



MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING MEETING

Monday, July 24, 2023

7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers, Langley City Hall
20399 Douglas Crescent

- Present: Mayor Pachal
Councillor James
Councillor Mack
Councillor Solyom
Councillor Wallace
Councillor White
- Absent: Councillor Albrecht
- Staff Present: F. Cheung, Chief Administrative Officer
K. Hilton, Director of Recreation, Culture and Community Services
C. Johannsen, Director of Development Services
D. Leite, Director of Corporate Services
D. Pollock, Acting Director of Engineering, Parks and Environment
D. Colthorp, Deputy Fire Chief
H. Gill, Manager of Engineering
K. Kenney, Corporate Officer
A. Metalnikov, Planner

Mayor Pachal began by acknowledging that the land on which we gather is on the traditional unceded territory of the Katzie, Kwantlen, Matsqui and Semiahmoo First Nations.

1. **MOMENT OF SILENCE**

Mayor Pachal led everyone in attendance in observing a moment of silence to remember the victims of the July 25, 2022 shootings in the Township and City of Langley.

2. **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Pachal called the Public Hearing to order.

Mayor Pachal read a statement regarding the procedure to be followed for the Public Hearing.

The Corporate Officer advised that the Hearing was publicized in the following manner:

Newspaper advertisements were placed in the July 13 and July 20, 2023 editions of the Langley Advance Times.

Notices were mailed out to owners and occupants within 100m of the subject properties.

Notice of the Public Hearing was placed on the City's website and posted on the notice board on the first floor of City Hall.

The Corporate Officer advised that forty pieces of correspondence were received prior to publication of the agenda and are included in the council agenda.

Sixteen pieces of correspondence were received following publication of the agenda, which were circulated to council.

3. BUSINESS

a. Bylaw 3250 - Zoning Amendment No. 194 and Development Permit No. 01-23

A bylaw to rezone the properties located at 20214-24 54A Avenue from RM1 Multiple Residential Low Density Zone to CD88 Comprehensive Development to accommodate a 6-storey, 75-unit apartment development.

The Director of Development Services, provided a summary of the purpose of the bylaw, providing information as follows:

- the subject properties are zoned RM1 Multiple Residential Low Density zone in the Zoning Bylaw and are designated Mid-rise Residential in the Official Community Plan (OCP);
- this land use allows multi-family development between six to twelve storeys in height and a maximum density of 3.5 floor area ratio (FAR);
- the density of the proposed development, which is 2.66 FAR, with 75 units within a six storey building, complies with the OCP but requires a comprehensive development zone to accommodate the proposed rezoning of the site;
- the applicant is also proposing variances regarding shared bicycle parking lockers, visitor parking, and small car spaces, as well as reduced resident parking consistent with the draft zoning bylaw rates currently being contemplated;
- this application is also required by the OCP to replace the existing rental units on site on a one-to-one basis;
- the two current buildings each have four existing rental units;
- the applicant is proposing eight purpose built rental units in the new building;
- this application is also required to implement a tenant relocation plan in accordance with Council Policy CO-81.

Mayor Pachal invited the applicant to present the proposed development application:

David Eaton, Principal/Director, ParaMorph Architecture, Harp Saran, President, Development, Scale Projects, and David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, David Stoyko Landscape Architect, were in attendance and provided information on the development including the following:

- Project summary
- Program summary
- Design rationale
- Site survey
- Context plan
- Land use and concept plan
- Setbacks from neighbouring properties
- Streetscape views:
 - along lane
 - along 54A Ave.
- Shadow Study
- Design concept
- Site plan
- Pedestrian and vehicular site circulation
- Parkade level – 1 floor plan
- Parkade level – 2 floor plan
- Main floor plan
- 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th floor plans
- Roof floor plan
- Perspective renderings along 54A Ave.
- Material board
- Elevations
- Sections
- Part sections
- Unit plans
- Garbage enclosure detail
- Landscape concept – ground level
- Landscape concept – roof level
- Tenant relocation plan.

Mayor Pachal invited those in attendance who deemed their interest in property affected by the proposed bylaw to present their comments.

Lew Murphy, 20240 54A Ave., advised he lives in the building neighbouring the proposed development and expressed concerns with respect to the following:

- variance to reduce required amount of on-site parking in the development will increase on-street parking in the area, which is already an issue, and will set a precedent for future developments to provide less on-site parking;
- questionable soil stability due to creek bed in the area;
- removal of trees between his building and the proposed building will negatively impact privacy of residents in his building due to height of the proposed building and its close proximity to his building;
- his unit, which faces the building and is on the main floor, will get no light on that side of the building, especially on the lower floors due to height of the proposed building and its close proximity to his building;
- his building, which is three stories will be sandwiched in on both sides by six storey buildings so the existing trees on their property are needed as a buffer;
- residents in area will experience years of construction noise and potential vibrations.

In response to a question from a Council member, the applicant's geotechnical consultant advised that:

- his firm has completed an investigation of the site and prepared a report with recommendations for the design and construction of this development;
- this site has similar soil conditions to other sites in the city, consisting of a stiff layer of clay that gets softer at a depth of approximately 3m,
- this development includes two levels of underground parking which they expect would extend approximately 6m below grade;
- the upper level is in fairly close proximity to the property lines and the lower level in some areas is set back, but in some areas is also relatively close to the property lines;
- the shoring design has been discussed in a report and the requirements made clear to the developer;
- the detailed design would be worked through during the permitting process in conjunction with the other consultants on the project;
- from his firm's perspective this development is feasible and they would make sure any shoring design they prepare would adequately retain all the soil surrounding the property, including the neighbouring developments.

In response to a question from a Council member, Mr. Saran advised that:

- there are trees on both neighbouring properties which have roots that are encroaching over the property line;

- as this is an infill site in a high density area, they looked at several iterations of the underground parking design to try to maintain, at a minimum, a two level depth, while achieving highest and best use to meet the objectives of the Official Community Plan; however, it was determined the only way to facilitate redevelopment on this property was through property line to property line excavation with a small setback to allow for the excavation methodology;
- in September 2022, prior to their application being submitted, the applicant did meet with both neighbouring stratas to advise of the applicant's intention to redevelop and to discuss the trees;
- the applicant subsequently provided the stratas with a proposal with respect to three items: removal of nine off-site trees, a crane overswing agreement required to facilitate construction, and a shoring and underpinning agreement, which includes vibration monitoring, pre and post structural inspections, and monetary compensation;
- the on-site landscaping design includes the addition of 17 trees onto the site, and following construction the applicant has offered the neighbouring stratas a one-to-one tree replacement with appropriate species of trees that will not, over time encroach onto their property.

In response to questions from a Council member, staff advised that:

- as part of these types of developments there is a construction management plan, preconstruction meetings, and planning meetings with respect to how construction activity is to occur, including how the streets are used, vehicle access to and from the site;
- the City has a Noise bylaw that regulates when construction can and can't happen;
- the applicant is encouraged to establish a good relationship with the neighbours to ensure any issues can be mitigated;
- staff also require a plan identifying a designated area where trades vehicles will be parked during construction, which cannot be on the street;
- with respect to proposed resident and visitor parking, the site is located less than a 10-minute walk from the future Skytrain station, existing Fraser Highway high frequency bus routes, the downtown, and grocery stores and other services;
- as part of the OCP, there are proposals to reduce parking within a 5 and 10 minute walk of the Skytrain station and the downtown as research across the Lower Mainland shows the usage of parkades is lower in areas where there are better transit options available;
- the parking rates that are being proposed are consistent with what's being contemplated in the new Zoning Bylaw and would implement the new OCP.

Lois Munday, 20240 54A Ave., expressed concerns regarding the following:

- her building is 40 ft. from the property line of the proposed building which will have a two level underground parkade constructed in soil which she believes is unstable as a City worker told her there are underground creeks and rivers in that area, so is concerned there will be a cave-in on the site similar to what happened at the development on Michaud Crescent that could directly affect units on the east side of her building which includes hers;
- there are two mature trees near her unit that have been there since she moved in 28 years ago which provide shade in summer and let light in in winter;
- a six storey neighbouring building will block light to several rooms in her unit and cause the shrubs outside her unit to die;
- agrees with everything the former speaker said, particularly about the parking issue;
- questioned what insurance the developer has and what safety measures will be in place to prevent a cave-in similar to what happened to the development at Michaud and whether radar scanning has been used to determine soil stability in that area.

In response to the speaker's questions, Mr. Saran advised that:

- the developer carries a \$5 million per occurrence insurance policy for anything that may occur during construction;
- his understanding is that the excavation methodology for this development is slightly different than the development on 56 Ave.,
- they are taking additional precautions to prevent anything occurring, including pre and post construction monitoring and vibration monitoring during construction;

In response to the speakers questions, Mr. Eaton advised that:

- with respect to the building causing shadowing of neighbouring buildings, the City's OCP permits buildings between 6 to 12 stories in this area; as this building is six stories, it is on the low end of the height of building that is permitted in this downtown area.

Klaus Iden, 20240 54A Ave., advised he lives in the building adjacent to the proposed development and expressed concerns regarding the following:

- is surprised Council would allow a 6 storey building on a street where the rest of the buildings are only 3 stories; this will change the calm, quiet atmosphere on 54A Ave.;
- is yet to be convinced that people who live within walking distance to SkyTrain will not have cars;

- questioned what liability the City has in letting a building like this be built on land that has been suggested to be unstable;
- agrees with the first speaker's comments.

In response to the speaker's questions, Mr. Johannsen advised that:

- whenever there is an application involving complex construction such as parkades, the applicant must do a geotechnical assessment to:
 - ensure the soil can bear the weight
 - determine what kind of design is necessary for the parkade
 - determine the type of shoring and excavation required during construction;
- all these assessments are conducted by a geotechnical or structural engineer who is part of the development team and are registered professionals accountable to their professional designations;
- all geotechnical/structural engineers must sign and seal all their work attesting that the designs are sound and appropriate for the site and the building;
- ensuring any plans submitted by an applicant are signed and sealed is part of City staff's review of the permit application for developments.

Jeff Jacobs, 20219 54A Ave., advised that he lives in the building directly across the street from the proposed development, and is a member of his building's strata council; he spoke regarding the following:

- these developments are much needed in the city and commended Council on moving the city forward in a safe, positive, and welcoming manner in accordance with its Nexus of Community Plan;
- expressed concern that a project of this size has the potential to disrupt many of the residents living on this street;
- asked:
 - how street parking on 54A Ave. will be affected during and after construction; advising that, on any given day, the street is congested and street parking can be difficult to find;
 - what the plan was for parking for trades people during construction;
 - after construction is complete, if there were plans to alter 54A Ave. to be more accommodating for street parking.

Mayor Pachal advised that the City is working on a parking management study.

In response to the speakers questions and a question from a Council member, staff advised that:

- once the project is complete it will have frontage reconstruction, both on 54A Ave., and on the laneway; the roadway is for public parking and will remain so after construction; there will also be onsite parking in the development for residents;

- the road will be constructed in accordance with city standards, and will be widened to accommodate parking on both sides, but will tie in either side of the development with the existing roadway;
- should the project be approved, new frontage will be constructed along 54A Ave. and the existing driveways that service these two sites currently will be removed which will provide the ability to add more street parking along the curb;
- the laneway will be widened as well;
- depending on the results of a transportation impact assessment, further improvements will be implemented if necessary.

George Dolutli, 20214 54A Ave., advised that his family falls under the tenant relocation policy and expressed concerns regarding trying to find new housing as rent for most buildings is considerably more than what his family is currently paying in the existing building.

Nick Hardwick, 20240 54A Ave., spoke regarding the following:

- asked:
 - if the engineering report for the site has been completed or whether Council has to first vote on third reading of this zoning amendment;
 - with respect to the underpinning and shoring, whether it is imperative to be done in order for approval of a six storey building, and if so, should neighbouring properties not approve, whether the height of the development would need to be lowered to a three or four storey building;
 - if the engineering report has been done, whether the public may access it.

In response to questions from the speaker, Mr. Saran advised that:

- a geotechnical assessment has been completed; his understanding is that drilling, as well as cone penetrating tests have been conducted on-site in order to formulate the report to give them an understanding of the substructure of the soils below;
- with respect to underpinning and shoring, the applicant's request to neighbouring properties to allow for shoring is to facilitate a certain methodology of construction, which, though not necessary, is one the applicant has chosen to employ;
- the applicant has provided the neighbouring properties with a proposal for compensation in order to have the right to conduct the shoring; if the neighbouring stratas do not allow shoring, a different methodology could be used to construct without it.

Paul Dostal, 20200 54A Ave., spoke regarding the following:

- expressed concerns regarding:
 - impact on his family due to noise from construction of this building which will likely take several years to complete;
 - potential for collapse of a portion of his building due to soil instability ;
 - traffic congestion on the 54A Ave., which is a two way street but has parking on both sides of the street; suggested making it a one way street;
 - tenants that need to be relocated will be at risk for homelessness as most will not be able to afford housing due to significant increase in rents and questioned how long BC Housing will assist tenants who need to be relocated;
- suggested other developments, particularly on 204 street should be built before this building, and would not be as disruptive to the neighbourhood;
- his unit is on the side of his building that gets the most sun so he won't be impacted by shadowing due to the height of the development but understands lower units in his building may not get any light at all; asked if there are any steps to mitigate shadowing of units on lower floors in his building;
- as neighbourhood schools are already overcrowded, questioned what measures will be put in place to expand schools;
- asked whether there is adequate infrastructure in place to accommodate this type of growth;
- asked if this new building will use green technologies.

In response to the speaker's questions, Mr. Saran advised that:

- with respect to sustainability, the applicant has made best efforts to move away from fossil fuels, for example the HVAC system will be electric;
- although construction is inherently noisy, prefabricated panels are used for framing are employed which significantly reduces the amount of hammering and nailing that is required to be done on site which helps to minimize construction noise;
- with respect to the concern that current tenants could become homeless due to this development, the City's tenant relocation policy will not allow this project to proceed until all tenants are successfully re-housed; in speaking with BC Housing, they are prioritizing applicants with the most urgent need to be re-housed; accordingly, the applicant has advised tenants how to maintain their applications as active status with BC Housing and provided them with correspondence they require to update their BC Housing advisors as to the status of this project; until this project receives third reading, BC Housing classifies these applications as a possibility of requiring to relocate.

In response to a question from a Council member, Mr. Johannsen advised that, through the City of Langley / School District No. 35 Staff Liaison Committee, the

City keeps the School District apprised of development in the city, including providing development stats in terms of housing starts so the School District can ensure their capital planning aligns with potential future growth in the schools, for example, Nicomekl Elementary is planning for classroom expansion due to growth in the area.

Kyle Gauthier, 20240 54A Ave., advised he lives in the building east of the proposed building and spoke regarding the following:

- expressed concerns regarding:
 - the proximity of the proposed building to 54A Ave. itself:
 - questioned the accuracy of the applicant's drawings with respect to the width of the boulevard in front of the proposed building;
 - potential for the view from his unit to be significantly obstructed;
 - required to narrow the width of the sidewalk;
 - potential soil stability issues;
- the footprint of the building is too large for the lot, particularly having the parkade come right to the edge of his building's property line;
- questioned how the applicant is planning to have street trees planted on the boulevard without their root systems impacting the concrete sidewalk;
- suggested there won't be room for the green space shown on the drawings.

In response to concerns raised by the speaker, Mr. Eaton advised that the current setback from the property line is 3m, which is slightly under 10 ft. and from the street to the building is approximately 5m.

In response to questions from a Council member, Mr. Pollock advised that:

- the drawings the applicant has provided do show a grass boulevard adjacent to the curb with the sidewalk being behind that;
- as the applicant has noted, the building is set back 3m from the property line at the south side of 54A Ave. so there will be the City's normal road standards for construction in this area;
- with respect to the proposed street trees, the design criteria requires a certain volume of soil to be placed for every tree that is planted in the boulevard, and that will be accommodated in the design as well; accordingly, the drawings will be in accordance with the City's standards which will have the separated boulevard and sidewalk;
- the street will not be narrowed and the sidewalk width will be the same as other city sidewalks of this type.

In response to the concerns regarding street trees raised by the speaker, Mr. Stoyko advised that, as the landscape architect for this project, he can confirm that they will make sure the soil volumes for each tree planted on site are at least

the minimum standard of 10 cubic m per tree or above; accordingly, he will work very closely with the architect to make sure the parkade itself is lowered enough so that all the trees are completely viable and that they are calculating per tree so that each tree gets a sufficient volume of soil.

Roger Mitchell, 20240 54A Ave., advised he lives in the building next door to the proposed development, and spoke regarding the following:

- asked if the back lane was going to be widened as part of this development; as there are residents from multiple properties in that area that exit onto that back lane, asked how residents will get in and out of their properties if the back lane is dug up during construction;
- asked when construction would be starting on this development; noting that it is already difficult to get in and out of his property from the lane, and garbage trucks also have trouble getting down that lane;
- asked how many people are anticipated to be living in the new building;
- suggested that the owners of each unit will likely have up to two cars and expressed concern that the street will become even more congested than it is currently;
- expressed concerns regarding increased population density in the city due SkyTrain coming (his strata heard potentially up to 500,000 people), noting there is a seniors development under redevelopment at the end of the street, a new bike lane is going to be added, and the developer of this property also owns the other property in that area.

Mayor Pachal provided the following information:

- assured the speaker there would not be half a million people living in Langley City;
- advised that the City did prepare a housing needs report, as is required by all municipalities in BC, and is building in accordance with the findings of that report, as required per the provincial government;
- he would defer to staff to provide the Metro Vancouver population projection for Langley City, and the speaker was also welcome to email either the Mayor or staff to get the City's housing needs report and Official Community Plan.

In response to a question from a Council member, Mr. Pollock advised that the drawings do indicate an additional dedication proposed along the width of the back lane.

Members of the applicant team further advised that:

- the rear lane is proposed to be widened by almost a metre (2.95 of a metre) and there is parking proposed perpendicular to it;
- the rear lane on both the east and west terminus points discharges both north and south, onto 54A Ave. and onto 54 Ave. to the south, both of

which will be unaffected during construction so residents of neighbouring properties will still have two points of ingress and egress from their properties during construction; should any portion of the rear lane or 54A Ave. be required to be shut down for construction, the applicant will work the City engineering department to facilitate a traffic management plan, which must include safety and traffic control measures to facilitate traffic as required.

Bhupinder Atwal, 4615 208 St. spoke regarding the following:

- asked if the building will have electric vehicle (EV) chargers;
- requested clarification as to whether the proposed height of the building (6 storeys) is already permitted under the City's Official Community Plan.

In response to questions from the speaker, the applicant and staff provided the following information:

- Mr. Saran advised that the building will be 100% EV-ready, eight EV chargers will be provided in the underground parking area, and the visitor parking area will have a conduit to allow for future EV charging at grade;
- Mr. Johannsen advised that:
 - the Official Community Plan (OCP), which was adopted by Council in November 2021, is intended to map out growth in the city for the next 30 years, up to 2050, in anticipation of SkyTrain, regional housing, and employment growth;
 - the city is projecting up to 14,000 new residents by 2050;
 - in this area, the OCP does identify the possibility of buildings between 6 to 12 storeys; however, that is just the land use vision;
 - the purpose of tonight's public hearing is re-zoning of the properties, which, if approved by Council, would change the legal right of the property owner to build more storeys than the 2 storeys that are currently allowed (under the City's Zoning bylaw);
 - the OCP is available on the City's website for viewing.

Ken Ens, 20224 54A Ave., spoke regarding the following:

- has lived in Langley City for 40 years; has never seen it grow so much;
- the difficulty in finding housing anywhere right now, especially in the city;
- he would like to stay in Langley City, but it's very expensive;
- little to no action has been taken to address the housing issues for tenants of the building who will need to be relocated;
- BC Housing is in shambles and has little to no housing;
- is disappointed with little to no action from the housing liaison;
- it will be difficult to find everyone suitable housing; he doesn't know where he will go.

Having gone through the speakers on the speakers list, Mayor Pachal asked if there was anyone in attendance who wished to speak to the bylaw.

A resident, 20219 54A Ave. spoke regarding the following:

- has lived in her building for 10 years;
- the proposed building is not in keeping with the design and height of other buildings in this neighbourhood;
- the 400 sq. ft. units are very small for a couple or a couple with a small child;
- approximately 30 to 50% of residents in her building have two vehicles and her building has adequate parking for one vehicle; as this new building has 75 units, that means possibly 150 more vehicles in the area;
- the Handydart van that her friend uses to come visit her already has trouble getting into her area due to the number of vehicles parked on both sides of the street; with more cars parking on the street, it will be even harder for the Handydart van to get around;
- even though it is a two way street, because vehicles are parked on both sides of the street, it reduces the usable road area to that of a one way street, with one car having to pull over into an available parking space in order to let an oncoming vehicle pass;
- hopes Council takes into consideration the comments being made tonight.

Mayor Pachal suggested the speaker reach out to Council or staff with respect to her concern about Handydart access on 54A Avenue.

Mike McFee, 20240 54A Ave., spoke regarding the following:

- the applicant's drawings don't reflect the reality of how the building will look in the neighbourhood with the surrounding smaller buildings; as it will block views and won't fit in with the neighbourhood;
- for the people who are currently renting in the existing building, the tenant relocation plan amounts to renoeviction by the City, as once these people are moved along and their financial compensation has run out, Council and the province do not have a plan for them;
- in order to bring SkyTrain to the city, he would be supportive of high rise residential development in the downtown core, but does not support having taller residential buildings in neighbourhoods like this where the existing residential buildings are only four storeys;
- residents in the building located at 20240 54A Ave. will lose their views as their building will be sandwiched between two taller buildings; accordingly, believes these residents should receive large financial compensation because of their loss of views.

In response to questions from a Council member, Mr. Saran advised that a traffic impact assessment has not been completed as yet; it is a requirement after third reading of the Zoning bylaw amendment as part of the servicing agreement.

Mr. Pollock explained that a traffic impact assessment looks at what the current traffic volumes are on a street, what will be generated by the proposed development, what the impact will be on surrounding streets and intersections, and also identify any mitigation measures that are required at particular areas; noting that the scale of the assessment is dependent on the size of the development.

Linda Shaw, 20200 54A Ave., advised she was speaking on behalf of residents in her building, and spoke regarding the following:

- no one in her building is supportive of this development;
- traffic in her area is brutal; 54A Ave. will become another alley as it only spans from 201 St. to 203 St.;
- although her place of work is only around the corner, some days it is faster for her to walk there than to drive there, due to current construction of bike lanes in that area;
- the proposed building is beautiful and she would be supportive of it being built in an area of the city where there are already buildings of similar height, but is opposed to putting a 6 storey building between two 4 storey buildings.

Kay Griffiths, 20240 54A. Ave., advised she lived in the building next door to this proposed building and asked what would happen if her strata does not agree to allow the applicant to remove existing trees from their property which she understands is required in order to allow enough space for the underground parking.

In response to the question from the speaker, Mr. Saran advised that, prior to this public hearing, the applicant had consulted with their legal advisor on what would happen if an agreement could not be reached with the neighbouring stratas on the tree removal, and was advised that, if a municipality does not have a tree bylaw in place, the applicant, as the owner of the property, has the right to cut overhanging limbs and encroaching roots on their property and that, based on standing case law, there would be no legal recourse against the applicant if any of those trees were to fall and result in damage or death; however, the applicant's preference has always been to reach agreement with the neighbouring properties which is why the applicant reached out to the stratas well before application, explaining the proposed development, the limitations of the development, and seeking their approval to remove the trees, offering financial compensation, and one to one tree replacement with an appropriate species that would not cause encroachment problems in the future.

The Mayor called a second time for speakers on the bylaw.

Jeff Jacobs, 20219 54A Ave., speaking a second time, asked the applicant if the amount of \$5 million in incidental insurance is adequate to compensate the owners of each unit if there was an incident in the building, considering the average condominium in that area is worth between \$450,000 to \$850,000.

In response to the speaker's question, Mr. Saran advised that the applicant's insurance advisors have advised that \$5 million per occurrence is sufficient; further advising that hopefully, the due diligence of the applicant's engineers and the studies put forth as part of the building permit application, as well as City staff's review of the application, will eliminate risk of a serious incident occurring that would require the use of that insurance requirement.

Lois Munday, 20240 54A Ave., speaking a second time, spoke regarding the following:

- suggested the smallest units in the building would be perfect for B&Bs for tourists;
- opposed to allowing 6 to 12 storey buildings in this area;
- keep building heights in this neighbourhood to 4 storeys, which fits the neighbourhood;
- takes exception to applicant's comment in response to her concerns regarding the potential complete shadowing of her unit by the proposed 6 storey building;
- stated people count and should come before high profits.

Paul Dostal, 20200 54A Ave., speaking a second time, spoke regarding the following:

- expressed concerns regarding the following:
 - potential loss of the use of the laneway behind his building for an extended period of time due to construction of this building;
 - traffic issues in the lane, including visibility issues when exiting the underground parking in his building into the lane; suggested concave mirrors be installed at exit points of parking lots and making the lane one way to mitigate risks to motorists;
- likes the idea of rooftop gardens; asked if any of the rooftop garden spaces were wheelchair accessible;
- likes the design of the building but the height of the building doesn't quite fit with the neighbourhood; suggest removing two storeys;
- need to take into account that the increase in number of families this development will bring to the neighbourhood will mean increased use of amenities in the area such as Linwood Park, which will create an even greater challenge in cleaning and maintenance of the park and bathrooms;

- the relocation of tenants in the current building is a renovation; believes 6 months from now these individuals may be in far worse shape than they are in now; hopes there are plans in the works to ensure they don't end up homeless.

In response to some of the speaker's concerns, Mayor Pachal advised that:

- at the Regular Council meeting later this evening, Council will be receiving a presentation on the new Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan which outlines improvements the City will be making throughout the community, including Linwood Park, to accommodate population growth;
- acknowledged the benefits of concave mirrors at access points to underground parking garages.

Dianna Gilfillan, 20219 45A Ave., spoke regarding the following:

- advised her building has two entrances – one for visitors and one for residents; expressed concern regarding vehicles parking too close to these entrances;
- asked what the minimum required parking distance was from a driveway and whether this distance will be reduced to allow for more on-street because of the new building.
- the maximum height of buildings recently constructed in the neighbourhood is 5 stories; the proposed 6 storey building is out of character for the general area.

In response to the speaker's questions, the following information was provided:

- Mayor Pachal advised that parking distances are outlined in City bylaws and would not be changed;
- Mr. Pollock advised that:
 - the setback distance from driveway letdowns is consistent throughout the city and is enforced;
 - vehicle access to the proposed building will be from the lane rather than off 54A Ave.; therefore, additional on-street parking will be created on 54A Ave. with removal of the current building's driveway.
- Mr. Johannsen advised that many of the buildings in this neighbourhood were built when the Building Code height limit for wood frame buildings was 3 storeys, which then increased to 4 storeys; recent changes to the Building Code have increased the height limit for wood frame buildings to 6 storeys which is why there are more development applications for 5 and 6 storey wood frame buildings similar to the one that is being proposed tonight;
- for taller buildings, staff work with the applicant and the City's design guidelines to try to make them thinner and narrower and create more space between existing buildings and the new building to reduce shadowing and massing impacts; for example, on the east side of this

building the setback is actually 8.6m from the property line instead of the standard 6m; and on the other side the setback was pushed further back by approximately a metre;

- typically shadow studies are used to prevent shadowing on plazas, public parks and other public spaces; however, staff do use them for residential projects to help shape the building form.

Kyle Gauthier, 20240 54A Ave., speaking a second time, spoke regarding the following:

- parking is an issue in the area already given the number of vehicles trying to exit the alleyways onto 54A Ave.;
- it is difficult to turn onto 54A Ave. from the alleyways due to the narrowness of the street and people parking too close to the alleyways which impedes visibility of oncoming traffic;
- residents of a townhouse near 201A St. park their cars in the alleyway for periods of time which impedes traffic;
- in applicant's drawing labelled A24, although the ground floor may be 3 m from the street, the building steps out further at various heights;
- in applicant's drawing labelled L1.0, it looks like the boulevard is encroaching onto the street;
- encourage Council to ensure these drawings are reviewed to verify the accuracy of the drawings and measurements prior to approving construction of this building.

In response to one of the speaker's comments, Mr. Johannsen advised that:

- this building is required to meet the City's standard of having a 3m setback to the building face; however, balconies can protrude a little into this setback;
- the actual site plan in the drawing is what staff rely on in terms of setbacks;
- the civil plans that will be submitted must be consistent with the City's street standards; accordingly, there is space, consistent with best practice, between the curb and the building face;
- staff would not issue a building permit that does not meet that standard.

A resident, 4503 200 Street, spoke regarding the following:

- he works for a housing society which is currently building 1500 units with BC Housing; he is a project manager on these types of projects;
- is supportive of the City pursuing more growth and upping its density, because young people cannot afford housing;

- it's very important to add units into our supply as it's not easy for young families to get into the market these days; you can't purchase anything for under \$500k these days;
- understands there are concerns with the design of the building and parking but those issues can all be addressed;
- need to increase, not decrease density wherever we can;
- is very sympathetic to those that are affected by this proposed development, however, with collaborative initiatives with the City and residents we can all put together a good plan.

Pardi Dillon 20200 54A Ave., spoke regarding the following:

- expressed concerns regarding the potential for vibrations caused by construction of the building to damage his unit which is in a neighbouring building, advising that he is on the 4th floor, and when a garbage truck comes by, it causes vibrations in his apartment;
- asked if an assessment has been done on how construction will impact his building.

In response to the speaker's question, Mr. Saran advised that they have reached out to the neighbouring buildings to propose vibration monitoring, and a pre and post construction assessment to be able to monitor the effects of the construction on their buildings and to be able to remediate any issues should they occur.

Mike McFee, 20240 54A Ave., speaking a second time, spoke regarding the following:

- asked how many EV chargers will be provided;
- asked when SkyTrain would be coming;
- reiterated his concerns regarding parking and renovation.

In response to the speaker's questions, the following information was provided:

- Mr. Saran advised that they are providing EV ready conduit for all parking stalls in addition to eight EV chargers upon completion of construction.
- Mayor Pachal advised that the new SkyTrain station will be opened in 2028, with construction starting next year.

A resident, 20200 54 Ave. spoke regarding the following:

- asked what the closest distance was between a balcony of the proposed building and the balconies of the adjacent buildings;
- asked that, before Council approves this development, it consider how the close proximity of the proposed building's balconies to the balconies of

adjacent buildings may negatively impact the property values of units in these existing buildings.

In response to the speaker's questions, the following information was provided:

- Mr. Saran advised that, in looking at the drawings, on the west side the setback to the building face is 6m; however, as Mr. Johannsen explained previously, a certain amount of encroachment is allowed for the balconies along the setback; the balconies on the west side are encroaching into the setback 1.2m, which leaves a minimum 4.8m from the balcony to the property line.
- Mr. Johannsen advised that:
 - the best practice used for design across the region and North America is to have 12m between building faces that are facing each other across the property line; balconies typically do encroach across that, but the idea is to take the main massing of the building face and make sure it's set back;
 - in this case, as mentioned previously, on the east side the majority of the building face is set back 8.6m to help with the shadowing and the massing; however, those balconies do individually still jut out by about 1.2m.

Lew Murphy, 20240 54A Ave., speaking a second time, spoke regarding the following:

- requested confirmation that the City does not have a tree bylaw; and if this is the case, asked if the developer could remove the trees that are planted on his building's property close to the property line which have branches and roots that are encroaching onto the developer's property;
- asked if there was a way to prevent the developer from doing this.

In response to questions from the speaker, the following information was provided:

- Mayor Pachal confirmed that the City does not have a tree bylaw, but noted the City is developing an urban forest management plan; he further advised that the issue he is describing is a matter between his strata and the applicant;
- Mr. Johannsen advised that:
 - it's the expectation of staff that the applicant would work with the strata to come up with an agreement on how to handle that situation;
 - the building plans do show the parkade setback from the property line to allow for future trees to be planted there in order to regrow the canopy that was there;

- the applicant referred to one to one tree replacement which is a matter between the applicant and the strata to work through; however, staff do try to configure parkades to preserve trees where they can; unfortunately, in this case, there are some trees that come so close to the property line that the drip line (roots) encroach well into the applicant's property. Like many neighbourhoods, a range of different building types have been built in the area at different times and sometimes trees have been planted near property lines and do encroach onto neighbouring properties; it's through the redevelopment process where these issues have to be resolved.

Lew Murphy, 20240 54A Ave., further spoke regarding the following:

- advised that that the trees that are to be removed are large, mature trees and expressed concern that the new trees that would be planted to replace them will be very small and will take many years to grow to the size of the trees they replaced;
- reiterated his concerns regarding parking and advised that the residents of the new building will all likely have two or three vehicles which will be parked on the surrounding streets;
- he would like to see the building reduced to four storeys.

In response to a concern raised by the speaker, Mr. Saran advised that in an effort to be a good neighbour the applicant can look at replacing the trees that are encroaching on their property with more mature trees.

Mr. Hirod Gill, Manager of Engineering, clarified that, though the City does not have a tree bylaw, the City's subdivision servicing bylaw has requirements applicants must meet when replacing existing trees with new trees (staff clarification: this applies when trees on parkland or protected areas are impacted), the applicant must add one or more trees whose diameter, either singularly or combined is/are the same as the tree it/they are replacing.

Mayor Pachal called a third and final time for speakers on the bylaw.

There were no further speakers.

Mayor Pachal invited Council members to ask questions and provide comments.

In response to questions from Council members, the applicant advised that:

- in some of the three bedroom units occupied by the current tenants, not all of the bedrooms are being used; accordingly, there are tenants that are couples that could return and rent a two bedroom unit; for those tenants who do require a 3 bedroom rental unit, which is not offered in the new development, the applicant is working with those individuals to find

suitable housing and accommodation and they will be successfully relocated prior to this project moving forward;

- there are two parking spaces to the east of the accessway and four parking spaces on the west side; there is significant space between the last parking space on the west side and the vehicular entrance which provides good visibility to the east; there is also additional parking inside that is reached by way of the ramp coming in off the vehicular entrance.

Council members provided the following comments:

- include 3 bedroom rental units in future developments
- provide more advance notice to tenants of current building of upcoming information meetings;
- developer encouraged to review subdivision servicing bylaw with respect to requirements for tree replacement and before bylaw receives third reading, would like applicant to advise Council how many trees would be provided to replace the existing trees that are proposed to be removed;
- if existing trees are not removed, it is unacceptable to Council for developer to cut trees' root systems that are encroaching onto their property as that could diminish health of the trees and create potential falling hazards;
- if possible, provide results of traffic impact study before consideration of third reading of the bylaw;
- current tenant relocation policy isn't sufficient; developer's application has been grandfathered through under the current policy; advised the developer that the City has stopped accepting development applications that require tenant relocation until a new tenant relocation policy is approved in the Fall;
- would like to see what vehicle safety measures are proposed for the laneway at the back of the proposed development;
- the City is trying to build more housing and densify in order to address the shortage of housing in the City,
- would be helpful to get information from BC Housing on where they are at in terms of number of people waiting for housing;
- roads and lanes are narrow in that area of the City; as redevelopment occurs in that area, the road and the lane will be widened with more parking, so over time that will be resolved;
- with respect to D,E, and G units, before the bylaw is considered for third reading, would like the applicant to clarify how the combined storage/bike parking units work in terms of how someone would get a bike out, while also having items stored in the storage unit;
- prior to consideration of third reading of the bylaw, applicant to provide Council with drawing from PPT slide identifying the units for tenant relocation.

In response to questions from Council members, staff advised that:

- when developments come forward that are lane-served, the City takes a dedication on a project by project basis to ensure that, eventually, when a lane gets built out, it meets certain widths, for example, to allow a Fire truck to be deployed to the area, which requires an 8m wide lane; with projects staff also determine whether there is a need for strategic improvements; staff have been to view the lane several times; it is very narrow; and doesn't meet today's standards as it is only 5.75m wide and should be 8m wide; at the corners, where the existing development fence lines and the growth is right up to the edge of the lane, these are things that would be corrected through future development; however, there may be some interim steps that the City can take;
- right now there are three applications that are subject to the current tenant relocation policy that is currently in effect and which was brought in in March 2022; a new updated tenant relocation policy is being developed that should be coming to Council for review in late Fall, and for consideration of approval in early 2024.

4. MOTION TO CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Public Hearing close at 9:33 pm.

CARRIED

Signed:

MAYOR

Certified Correct:

CORPORATE OFFICER