits the community.
- Serves the community, possible revenue generation for the City?
- Building will be used, maintained and safe.



- Offers an opportunity for information and interpretation.
- The building is retained and utilized.
- (Second choice.) Possible positive cash flow?
- Tower retained, public access, community use, however, I would prefer the surrounding garden to be larger than the illustration incorporating a small park like the memorial garden.
- This is my second choice - if there are windows at the rear, not a concrete wall.
- More space for community groups; allows for some control of space so it doesn't pose a security risk.
- Community centre; incorporate "wellness" places - i.e., yoga centre/mental health centre.
- Creative positive reuse.
- It respects the heritage and the memory of the original institution but revitalizes it so it's accessible to the public.
- Ugly unattractive building, no one wants to live in front of it and look at that site. Obvious choice: see water or centre block.
- It is a good use of the space and presents a positive image.
- It retains structure, tells the story and is put to use.
- Keeps the building, heritage preserved; gives new life, do something positive with it; good space for small business, like retail or café (very unusual location), we need a coffee shop around here!
- Commercial business would be attracted to the area.
- It retains some of the original building and it could be used as a "healing space."
- First choice; preserve and see staircase; could still have garden/landscaping around it; retains heritage building and tells the story; has important public use/access option; functional.
- Second choice; reuse is the best way to preserve heritage. Community benefits - Queen's Park may also use; numerous possibilities.
- Fourth choice: it retains the building and puts it to use. It gives the opportunity to honour former residents and allow them to "take back" the building.
- Second choice: it is still in use - not an "empty shell" - still a living building and more protected from future damage.
- It will add more [illegible]; could offer more opportunity for "telling the story" and incorporates office/non-profit use.
- It saves the structure but does change it.
- Definitely preferred.



- An effective use of a heritage structure, remembers the past, but also the only idea that will benefit the surrounding community.
- Brings new life to the building; creates a place of healing; best heritage retention.
- It was a medical conference (1200m) on the third floor, I remember that room because it was the first kind in North America, before college changed policy in 1963. Museum.
- Preserves the historical building, but truly limiting.
- Practical combination of historical meaning and contemporary, empowering perspective for residents/community.
- Retains building architecture, public access, tells historic story - without doubt the best choice.

*I do not like this because:*

- Do not like it. No hope for retailers and businesses to rent/use this space, will remain empty and not used. Bad for pricing the value of houses in Victoria Hill. Also, former patients do not care for help and ongoing talk about experiences. As an owner, I do not want a memory of this.
- I see no strengths/there are no elements I like, it would bring more traffic to the area, which already can be congested with cars that are illegally parked.
- No, costs too much: upfront cost high, maintenance is high; residents already have a meeting space they do not use.
- This is a bad solution. It is still a reminder. I don't want to go by it and see it still there.
- Just get rid of it!
- I (we) can't imagine that anyone would want to use that space.
- Garden idea looks better.
- Don't want reminder of my son's life at Woodlands.
- Too costly, waste of money.
- The building really needs to go for what it stands for.
- It is not respectful of the individuals who lived at Woodlands.
- Creates a "memorial" that reflects a dark and horrific era of abuse. Unrealistic estimate of operating costs.
- Would be an ongoing reminder of unpleasant times for many future residents.
- Does not represent the social history of the building.
- "Total Annual Operating Costs - \$6,000" (under-estimated); again, a "costly" reminder to victims of abuse of how they were treated.



- Undecided.
- Misuse of public funds.
- Far too much cost; operating cost seems unrealistic.
- I doubt former residents would want to see this building as is.
- No! Too much of a reminder.
- Too much money.
- High cost.
- It's insensitive to the people who were housed there without choice.
- Cost.
- Most expensive, greatly compromises heritage aspect.
- High development costs; might bring safety issues to the area because of different sources of people coming.
- The initial cost is too high. The representation of the finished product is not beneficial.
- How do the former residents feel about this option? This is very important to know. Must be used appropriately to show adequate level of respect.
- Overhead too high.
- Too speculative, don't trust Onni and what they will do; too expensive.
- Rooms too small for anything.
- Don't like the "glazed" wall, question of cost - recouping some through rental of space?
- (Second choice.) Possible negative cash flow?
- Too expensive and waste of money; negative issues to retain tower.
- Everybody is telling stories about this place, horrible stories. Even in the dental office where I work, patients, co-workers, my children's classmates.
- Very high initial costs; very limited amount of room without a defined plan for use (too vague).
- Detracts from residential development; too expensive; keeping an old, decrepit building alive for no good reason.
- I am surprised maintenance is only \$6000, less than scenario #2, why? Electricity, cleaning, etc.
- We already have lots of meeting space, no need for more!
- Are you guys crazy? \$\$\$
- See comment #1: I work with several former residents of Woodlands - they all say "tear it down" and "I don't want to be reminded of what went on there".
- Who would be the tenants/managers? Parking issues? Operating costs seem low.



- I do not like this one.
- Already have issues with lack of parking, do not want an ugly parking lot.
- Capital cost much too high for limited use. Meeting rooms already available elsewhere in the development.
- Higher risk - who pays for it? (more expensive); ownership and governance issues (what if it doesn't work out with non-profit groups?).
- Not sure that former residents use should be prioritized over broad community benefits, but their concerns should continue to be respected.
- Fourth choice: expensive - difficult to get a market rent from a non-profit group. Expensive per square foot costs not feasible economically.
- Second choice: the use must be carefully considered - has to fit with what the community wants.
- Fairly expensive option; interfere with adjacent residential buildings will need to be addressed; isolated location for non-profit groups.
- Who is going to operate it and who will use it? Community amenities; what will secure its future use/life?
- Demolition: I like this one because: don't want the reminder.
- It is a magnification of the other two choices; keep the story in the history books; affirmative no!
- The building looks too tall and narrow standing alone - it no longer fits with the surrounding buildings; it requires a major renovation.
- Not enough restoration of original exterior or roof; building should make some revenue to off-set costs.
- Scrap the building.
- Too expensive; would be nice to see preservation but may not be feasible.



#### 4. Other...

- I would like the tower to be demolished because it will bring closure in every way. Victoria Hill would be able to thrive and get its most property value instead of a bad reputation for remembering "a heritage mental asylum."
- I would like to see the site part of the larger context of Victoria Hill, it would be great if there was a way to integrate the use of this building into Healthy options i.e.: community facility, library, community service, etc.
- Demolition is the preferred option and allows for healing.
- I would like the tower to be demolished and the space used for city purposes. My family and I do not want to review our memories of the time I spent at Woodlands. My life is happy now and I do not need reminders of the past.
- My family and I have no desire to revisit the Woodlands site or buildings. It should be cleared away and the property used for something functional. I will not be interested in anything else.
- My family and I would like all associations with Woodlands buildings and property to be eliminated. We have moved on to a good life and don't want to review those memories from the past. Put the property for some use for the neighbourhood.
- To demolish.
- Demolish it! I want to be invited to the demolition to watch it get destroyed. I just want it demolished. Listen to our wishes.
- 10 tons of TNT detonated in it!!
- The tower should be knocked down and plant trees and a garden.
- Why wasn't demolition costed out? Please destroy it so that those who were abused there never have to see it again.
- Demolish!!!
- Remove the tower. This tower is not a positive to many folks that lost their freedoms and dignity.
- I would like to see the tower removed.
- Make it into a classroom for former residents.
- Woodlands institution has represented a prison to many folks I support. For them it is "finished forever and ever" as a former resident would say. They would like to think the building/tower is gone too.
- Garden.
- This building has very bad memories for my loved ones. It would be nice to see a new chapter started with new construction.



- I like it to be a White Spot, like it to be a coffee place, Tim Horton's. I like it to be a park and square. I was a Woodlands [former resident] for 12 years and I left on January 18, 1974. On site ramps. Like to see Woodlands for parking place and like to see an art gallery.
- Destroy.
- Get rid of it.
- Level it to the ground.
- The tower needs to go, perhaps what is done with the space honours community living and the former residents. Option 2 keeps part of the structure and that is for many the truly painful past for many residents. From a historical perspective, this site needs to be remembered but the symbol of the horror needs to be removed. Consider a museum to be housed the "inside, out" exhibition and really making it a community living education centre.
- An international centre for learning and sharing around building strong inclusive communities and supporting accessibility.
- That it should be taken down. We want it to be gone so people can live in peace.
- Demolition, the building represents a dark history that needs to be addressed. Keeping the building is an offense to former residents, their families and all Canadians who believe in inclusion.
- This space is left blank as it reflects my position. Demolish the building, it's the right thing. Honour the individuals who suffered there; honour their voice. Demolish the tower.
- Complete demolition in respect to the former residents who were abused within those very walls - a museum would be a good option. There is already a memorial garden.
- Remove the tower, spend some of this money to upgrade and maintain the cemetery as a memorial and a reminder of why we do not want to ever return to institutions.
- A dedicated museum/interpretive centre around Woodlands but also Riverview and prison - no need for a garden as we have a memorial garden; open to public inside; multi-media, video clips from former residents, etc.
- Demolish: The centre block represents, and was, the site of some of the abuse at Woodlands. Out of respect for the survivors wishes, demolish the Centre Block.
- Demolition, as per the wishes of survivors. By ignoring the voices of people with disabilities we further victimize them.
- Bulldoze the whole thing and clean up the site.
- Demolish the edifice of this shameful and oppressive history; this heritage of harm must not be preserved. A quite, public space that enables the healing.



- Not all history is equal, nor is all “heritage” the same. Commemorating “May Day” parades in any possible plaque or signage on a site where so much harm was done to so many, where so much violence and hurt was perpetuated, is to diminish this dark stain on our history. It would be to insult and marginalize once again those who suffered and died. Be careful. Be respectful. Be focused on the most significant period of the site’s history.
- I would like to respect the people who died. I would like to see the structure demolished, however, the space used to respect the former residents of Woodlands.
- Blow it up and give former residents a role in the process, most former residents want it demolished; their wishes should be honoured.
- Blow it up. Now as of yesterday.
- Tear it down and make it into a memorial park for residents of Woodland. What/whose story of Woodlands are you going to tell?
- It should be demolished and not held against people’s wishes.
- I like the second option and there should be a fee to go in a view things if you weren’t a Woodlands resident or support staff, and the \$\$\$ should go towards funding activities or creative activities for survivors. There could even be able to take part in planting items in the garden, flowers, veggies, etc. I also want to know “who’s” story is going to be displayed and told about the Woodlands School? There should be a ton of effort to get as many residents who are still alive and get their story from their mouth and/or the parent’s perception and experience. To just pick 10/20 people’s story and put the best sounding one on display isn’t truly telling the whole picture. To get a display of ‘where are they now” would be good too, to show how society has progressed, and the advocacy movement. Whatever happens, former residents should have a say of what goes in it.
- I would only support this option if a portion of it is used as a Woodlands school museum and/or interpretive centre so people can see the real history of the site.
- A memorial of some kind needs to remain, the residents’ story told.
- Knock down, don’t need a reminder.
- Go down.
- I would keep the building and make it safe, open to the public. Make it an art and history “museum,” reflecting the history of New Westminster not only the institution (see choice 1 for illustration).
- Tear it down! Get rid of everything.
- Tear it down. It was a good idea to plough Woodlands down because people can live a normal life and not have to go into an institution.
- The building should be torn down. All traces of the building should be removed. People who lived at Woodlands do not recognize it as a site that needs to be memorialized. Anyone who spent any time there would say the same.



- My whole point is to increase the value of surrounding properties, make the neighbourhood a safe area to live in. Repaint it and make it stronger and nicer.
- All of nothing; choice 1 or demolish the tower.
- None of these scenarios make sense to me, the tower will be dwarfed by all the other residential development that is to happen.
- I feel they should remove the existing tower and rebuild a similar structure illustrating the architecture of the time. Also, the new building can be used as a museum with pictures and artifacts, illustrations and history unfolding the Woodlands story. It could be quite a revenue generator.
- Remove the tower, develop native species garden and allow the superb New Westminster Parks Department to show their stuff again.
- Onni is not a reputable builder, please to not allow them to over build these beautiful grounds - something that adds real beauty and heritage to New Westminster. I would be happy with any of these three options, I would not like to see more commercial/residential. Green space is a premium and a great way to share the beautiful area with all people, great way to 'make amends.' An alternative: any of the three scenarios add green space, no further development - open parking so people can visit (use C & E for green space and parking). People could visit both gardens - now there is a chance to visit either garden.
- Add new Centre Block as new (to look the same as it originally looked), reusing existing tower - old meets new but still keeps the original look of the building. Make the tower space for artifacts for building history, and not just about the abuse issues.
- Rebuild as it was suppose to look: "the castle on the hill."
- Preserve tower as part of our history for good or bad. Architecturally significant.
- Do whatever the former residents want. They have gone through enough and that are the only opinions we should be considered with.
- We favour the demolition of the tower. The buildings to be built can incorporate certain features of the historical significance of the original buildings. It also allows for the new residences to be spread out rather than being built higher.
- Prefer to demolish. Both because former residents prefer that and we already have a memorial garden.
- I would like Parcel E to be turned into green space by the City and not selling it to any developer!
- Best option - Demolish tower, create a park.
- Demolish the tower.
- Demolish the tower. Demolish the tower.
- Demolish the tower! The people's interest is most important because we live here! It causes negative reflection of Victoria Hill and is a turn off to buyers. We are trying to make New Westminster flourish not scare away people/buyers.



- Preferred choice is for total demolition - why save this old ruin? It's full of horrible memories and an awful history.
- Need reassurance that there is a setback of adjacent strata buildings.
- Our strata fees are already high enough, I do not want anything that will increase my fees. Tear it down. Put all the memories in the memorial garden. We need a small market, more parking! If we are concerned about heritage, why no discussion around St. Mary's Hospital?
- Knock it down in favour of more parking; small flower/gardens and a newer artefact (remembrance of tower) model! New Westminster is full of heritage, how come no one cared about St. Mary's hospital? We would like the ownership to never be able to affect strata fees.
- Tear it down and build extra parking; St. Mary's should have been heritage.
- Swap parcels E and C with Onni, develop as community space and community gardens.
- Raze the tower and start over ... and if we must have more towers built at Victoria Hill, build them here at the lower end of the property, not at the top (i.e. "J"). If ruin must be kept, then combine choice #3 with two high-rises.
- Plaque/ground memorial "Woodlands friends remember that fate of many but will never forget;" do not give any portion of it to Onni ever.
- It is important that adjacent development does not overwhelm it. The height, mass, footprint restrictions must be applied. Residents must be consulted again once Onni have put forward their proposal and we can see the tower site in context of what is proposed.
- I know a lot of people would like to see the tower demolished because of its history. I think it is an important reminder - myself, when I'm walking outside (I have a dog, so it's a lot) I look at it and think of those kids. So, I think if we demolish the reminder, we will forget - and perhaps keep repeating the cruelty? Memories are important, even the bad ones. If it's demolished, does Onni then have free rein to build right out to the edge of the current green space?
- Demolish it! We have to look at it every day; leave open park space - larger green space.
- I would like to retain the heritage building and have it available as a "healing place" with a surrounding community garden.
- Incorporate tower into a larger contemporary public facility that includes interpretive panels on history of the building; tower would be the focus.
- Second choice: I would like to see all or part of the tower retained and incorporated "inside" a new building. If the former residents are not in favour of keeping the tower - who really does want it? Is there enough to retain any heritage value?
- More of a museum concept; use the space as a museum space - with historic photos etc. on display.



- Keep new residential buildings distinct from tower - physically separated if possible; all three scenarios - or versions of them - offer a sensitive response and enhance heritage value.
- Demolish ruins. Build a much needed library and keep the unpleasant history in the books. The money in my mind would be better spent for former patients and residents of North Woodlands.
- The tower should be incorporated into a small neighbourhood commercial complex with parking. Residents of the area currently are cut off from commercial due to high traffic on McBride and completely inadequate transit service. Tower was originally going to be incorporated into new condo's - why now are we looking at 'benefiting former residents.' That is what the "memorial gardens" are for. New Westminster to start supporting new owners with amenities. Lack of bus service, lack of parking, no bike storage will drive owners to look elsewhere, as I am.
- Presentation could be enhanced if: a) a true site context plan was provided - the site plan contained in the report and hard copies provided didn't illustrate the larger context - i.e., current towers place within Victoria Hill. Many individuals have seen the "old" Onni Master Community Plan image which illustrated the prior vision for the Centre Tower Block - it would have been great to see what the new "site" could look like in these planning scenarios; b) the use of a 50 foot perimeter centred on the tower ruin was not clearly defined (visually or contextually) making it harder for individuals to visualize - was the 50 foot perimeter centred on the tower ruin - and what did that mean in terms of the tower relative to existing fixed assets (i.e., the road or sidewalks).
- Frankly, I find the construction not worth saving. In time, there will be no former residents (and no us either!) and I can only imagine what future residents of New Westminster would say upon gazing at this ignoble ruin. I think a plaque somewhere would suffice to inform that this area once held a construction with a tragic history. Photographs of it in its original state would be more informative. It was never a pretty building.
- We sympathize with former residents of Woodlands and feel the tower should be completely demolished. These people do not need a reminder of that time. Our only other acceptance would incorporate this tower into a low rise that Onni has planned to build on this parcel of land. This then would be maintained in the strata fees of the low rise built on the Centre Block site and should not be everyone else's expense. Onni's previous plans for this area are a disaster. We have now a problem with parking in Victoria Hill, we do not need more expense.
- The existence of this building is painful. Please tear it down. Total annual operating cost - priceless.
- Who will pay? How will new buildings attach? Not enough space for it. Wellness centre.



- Interactive for children, but lower the walls so that street people don't sleep there. Make it a large playground for children.
- As a current resident, I do not want a memorial. What took place on the site is of course a sorry human history ... I don't want to live in an area reminiscent of the worst in human potential. There is a memorial garden to the northwest that is very appropriate. Therefore, take the tower down.
- Full restoration to 19<sup>th</sup> century character on exterior; usable interior spaces; some community access but not entirely necessarily (e.g. PEN building); interpretive garden for art/history; recreate greenhouses for community gardens including mental health community; (see drawings) restore original height of tower equals more space and more character; restore bay window and porch.
- Demolition, yes please.
- Preserving the rich history of the site, including its role as the first BC Legislature and Government house of the colony of British Columbia, along with architectural history of this specific building.
- Use the tower as a gallery associated with a hi-tech library. New West City has to build on this site; a rare opportunity for visions and creativity; no developers please.



5. Written Feedback Not on a Feedback Form:

a. Option #1

- (Dislike) much like the memories that many residents had here - a ruin of hope.
- This would be my top choice as it is the most respectful of former Woodlands residents and their families; the ruin is accessible to all, however no access into the building will make the area safer; the art work panels could help support local artists; it has a low annual operating cost.

b. Option #2

- Reduce the height of the walls, remove the roof and create a garden; public access to where the building was; artwork and interpretive panels (tell the story of Woodlands and its former residents) absolutely no; total project cost would be much lower; create a park/garden, let people come and make a positive space, if they want to know the story, they can look it up.
- Appropriate if just a garden was left with memorial plaques, no walls; concerns about vandalism.
- Without disrespecting former Woodlands residents and their family, I fail to see what another "reflecting pool" or a ruin will add to the community as it is today, and will be tomorrow.
- This would be my second choice and I really like the idea of reflective garden; however, having the walls of the tower open to walk through could lead to potential crime and possibly homeless people using it for shelter.

c. Option #3

- (Like) this is my choice from those given, other than the garden without walls. Easy for maintenance, as well!!
- I really like the third option for the Centre Block tower; one of my favourite parts of the area is the historical buildings so I really liked how the third option has used the remaining heritage building in its entirety; I think it would encourage a sense of community, especially if it stays true to being a meeting place for outreach programs, resource centres and local art showcases.
- I do not like this idea; don't think it's an area that can accommodate traffic flow.
- I would prefer that option #3 be given primary consideration; functional use would provide nearby residents with a viable community focal point/anchor for



community events; as well, the buildings "story" would provide an opportunity for current society to acknowledge the legitimate grievances of those who were incarcerated and suffered abuse from those in positions of power or from other inmates/ residents who were allowed to enact trauma while not properly supervised by those in authority; it might even allow former residents an opportunity to continue on their journey of recovery through the recognition by others of their suffering.

d. Other

- The building should be razed to the ground and forever forgotten.
- I would rather see the tower demolished rather than retain it with maintenance costs falling on the residents of Victoria Hill.
- A commercial area that serves the current residents will make the community much more attractive for new owners.