

**Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area: Incentives Program —
Review of Council Discussion on Implementation Framework**

ON-TABLE ITEM 1

Memorandum

To: Advisory Planning Commission Date: May 15, 2018

From: Lynn Roxburgh, Senior Planner File: 13.2605.40
Britney Quail, Heritage Planner

Subject: Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area: Incentives Program— Review
of Council Discussion on Implementation Framework

The Advisory Planning Commission has been presented with a report which summarizes the results of the work on the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area Incentives Program and provided a draft Implementation Framework. Per the report, Council discussed the draft Framework at a meeting on May 14, 2018 and provided direction on which incentives to implement.

Attached to this memorandum, the Advisory Planning Commission is being presented with a chart which details Council's direction on each incentive. The summary chart is the endorsed Framework.

Also on-table is a draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw, which would bring into effect those incentives which have been identified in the Framework for implementation in the short term. The short term incentives endorsed by Council on May 14 include:

- 1) additional floor space for the principal house,
- 2) more achievable density transfer to laneway and carriage houses,
- 3) relaxation of laneway and carriage house guidelines, and
- 4) Building Code relaxations.

The first two of these incentives require changes to the Zoning Bylaw. The draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw is attached for the Commission to review.

The Advisory Planning Commission is being asked to make a recommendation on supporting the Zoning Bylaw amendment, which would implement the two short term elements of the Incentives Program. The other two short term incentives can begin to be implemented immediately without any bylaw amendments.

Appendix 1

*Summary of Council Direction: Incentive
Framework for Protected Properties in the
Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area*

Summary of Council Direction: Incentive Framework for Protected Properties in the Queen’s Park Heritage Conservation Area

Proposed Incentive	Staff Recommendation	Timeframe	Details	Council Direction (May 14, 2018)
<i>1.0 Increase in Density</i>				
1.1 Increased Floor Space Ratio (FSR) for the Principal Dwelling	Yes	Short Term	Increase the FSR by 0.20 for all protected properties.	Support direction proposed by staff.
1.2 Existing Basement Floor Space Exclusion	No	-	Offer a larger increase in FSR instead of this incentive.	Support direction proposed by staff.
1.3 Existing Attic Floor Space Exclusion	No	-	Offer a larger increase in FSR instead of this incentive.	Support direction proposed by staff.
1.4 More Achievable Laneway or Carriage House Density	Yes	Short Term	Allow a larger density transfer to enable a laneway or carriage house of up to 958 square feet.	Support direction proposed by staff.
1.5 Larger Laneway House or Carriage House	Yes, for some	Medium Term	Allow only for large properties with houses that are already over density.	Do not support the direction proposed by staff. Instead, only allow through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement.

Proposed Incentive	Staff Recommendation	Timeframe	Details	Council Direction (May 14, 2018)
<i>2.0 Relaxation of Regulations</i>				
2.1 Policy to Support Additions to Buildings that do not Conform with the Zoning Bylaw	Yes	Medium Term	Existing policy for Development Variance Permits would be reviewed and a guide created	Support direction proposed by staff.
2.2 Relaxations for Laneway and Carriage House Regulations and Guidelines	Yes	Short Term	Minor relaxations to guidelines will be supported, when appropriate.	Support direction proposed by staff.
2.3 Relaxation of Sewer Separation Requirements for Laneway and Carriage Houses	Citywide	-	Citywide relaxations when the principal dwelling is being retained.	Support direction proposed by staff.
2.4 Building Code Relaxations	Yes	As requested, starting in the short term	Opportunities for owners will be identified when they apply to renovate.	Support direction proposed by staff.

Proposed Incentive	Staff Recommendation	Timeframe	Details	Council Direction (May 14, 2018)
<i>3.0 Change of Tenure</i>				
3.1 Stratified Laneway or Carriage House	Yes	Medium Term	Allow for all protected properties.	More work needed over the medium term to determine whether implemented outright, with conditions or only through a Heritage Revitalisation Agreement.
3.2 Stratified Principal Dwelling	Yes, for some	Medium Term	Allow only for large properties with houses that are already over density.	Do not support the direction proposed by staff. Instead, only allow through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement.
3.3 Multiple Unit Conversion (Rental)	Yes, for some	Medium Term	Allow only for large properties with houses that are already over density.	Support direction proposed by staff, but more work needed over the medium term.
3.4 Small Lot Subdivision	No	-	Only allow through a Heritage Revitalization Agreement	Support direction proposed by staff.

Proposed Incentive	Staff Recommendation	Timeframe	Details	Council Direction (May 14, 2018)
<i>4.0 Process and Other Changes</i>				
4.1 Heritage Home Grant Program	Citywide	-	Explore expansion of the program citywide.	Support direction proposed by staff.
4.2 Interpretive Sign Program	Citywide	-	Incorporate into an existing citywide work plan.	Support direction proposed by staff.
4.3 Expedited Approval Process	Yes	Medium Term	Explore ways to expedite other related city permits. Explore additional services to assist owners when they apply to renovate. Refine the Evaluation Checklist. Develop additional design guidelines during Heritage Conservation Area review.	Support direction proposed by staff.

Appendix 2
Bylaw No. 8024, 2018

GIVEN THIRD READING this day of 2018.

ADOPTED and the Seal of the Corporation of the City of New Westminster affixed
this day of 2018.

JONATHAN X. COTE, MAYOR

JACQUE KILLAWEE, CITY CLERK

DRAFT



Schedule A to Bylaw 8024, 2018:
Single Detached Residential Districts (Queen's Park) (RS-4)

DRAFT



Single Detached Residential Districts (Queen's Park) (RS-4)

313 Single Detached Residential Districts (Queen's Park) (RS-4)

- 311 .1 The intent of this district is to align with the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area, designated in the Official Community Plan. This district provides density bonuses to Queen's Park Advanced Category Houses, the preservation of which makes a significant contribution to the heritage value of the conservation area. This district allows single detached dwellings, secondary suites, and detached accessory dwellings in the Queen's Park neighbourhood.

Single Detached Residential Districts RS-4 Regulations

- 311 .2 Development of sites zoned RS-4 shall comply with the regulations and requirements of the Single Detached Residential Dwelling District (RS-1), except that lots which include for *Queen's Park Advanced Category Houses*:
- (a) the floor space ratio may be increased by 0.2; and
 - (b) notwithstanding section 310.18, the maximum permitted *detached accessory area* may be increased, provided that there is a corresponding decrease in floor area of the principal building and the additional floor area is within a detached accessory dwelling unit, provided that the detached accessory dwelling unit does not exceed 89 square metres (958 square feet) in area, as required by Section 310.19(a).



**Schedule B to Bylaw 8024, 2018:
Single Detached Residential Districts (Queen's Park) (RS-4)**

DRAFT



CORRESPONDENCE

ON-TABLE ITEM 2



Seyem' Qwantlen Business Group

*Limited partnership economic development/ resource corporations of Kwantlen First Nation
Seyem' Qwantlen Development Ltd. – Seyem' Qwantlen Land Development Ltd. – Seyem' Qwantlen Resources Ltd.*

May 14, 2018

Via email: bsokol@newwestcity.ca

SQ File: SQR 2018-73.1
Proponent File: 13.2675.05

Mr. Bob Sokol
511 Royal Ave
New Westminster, BC
V3L 1H9

Dear Mr. Sokol,

Re: Proposed Official Community Plan Amendment for 838 Ewen Avenue

We write in the interest of Kwantlen First Nation Council. Thank you for your correspondence dated April 16, 2018. We have had an opportunity to review the referral referenced above and have the following comments.

We would like to confirm that the location of the properties at 838 Ewen Avenue — the focus of the Official Community Plan Amendment (OCP00024) — are situated within Kwantlen First Nation traditional territory in an area where we assert Aboriginal Rights and Title. This is based on oral histories captured in the Kwantlen Territory Knowledge Project, early settler ethnographies, and the archaeological record of the area.

Kwantlen First Nation has, currently, no concerns regarding the Official Community Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of the properties at 838 Ewen Avenue. However, Kwantlen will have future concerns — archaeological and environmental in nature — regarding the project itself. These concerns are likely outside the scope of your referral and are expected to be addressed separately, closer to the project commencing.

Kwantlen would like to be kept up to date regarding the OCP Amendment; please forward any archaeological or environmental reports relating to this project. Lastly, we are hoping you might be able to clarify whether New Westminster will be offsetting the removal of greenspace elsewhere.

P.O. Box 1023, Fort Langley, B.C. V1M 2S4

Phone: 604.888.5556 (ext. 209) Email: jonathan.wiese@seyemqwantlen.ca



Seyem' Qwantlen Business Group

*Limited partnership economic development/ resource corporations of Kwantlen First Nation
Seyem' Qwantlen Development Ltd. – Seyem' Qwantlen Land Development Ltd. – Seyem' Qwantlen Resources Ltd.*

If you have any questions or require further clarification, please contact me at 604.888.5556 (Ext. 209) or via email at jonathan.wiese@sqbg.ca.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Wiese
Seyem' Qwantlen Resources Ltd.
Lands Officer

From: [Stefan Hertel](#)
To: [Samantha Bohmert](#)
Subject: Re: Official Community Plan Amendment (OCP00024) and Zoning Bylaw Amendment (REZ00157) for 838 Ewen Avenue
Date: Monday, May 14, 2018 16:44:19
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Samantha,

Please forward to all groups noted in your email.

Thanks,
Stefan

On May 14, 2018, at 11:53 AM, Samantha Bohmert <sbohmert@newwestcity.ca> wrote:

Good morning Stefan,

Thank you for your email. Did you want your email provided to:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->- <!--[endif]-->Staff,
<!--[if !supportLists]-->- <!--[endif]-->The [Advisory Planning Commission](#),
prior to their meeting tomorrow night where they will discuss this project,
and/or
<!--[if !supportLists]-->- <!--[endif]-->Council?

Please let me know.

Best,

Samantha Bohmert | T 604.515.3791
Planning Assistant | <image001.png> City of New Westminster

From: Stefan Hertel [<mailto:lewhertel@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 21:13
To: External-Post Master - Pln
Subject: Official Community Plan Amendment (OCP00024) and Zoning Bylaw Amendment (REZ00157) for 838 Ewen Avenue

Hello,

I am writing in regards to the proposed OCP amendment and rezoning for 838 Ewen Avenue.

I think the objectives of diversifying the housing stock, providing options to address homelessness and facilitating access to affordable and non-market housing for low-to-moderate income households are great. Homelessness is a pervasive societal issue that needs to be addressed after being overlooked for

so long.

As a resident of New Westminster living directly across the street (at 843 Ewen Avenue) from the proposed modular housing development, I would like to express my opinion that 838 Ewen Avenue is not the right location for this project. If the housing with support services moves forward, it will be surrounded by a middle school, a community centre and an elementary school. The housing is meant for women over the age of 19 with low-incomes who have experienced homelessness or who are at risk of homelessness, a demograph that will not benefit from being in close proximity to the schools and playgrounds that neighbour the property.

The lack of an identifiable use for this site was cited as a reason that this location was selected for consideration. As a father of two young children, I think the site would be an ideal location for a park or other public amenity that would service the many families that populate the surrounding neighbourhoods.

In summary, I am supportive of the objectives the City is seeking to achieve with the modular housing for women at risk of homelessness; however, the proposed location is inappropriate for such a project.

Regards,
Stefan Hertel

From: [Brandon Yeung](#)
To: [Samantha Bohmert](#)
Subject: Re: Complaint regarding OCP00024 and REZ00157: 838 Ewen Avenue
Date: Monday, May 14, 2018 14:07:11
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Samantha,

As discussed, please send to apc.

Thanks
Brandon

On Mon, May 14, 2018, 12:56 PM Samantha Bohmert, <sbohmert@newwestcity.ca> wrote:

Hi Brandon,

I'm back in the office for the afternoon. Why don't you give me a call and I can walk you through what the different options mean.

Best,

Samantha Bohmert | T 604.515.3791

Planning Assistant | City of New Westminster

From: Brandon Yeung [mailto:brandon.amy2017@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 12:46
To: Samantha Bohmert
Subject: Re: Complaint regarding OCP00024 and REZ00157: 838 Ewen Avenue

Hi Samantha,

I'm not sure where it would be best directed. What would you recommend? To all?

Thank you
Brandon

On Mon, May 14, 2018, 11:52 AM Samantha Bohmert,
<sbohmert@newwestcity.ca> wrote:

Good morning Brandon,

Thank you for your email. Did you want your email provided to:

- Staff,
- The [Advisory Planning Commission](#), prior to their meeting tomorrow night where they will discuss this project, and/or
- Council?

Please let me know.

Best,

Samantha Bohmert | T 604.515.3791

Planning Assistant | City of New Westminster

From: Brandon Yeung [mailto:brandon.amy2017@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 22:19

To: External-Post Master - Pln

Subject: Complaint regarding OCP00024 and REZ00157: 838 Ewen Avenue

Good evening,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the application for the amendment of the official community plan use and change of the development permit area.

We recently purchased a property directly across from the proposed site and am deeply disappointed that this plan is being proposed. We decided to purchase

and move into this area based on many factors, including that this would be a great place to live and grow a young family. The park land across from our property was a big selling feature to not only us, but many of the residents in the area who have families. It is to our dismay that we hear of the proposal to change this park land into modular housing. Our hope was that this land was going to be developed/fixed into an area where our kids could play near their homes.

While we can certainly appreciate the need to build and develop underprivileged communities, they should be planned to be in areas that have other supports for them. This area is primarily a residential neighborhood for those with growing families and adding modular housing will certainly not appeal well to the new residents of the area. I am aware of at least a few petitions that are being organized to appeal this proposal.

There have already been some concerns regarding safety in the area and adding this to the fold will only heighten the insecurity that residents are already feeling. We need to be creating a safer and more established neighborhood, not one where there will be even greater concerns regarding safety, whether that be founded or unfounded.

I fear that this proposal does not do justice to the residents of the area, nor the inhabitants of the planned housing. It would likely make more sense for this type of housing to be situated in the downtown area of New Westminster, if anything, given the proximity to basic necessities and services. In a growing neighbourhood with so many young families, this project looks to be out of place.

The land should be repaired and developed into a park area for kids as what was originally intended (or so I, and many others, thought). Queensborough has come a long way in terms of building up its reputation as a great place to live - putting modular housing into this, only puts a damper on that and will put us back years.

I hope that city council reconsiders this request and looks for a more suitable location for this project. Having it located where this plan proposes, destroys the vision and dreams of many whom have recently moved into the area hoping for a place that has all the amenities for families, while also providing a sense of safety and security.

Thank you,

Brooke Holtz

From: Personal Information Removed
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 11:09 PM
To: External-Post Master - Pln
Subject: APC re. Official community plan amendment and Zoning bylaw amendment for 838 Ewen Ave

Dear APC,

We are writing to you as outlined by the Notice of Advisory Planning Commission Meeting, Official Community Plan Amendment (OCP00024) and Zoning Bylaw Amendment (REZ00157) for 838 Ewen Ave.

As new residents of 843 Ewen Ave which is directly across the street from the proposed site of the modular housing development, we are strongly opposed to the amendment plan and re-zoning of 838 Ewen. We recently moved from Winnipeg, MB and part of our decision in the purchase of our newly built townhome was the immediate access and proximity to the park area and community centre for our two young children. The building of the modular housing will eliminate the only free space for many families and children to enjoy. It does not seem to make any sense to decrease the limited green space that is already available, especially when there appears to be vacant property elsewhere in Queensborough or on the other side of New Westminster. As parents, we are also concerned about the potential safety of our children and the attraction of that area of Ewen Ave if modular housing were to be developed. In addition, the modular housing can only negatively affect property values for all new townhomes, which will be a blow to all the young families in the area who have invested heavily in the purchase of their homes.

We strongly urge you to reconsider the placement at 838 Ewen Ave and to find an alternative site elsewhere.

Yours Truly,

Personal Information Removed

From: [Kathleen Langstroth](#)
To: [External-Post Master - Pln](#)
Subject: Letter Re: Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area - Incentives Program
Date: Thursday, May 10, 2018 22:47:05
Attachments: [Incentives Letter May 9, 2018.docx](#)

Please forward the attached letter to the Advisory Planning Commission for the May 15th 2018 meeting.

Thank you,
Kathleen Langstroth

May 11, 2018

To Mayor Cote and Councillors,

I am writing this letter in response to the report and presentation to council on May 7th, 2018 on the Heritage Conservation Area Incentives.

The Queen's Park Residence Association has not met since February 2018 to discuss the incentives and with the rapidly advancing and changing schedule it is unlikely that we will have an opportunity to do so. The city's workshops and surveys however, have kept us informed. The QPRA would like to thank the staff for all the work they did compiling the information and the feedback on the numerous incentives being considered for implementation for the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area.

At Council's request the staff has produced a very detailed and comprehensive document which contains 16 possible incentives divided into 4 categories; 1.) Increase in Density. 2.) Relaxation of Regulations. 3.) Change of Tenure. 4.) Process and Other Changes.

This is quite an increase from the original recommendation by the Queen's Park Neighbourhood Heritage Study Working Group to "bonus basements and attics to allow for an overall increase in an FSR of .1 to be added to the principal house". This incentive was initially recommended to benefit the small number of houses that **may be negatively affected** by the HCA due to small house or lot size.

It is most important now to remember the original purpose of the HCA and the reasons why the majority of Queen's Park residents supported its implementation by displaying the lawn signs reading; "Support Heritage Conservation". Its intent is ***"to preserve the character and green space of the neighbourhood by encouraging the retention of single family homes constructed in or before 1940 and to manage change so that the renovations/additions of retained existing homes and the constructions of new homes will be in keeping with the heritage character of the neighbourhood through the use of design guidelines"***.

In reviewing the incentives being offered it is very apparent that 11 of the 16 incentives or over 66%, offer increased FSR to either the principal dwelling or laneway and carriage houses. **Please remember that the Queen's Park neighbourhood is a Heritage Conversation Area not a Heritage Densification Area.** It is quite conceivable that if all these incentives were adopted our neighbourhood could become another Kitsilano or West Mount Pleasant within a decade. Oversized additions added to principal homes to allow for stratification and/or rental units of 2, 3 or even 4 in multifamily conversions, as well as oversized laneway and carriage houses will eat up the green space and gardens that are so valued by everyone. Backyards will cease to exist as they have in these Vancouver areas and the increase in people will also lead to increased traffic

and parked cars, including EVO cars. The lack of on-site parking in these neighbourhoods has necessitated traffic calming measures which include one way streets because cars cannot pass each other going in the opposite direction. This type of increased density would not only erode the heritage character of the homes in the Queen's Park neighbourhood but would most definitely destroy the streetscapes and green spaces, often referred to as "garden-like settings" of this heritage neighbourhood.

This entire "supersizing" addressed in **Section 2.0 Relaxation of Regulations** belongs in a fast food restaurant not in a heritage neighbourhood. Further, the majority of the increased density and stratifying incentives should remain in the OCP and/or an HRA where the zoning and strict guidelines have been laid out citywide. The maximum FSR for a laneway is calculated according to lot size with the maximum being 958 and some properties will not qualify because they are too small or already over built. Anything bigger, regardless of whether it is built on a lane or not, is an Infill Ground Oriented Residence and therefore requires an HRA and thus council approval whether it is stratified or not. Do not muddy the waters and confuse people by calling it what it is not.

There is a great deal of concern surrounding small homes and small lots and their needs should and must to be addressed. But let us not forget there has always been a need and desire for small homes. These homes and properties are an integral part of all neighbourhoods. Neighbourhoods thrive on variety. The small homes, as well as the medium and the big, fill a variety of needs and options of the families that own them, live in them or want to buy them. Bigger does not make it better or more desirable. People upsize and downsize as their lives change. The HCA will not result in loss of value of small homes to their owners; as throughout time there has always been a market for them. They existed before the HCA and they will continue to flourish in it.

The incentives should be kept simple, easy to understand and straight forward. If density is what people want then offer **1.2 Existing Basement Floor Space Exclusion** and **1.3 Existing Attic Floor Space Exclusion** and if you must include **1.1 Increased FSR for Principal Dwelling** for those rare occasions when the first 2 cannot be applied. If all 3 are considered then the debate should perhaps centre on implementing an increase of .1 or .2 FSR to a specific maximum so that houses are not overbuilt into monster home maximums as developers are so intent on doing.

The **2.4 Building Code Relation** will likely have more benefits to home owners than most would initially realize and this should be explained in greater detail.

If implemented citywide, the funding for the **Heritage Home Grant Program** and the **Interpretive Sign Program** incentives listed under the heading **4.0 Process and Other Changes**,

should come from a source other than city taxes. Perhaps a small percentage from the fees the city collects from the film industry that so frequently use our city's neighbourhoods could be directed to these projects.

The implementation of the details listed under the incentive **4.3 Expedited Approval Process** could be very helpful for home owners and city planning staff. But as is said, "the devil is in the detail" so it is very important that these procedures/steps are clearly stated, straight forward and easy to understand for both the staff and the home owner. Therefore, intense training for the entire planning staff is of the utmost importance; everyone at the front desk must be on the same page. After the initial Special Limited Category has been reviewed and reassigned in the fall of 2018, moving from one category to another needs to follow a stringent review process as does a demolition permit for any home in the Advanced Category.

It is most important that everyone understands and follows the HCA Design Guidelines. These guidelines must be consistent with and enforce the architectural character of the homes in the neighbourhood, especially the siting of the house, doors, windows and front porch and railings. The residents of Queen's Park have stood firm and clear on this point since the inception of the Queen's Park Neighbourhood Heritage Study Working Group. It was one of the main reasons they embraced the HCA.

The HCA will be reviewed in 2019 and minor adjustments may be made then. On a cautionary note it is always better to add to than to take away and that is exactly what this forthcoming review will allow the city to do.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Langstroth

QPRA President

From: zorch1969@shaw.ca
To: [Samantha Bohmert](#)
Subject: Re: 838 Ewen Avenue Plan Amendment (OCP00024) and Zoning Bylaw Amendment (REZ00157)
Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 16:34:48
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
Importance: High

Hi Samantha,

Ok then I [allow.my](#) name to be forwarded in order for this information to be passed on.

Thanks,

Jamie Capell

----- Original message-----

From: Samantha Bohmert
Date: Tue, May 15, 2018 2:09 PM
To: 'Jamie Capell';
Cc:
Subject: RE: 838 Ewen Avenue Plan Amendment (OCP00024) and Zoning Bylaw Amendment (REZ00157)

Hi Jamie,

There are several options here:

- [if !supportLists]-->1) <!--[endif]-->I can provide your feedback to staff working on the project.
- [if !supportLists]-->2) <!--[endif]-->I can provide your feedback on-table to the Advisory Planning Commission, an advisory body made of community members who will be reviewing the project tonight. If I provide your feedback to the APC (it will automatically be provided to staff as well), you will not be able to be anonymous. **Please let me know ASAP if you would like this feedback provided to the APC.** You are welcome to send me a new email which doesn't have the request to not publish your name publicly.
- [if !supportLists]-->3) <!--[endif]-->You can provide your feedback to any of Mayor and Council. Please [click here](#) for more information.

Feel free to call me if I can answer any questions or provide anonymity.

Best,

Samantha Bohmert | T [604.515.3791](tel:604.515.3791)

Planning Assistant | City of New Westminster

From: Jamie Capell [mailto:zorch1969@shaw.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 07:20

To: External-Post Master - Pln

Subject: 838 Ewen Avenue Plan Amendment (OCP00024) and Zoning Bylaw Amendment (REZ00157)

To whom it may concern,

My wife and I just moved into 843 Ewen avenue in February, thinking this would be a nice community to live in with the community center just across the street. Suddenly we see a sign referring to this BC Housing project.

We were very disappointed to see this sign and questioning the placement of this building project.

Why would you build such a shelter here, in a family orientated location? You have a community ctr, two schools, skate board park, green spaces and possibly two new dog parks. You want to place such a building right in the middle of it all?

As you can see on the news, homeless and near homelessness is a growing concern for everyone and things should be done to help people (who want to be helped) to get off the street and have a fresh start. But why in the middle of a safe, family oriented area?

With homelessness and near homelessness can come drugs, alcoholism, crime, dirtiness and other issues. Is this ok to expose young children to such environments and dangers? There could also be violence, that could follow these people.

Have you considered trying to get these people into a working life again? How do they commute to Vancouver, Surrey, Coquitlam, Burnaby or even Richmond from Queensborough. The transit system is already lacking and they cannot afford cars, so how do they safely manage to get to work and how do they keep a job, when they do not have a reliable mode of transport to get to and from work? THINK ABOUT IT!

What about treatments? There are no doctors in Queensborough or hospitals. Access to Queensborough is limited, so now possible emergency vehicles will have issues getting there in time.

Is this a smart move? How about taking this piece of land and fencing it off and making it into a nice family green space, with benches and trees and space to put down a blanket and have a picnic with family and friends?? How about giving back some of the green space, instead of taking it away to constant building of concrete structures.

This is a very nice neighborhood to be in, why ruin for us and new families, who move here start a life and raise a family!?

The last point to mention is, how you considered that the housing prices may drop due to this? How will

you (City of New Westminster) compensate the homeowners in this area? There are many discussion going around already about this topic. It is a serious discussion.

Please do not build this project here. Please find another spot for it closer to amenities, that these people may require to help them transition back into a working life easier, faster and safer.

Sincerely,

Jamie Capell

7 – 843 Ewen Avenue, New Westminster BC

[778-840-6829](tel:778-840-6829)

Please do not publish my name publicly.



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: [Mark Fox](#)
To: [External-Post Master - Pln](#)
Subject: Comment on HCA proposal and staff recommendation to APC
Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 15:30:16

Members of the APC:

I just received notice of this meeting tonight, this morning via email (email date stamp: Tue, May 15, 2018 at 10:20 AM).

Excuse the rushed note. I am not sure I will be able to be there in person. Please take the following into consideration:

- Please support anything that minimizes the process of getting changes approved. The less red tape the better. Giving staff authority to decide and expedite permission will be a good thing.
- Remember that the work on incentives only happened after there was community push back and the HCA was in force! There seemed to be no intent to include incentives when the HCA was proposed. We are playing catchup.
- Given the non-uniform character (Ask yourselves: is the simple designation of a date an adequate measure of heritage merit?) of the houses that have suddenly inherited advanced protection status, I encourage you to further relax the FSR proposals: why not accept the .7 FSR proposal on the main dwelling and not count the minimum of the attic and basement area in that number? The economic analysis indicated that "The economic analysis proposed both an increase in FSR and the exemption of basement floor space" (p. 74 of your agenda package) That would give those negatively impacted by the imposition of the HCA an incentive that might actually be usable.

Sincerely,
Mark Fox