

Attachment 6
*Applicant-Led Consultation
and Be Heard New West
Summaries*

8th & 8th

802, 806 Eighth Street & 809 Eighth Avenue Application-led Public Consultation Overview

The following memorandum provides a summary of the applicant-led Public Information Meeting (PIM) hosted by I4 Property Group on March 10, 2022.. The PIM was regarding the proposal at 802, 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue.

This memorandum contains the following sections:

1. Executive Summary
2. Public Information Meeting Details
3. Feedback Summary
4. Conclusion

1. Executive Summary

I4 Property Group (I4PG) hosted a virtual Public Information Meeting on March 10, 2022 from 5:30-7:30PM. The purpose of PIMs was to provide the community with information on the proposal and answer questions from the public.

I4 PG has submitted an application to redevelop the site to bring a heritage-restoration home, 13 3-4 bedroom townhomes and 4 accessible studio units to the neighborhood. The application includes a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Development Permit to allow for 18 units including:

- the restoration and relocation of the historic Sincock residence originally built in 1929;
- 13 three and 4 bedroom strata townhouse units; and
- 4 accessible studio units.

The community was able to provide their feedback on the proposal in the following ways:

- Via a dedicated email - 8and8@i4pg.com
- During the moderated Q&A portion of the PIM
- Through the online survey from February 7 to March 17, 2022

A total of twenty-three community members attended the PIMs, and a total of twenty-five survey submissions and two emails were received.

The majority of feedback received indicates support for new housing forms including the townhomes and studio units proposed in the community. The main questions and concerns received were around traffic impacts, parking, and the proposed height and density of the townhome and studio units.

Engagement Timeline:

- 7th February: Launched website '8and8.ca', including survey and contact forms
- 17th February: Mailed 195 postcards to neighbors within 100m radius
- 24th February: Published 1st advert in the New Westminister Record
- 2nd March: Attended community heritage commission meeting
- 3rd March: Published 2nd advert in the New Westminister Record
- 10th March: Virtual Open House by Zoom
- 17th March: Survey closed

2. Developer Hosted Virtual Public Information Meeting Event Details

Event Date: March 10, 2022

Time: 5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

Location: Zoom

Attendance: 23 individuals attended the zoom meeting

Meeting Overview:

The meeting was held via zoom and opened at 7:30 PM. Myron Calof introduced himself, made introductory comments on the contribution the heritage home to the architecture of the development by enabling a single family home to be the interface with the adjacent single-family community, and then introduced the Developer's team, Thomas Greenwood, Architect, Elana Zysblat, Heritage Consultant, and Brent Dozzi, Traffic Consultant.

Thomas Greenwood introduced the project and guided the meeting through the neighborhood context, the relocation of the heritage home, and the new townhome portions of the

development. Elana Zysblat guided listeners through a series of photos providing greater detail on the heritage home itself, its history and how it would be revitalized to re-create the home as it would have looked when it was built.

Myron Calof then spoke about the various sustainable qualities of the new development, the diversity of housing and various infrastructure improvements that would be generated by the project. He then opened the meeting for questions and general discussion.

3. Feedback Summary

The PIM provided the community with an opportunity to learn about the proposal and participate in a moderated question and answer period with the project team. Questions were received verbally and responses were provided by the project team verbally. The public was also able to provide their questions and comments through email as well as an online survey that was available from February 7 to March 17, 2022.

The following is a list of key questions and comments received during the PIM, via email and through the online survey:

- **Studios and Townhomes** - feedback suggested both support and concern over the addition of townhome and studio units. Questions/comments focused on new housing meeting the demands of the community and whether or not they fit into the existing neighborhood.
- **Parking** - feedback suggested both support and concern over the number of parking stalls included. Questions/comments included the number of stalls per unit, the lack of on-street parking availability and the walkability/transit oriented nature of the site location.
- **Traffic Impacts** – questions and concerns over the potential impact the proposal would have on the existing road network, traffic volumes, pedestrian safety, and accessibility units with entrances facing the bus stop.
- **Design Considerations** - Comments received indicated support for the architectural design, colors and stepped transition from single family homes to townhomes and studio units.
- **Built Form** – questions and concerns over the proposed height of the townhomes and studio units and their possible impacts to privacy of neighboring residents. Some respondents noted that they had no issues with the proposed townhouses and studio units.
- **Property Value** - questions and concerns over the impact on the property values of adjacent single-family homes.
- **Engagement Process** - questions received about the engagement process and whether or not the City would host their own engagement for the proposal.

Provided below is a summary of all the feedback received through the three different channels:

Public Information Meeting

14 questions and comments received

Survey Responses

25 survey responses received from February 7 to March 17, 2022. The survey included 5 questions, two of which were multiple choice questions.

Question	Responses
Q1 <u>What do you think about the project in the Moody Park Neighborhood?</u>	Agree: 52% Neutral: 28% Disagree: 20%
Q2 <u>What do you think about retaining and restoring the Thomas and Stella Sincock House heritage building?</u>	Agree: 56% Neutral: 28% Disagree: 16%
Q3 <u>Do you have any comments on the townhome parking and accessible studios?</u>	Common themes were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Limited parking space ● Proximity to schools, shops, parks, and amenities ● Density of the project ● Site well serviced by public transport ● Positive view towards the construction of the studio units ● Affordable housing
Q4 <u>Do you have any comments on the proposed building design?</u>	Common themes were as follows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Density ● Diverse housing options ● Concerns surrounding height ● Thoughtful layout ● Modern aesthetics
Q5 <u>Do you have any additional feedback?</u>	Themes occurring in question 3 and 4

responses were present in question 5 responses.

Survey responses indicated the following:

Responses in support: **13**

Neutral responses (did not clearly indicate stance but had questions or concerns): **7**

Responses in non-support: **5**

Email Correspondence

2 emails received from February 7 to March 17, 2022. Both emails received were in non-support.

A copy of all correspondence received is included in the appendices.

4. Conclusion

I4 Property Group (I4PG) hosted a virtual Public Information Meeting on March 10, 2022 from 5:30-7:30PM. The purpose of PIMs was to provide the community with information on the proposal and answer questions from the public.

The community was able to provide their feedback on the proposal through email, during the moderated Q&A portion of the PIM and through an online survey which was open from February 7 to March 17, 2022. A total of twenty-three community members attended the PIMs, and a total of twenty-five survey submissions and two emails were received.

The majority of feedback received indicates support for new housing forms including the townhomes and studio units proposed in the community. The main questions and concerns received were around traffic impacts, parking, and the proposed height and density of the townhome and studio units.

Appendices

March 10, 2022 Public Information Meeting Questions & Comments Transcript:


1. Parking concerns - one parking stall per home is inadequate and should be a higher number such as 1.5 per home, inadequate visitor parking, and no parking for studio homes
2. Why is this a virtual meeting and not a meeting in person
3. The small studio homes create a stacked townhome development which should not be in a single-family neighborhood
4. A question about variances – Thomas Greenwood explained the variances. This included pointing out that the height variances were few in number mostly involving the peaks of sloped roofs, that the largest variance was 39 inches near the corner of 8th & 8th and a corner of the roofline of the heritage home in the West, that the other height variances were smaller, and that the only setback variance was 10" affecting the rear yard of the heritage home.
5. One speaker complained that some members of Community Heritage Commission did not have advance notice or copies of the material presented at the CHC meeting on March 2. Same person commented that one visitor stall is inadequate.
 - a. Elana Zysblat pointed out that the home at 806 8th St. was originally not on the heritage register and that it was benefit of the development that it was being added to the heritage register to be protected.
6. Someone asked about access to and from the lane at 8th Street and Brent Dozzi explained that cars entering the lane from 8th Street while a car was backing out of a stall would have enough room to pull into the lane and not block traffic on 8th Street
 - a. Thomas explained that an angle cut at the lane and 8th Street was designed to allow greater visibility for entering and leaving the lane.
7. A speaker asked about the traffic disruption during the construction phase of the development and Myron responded that a construction management plan would be designed to minimize disruption during construction.
8. Someone asked if the parking stalls would be covered, and Thomas explained the planned for planters at the front of parking stalls and trellises for vinery to grow over the parking area.
9. Someone asked about drainage from the stalls to the lane
10. Someone asked about how the garbage would be taken away and Thomas explained that the garbage and recycling containers were planned in accordance with New Westminster requirements.
11. Someone suggested that the City should conduct a City run public information meeting

12. A speaker said he supports higher density on the site as it is close to transit and shopping, that higher density and fewer cars are the responsible way to build communities in the future and that we cannot keep doing the same thing
13. Another person pointed out the tradespeople need cars
14. A speaker said there should be respect for the neighborhood, that it was a single-family neighborhood and should not be redeveloped for more dense building forms. Myron Calof responded that according to the official community plan of the New Westminster the site was designated for densification and furthermore that the design of the development was respectful of the single-family home neighborhood in that the buildings transition from a taller structure at the busy corner of 8th & 8th down to a single-family structure in on the west side of the site similar to the adjacent single-family homes

Online Survey Responses:

The online survey included five questions: two questions were multiple choice questions and three open ended questions. There were 25 respondents in total.

Q1 and Q2 Survey responses:



Q1 and Q2 Survey Responses:

We had a total of 25 responses to Q1 and Q2 were multiple-choice questions with three options being – Agree, Neutral, and Disagree.

In Q1 the percentage breakdown is as follows:

- Agree: 52%
- Neutral: 28%
- Disagree: 20%

In Q2 the percentage breakdown is as follows:

- Agree: 56%

Neutral: 28%
Disagree: 16%

Q3: Do you have any comments on the townhome parking and accessible studios?

1. *"Great to see accessible studios. The entire length of the lane is in poor condition and has drainage issues - could we see an upgrade as part of this development? With about +15 additional cars calling this home, that's a lot more wear and tear. Happy to see a reduced parking requirement though (ie. not requiring 2 offstreet parking spots per unit). The transit is great in this location and on-street parking is usually ok."* -**12:16 PM February 12st 2022**
2. *"Very dense and with basically 1 Parking stall per unit I would expect most people would have an extra car and that will push more parking to 8th Ave which is not enough for Local residence and or Visitors of your Project"* -**3:08 PM February 21st 2022**
3. *"Please do not build large buildings as this doesn't suit the area."* -**1:15 PM February 21st 2022**
4. *"1 visitor spot is not enough"* -**8:33 PM February 24th 2022**
5. *"None."* -**3:48 PM February 28th 2022**
6. *"YES!!! Parking is already at a premium with circling the block over and over again. To the point where I do not invite people over during spring and summer as there is no where to park (live across from the lacrosse box). Such limited spots for so many units. Being three and four bedroom, it leads that there would be at least two cars for each unit - where will they go?"* -**2:25 PM March 7th 2022**
7. *"I strongly feel there isn't enough off street parking. The Canadian average is 1.5 cars per household, and this project only allocates 1 parking spot per townhome/heritage home and one visitor parking spot which is sorely lacking. You are offering 3-4 bed townhomes and conceivably there could be more than two vehicles per unit, and you are not allowing for the studios to have any visitor parking. The nearby side streets are usually close to full, so I don't know where all of the vehicles will be parking-owners or visitors."* -**6:44 PM March 7th 2022**
8. *"Living in the area it is nice to see that there will be affordable housing in the form of the studio homes, public transport is generally great in the area and will service the studio units that don't have parking stalls."* -**11:52 AM March 8th 2022**
9. *"Nice to see the transition away from a focus on parking, particularly in a location so well serviced by transit and close to shopping and recreational facilities."* -**7:53 PM March 8th 2022**
10. *"I feel the number of parking spaces is inadequate for the number of potential residents and vehicles"* -**8:41 PM March 8th 2022**

11. *"the OCP doesn't allow for stacking of townhomes. These studios will not have parking , the developer will give each studio a car share for two years. will will they park these cars?The parking on this site will not even be to a minimum standard of what is required. This will impact this neighbourhood long after this is completed it won't be for the better."* -**12:53 PM March 9th 2022**
12. *"Every unit should have parking stalls for at least 2 vehicles if you plan on building this where there is no street parking. Where will visitors park? People just cant park in the back lane."* -**12:03 PM March 10th 2022**
13. *".77 stalls per unit this is not enough parking esp for the 3 and 4 bedrooms units, not for families. Site Access 1)Access from lane off of 8th street left turns not permitted anytime (crossing 3 lanes of on coming traffic). 2)Access to 8th street from lane, left turns not permitted (crossing 3 lanes of on coming traffic) 3) right turn restriction from 8th Ave onto 10th Street."* -**6:20 PM March 10th 2022**
14. *"This corner has absolutely no street parking for the existing houses. You are not providing any additional parking, while increasing density. The burden on parking is unacceptable. Yes, as Canadians we do and will continue to have vehicles to access our whole province recreationally. Interprovincial travel has limited train and bus transportation while it does provide costly air travel we still use vehicles to access all corners of our province. It is unrealistic to say we will not have cars. We use vehicles for work in many fields, construction to name one. It is unrealistic to think this location or the residences of this project will not have vehicles especially when 11 units are 3 bedrooms, and two 4 bedroom units."* -**6:37PM March 10th 2022**
15. *"Appreciate the attempt to target alternative mods of transportation including car share, transit, cycling and walking but I am still concern over parking provided. I would be more comfortable with a parking calculation allowed for one car per unit including the heritage house."* -**7:04 PM March 10th 2022**
16. *"This is a good location for higher density, close to transit, recreation and shopping. We need to stop developing for cars - nobody needs to own or park cars. Higher density and fewer cars is better for the environment."* -**9:20 PM March 10th 2022**
17. *"Given the location of the homes is so close to the Uptown commercial center, parks and schools, and since the area is well served by transit the reduction to parking is entirely appropriate. Indeed, reduced parking should be encouraged not only make family-oriented housing more affordable but also to reduce the reliance on cars."* -**2:56 PM March 11th 2022**
18. *"I support reduced parking here. It's time to cut back cars on our streets. Reduced parking in locations like this so well served by transit and so near shopping, schools and recreation is a smart step, especially for smaller units. Lots of people don't have or don't want to have their own cars anymore and want the chance to buy a place of their own*

*without the additional cost of a parking space built into the price or rent.” -4:40 PM
March 12th 2022*

19. *“Only 15 parking place is limited and not enough for thirteen 3 and 4 bedroom people use And no extra parking place at near curbside. Because the position is very close to 8th ST and 8th Ave, both are too busy and heavy traffic. The new townhome access is to close to the intersection. It is very danger. One of the access is very close to the bus stop. It is unsafe for passengers especially many students. So it is unsuitable to build townhome.” -12:59 PM March 14th 2022*
20. *“I think the accessible studios are a very good idea. Good thinking by the builder. They give low income residents a chance to rent in a housing development not normally available to them. I can see pensioners on a low fixed income living here, and I love the idea of the age diversity this will support in the development. Not concerned about the parking. Lots of my friends don't own cars anymore, and live near transit and shopping. Time to get cars off the road. A family might need a car, but there are plenty of singles, old and young, who don't own or plan to own a car. The car share memberships and compass cards encourage more sustainable transportation, it's the way of the future. Let's embrace it.” -8:13 PM March 14th 2022*
21. *“The accessible studios are a great addition to the neighborhood. There are many singles and students looking for rental options. The parking is fine we don't need more parking stalls in our lanes, we need people using transit and there are transit stops surrounding this property. Most people want o use short term car rentals or uber nowadays.” -12:41 PM March 15th 2022*
22. *“This development is welcome in New Westminster. Let's get on with increasing the supply of all types of living areas.” -3:32 PM March 15th 2022*
23. *“I think the parking for the townhomes is good. We need to reduce vehicle traffic to reduce congestion, pollution and GHGs. We should stop spending so much on roads and parking for cars often occupied by just one occupant, and spend more on public transit. This location has lots of transit and is close to shopping, schools, parks, everything. It makes sense to have less parking here. As for the accessible studios, I totally support them. It's a novel idea in this kind of development that almost never sees accommodation for singles and couples struggling to make ends meet. Smart idea from this developer.” -5:45 PM March 15th 2022*
24. *“I think it is well thought out and will not impact the traffic routes” -3:40 PM March 16th 2022*
25. *“I think the parking is suitable and adequate for a location with such good access to transit, shopping, schools, recreation. The studios are a creative housing concept in this kind of development and I especially like that they are designed with accessible features.” -8:50 PM March 15th 2022*

Q3 Summary:

In question 3 we asked participants if they had any comments on the townhouse parking and about the accessible studio units. We had a total of 25 responses.

Common themes were as follows:

- Limited parking space
- Proximity to schools, shops, parks, and amenities
- Density of the project
- Site well serviced by public transport
- Positive view towards the construction of the studio units
- Affordable housing

Q4: Do you have any comments on the proposed building design?

1. *"I like the colour palette and appreciate the modern details. It's a busy traffic corner though. If not already considered, think about adding a noise reduction layer to the outside facing windows, or triple-pane."* -12:16 PM February 12st 2022
2. *"I would like to see a broader conceptual design layout"* -3:08 PM February 21st 2022
3. *"Your company should buy the whole block and then design the townhouses. This is not fair for the neighboring houses."* -1:15 PM February 21st 2022
4. *"No"* -8:33 PM February 24th 2022
5. *"I'm glad somebody is doing something with more modern design instead of the fake classical architecture."* -3:48 PM February 28th 2022
6. *"No, I think that it looks good."* -2:25 PM March 7th 2022
7. *"Has any thought been given as to how the parking will affect the pickup of garbage, organics, and recycling? Will there be enough room for pick up?"* -6:44 PM March 7th 2022
8. *"It has a modern/clean look to it."* -11:52 AM March 8th 2022
9. *"Nice to see a townhouse project well-suited for families proposed in that location while also providing options for smaller households. The different elevations add interest as well - not just a rectangular block."* -7:53 PM March 8th 2022
10. *"I think the building is too high"* -8:41 PM March 8th 2022
11. *"This building really does not fit into this neighbourhood as far as design. There will be too much density for the site. The height is nearly 40 feet in places. Maybe have a look at the OCP to see what was presented as townhomes/rowhousing. I think there could have been a much better and pleasing design even for one of the busiest intersections in the city."* -12:53 PM March 9th 2022
12. *"Not yet."* -12:03 PM March 10th 2022
13. *"to many units (density) for the site. Building mass at corner is too large does not fit with sf in the area. Mass will actually appear greater than multi family on the other side of the street"* -6:20 PM March 10th 2022
14. *"Will reply later just got the info"* -6:37PM March 10th 2022
15. *"Appreciate the efforts to transition to the existing single family massing. This has the potential to be quite an interesting development if the building details are well thought out and carefully constructed."* -7:04 PM March 10th 2022
16. *"I support the proposal"* -9:20 PM 10th March 2022
17. *"I commend the design team for the approach they've taken to the architecture. The design strikes an appealing balance between the typology of the heritage house and contemporary design elements. The style of the townhomes appropriately blend a modern aesthetic, reflecting the architecture of their time, while incorporating heritage elements such as pitched roofs. I appreciate how they approached the site layout."*

*Utilizing the area between the buildings as patios and usable outdoors space, rather than a drive aisle like so often is done in townhome projects, is encouraging to see.” -2:56 PM
March 11th 2022*

18. *“I like the variety of housing in one location, especially so close to transit and shopping. The density is fine, it's a perfect location for it, and I like the higher buildings near the corner and the transition down to the single family homes on the rest of the street. The heritage house is perfectly located for the transition.” -4:40 PM **March 12th 2022***
19. *“To build new townhome at the house area is incongruous.” -12:59 PM **March 14th 2022***
20. *“I like the diversity of the project. Three bedrooms for families, four bedroom units for larger families, at home work space or live-in older parents. The accessible studios will serve an under served part of the population. The heritage house really anchors in the project in the community, and preserves the history of the neighborhood while providing a unique family housing option. The higher buildings at the corner and the lower buildings near the heritage house respects the neighborhood while adding to housing stock.” -8:13 PM **on March 14th 2022***
21. *“The design is perfect for a corner property and will revitalize this entire intersection. The height is much needed on this corner which has been shrouded behind a wall of green for years. No one can see what's behind it and I'm sure it's much safer to have more exposure. It's also a nice compliment to the park across the street which is flat and not very interesting. The modern look is right for New West and for Moody Park and retaining the heritage house is the perfect homage to the area's history. I love the yellow color they chose for the house, it's so bright and refreshing.” -12:41 PM **on March 15th 2022***
22. *“The design respects heritage and neighbourhood character. Do follow through that there are accommodations for secure bicycle storage, a maintenance room and ebike charging” -3:32 PM **March 15th 2022***
23. *“I like it. It makes perfect sense to put the height and density at the corner, and the lower density and height near the rest of the street. The heritage house location helps the transition. Some people at the public information meeting said the buildings are too high, but the architect pointed out that just little pieces of the buildings are a little higher than the zoning allows, it's not a big deal. Changing subjects, I also like all the open space, whether on patios, balconies or even lower decks for the studios. I also like the landscaping plan.” -5:45 PM **March 15th 2022***
24. *“I think it is aesthetically appealing and fits the neighbourhood nicely.” -3:40 PM **March 16th 2022***
25. *“The higher buildings at the corner, reducing in height nearer the single family houses to the west are a good design. I heard some people say the buildings are too high but when the architect showed that only a few locations along the rooflines needed a*

*variance, I realized that such minor variances did not trouble me.” -8:50 PM March 16th
2022*

Summary:

In question 4 we asked participants if they had any comments on the proposed building design. We had a total of 25 responses.

Common themes were as follows.

- Density
- Diverse housing options
- Concerns surrounding height
- Thoughtful layout
- Modern aesthetics

Q5: Do you have any additional feedback?

1. *"Happy to see this stretch of 8th street developed. I hope it triggers an overall renewal of the blocks between 8th Ave and 10th Ave that is safer and more pedestrian friendly. Wider sidewalks, better separation from the traffic speeding through."* -**12:16 PM February 12st 2022**
2. *"My Main concern is density and Additional traffic in the area especially in the alley at 8th Street"* -**3:08 PM February 21st 2022**
3. *"Please do not build this into townhouses and studio. The neighbors do not want this design because it will block sunlight, take away privacy and lower the value of properties."* -**1:15 PM February 21st 2022**
4. *"In general I'm a fan of more modern and simple designs that are efficient to build and less environmentally impactful in terms of materials and design. People and use before heritage."* -**3:48 PM February 28th 2022**
5. *"With the way things are going, there should be rental included in the complex. All municipalities are including it now as a standard in multi-family developments - why not here?"* -**2:25 PM March 7th 2022**
6. *"We could do with more modern buildings in the area."* -**11:52 AM March 8th 2022**
7. *"This project looks to fit with what the City is trying to achieve - a variety of higher-density housing options in an area well serviced by transit, close to bike routes, and within easy walking distance of amenities. I support this project."* -**7:53 PM March 8th 2022**
8. *"Overall the buildings looks nice other than the height"* -**8:41 PM March 8th 2022**
9. *"I personally would like to see all three houses demo'd and a townhouse/rowhouse development , that fits in the neighbourhood with the correct amount of parking . I feel that the heritage house is being used for incentives. Every house has a story all the way up the street here."* -**12:53 PM March 9th 2022**
10. *"The project itself would be a good idea just not on the proposed corner. Poor location to be building a townhouse complex on such a busy corner with no street parking. Its hard enough trying to exit down this lane onto 8th street with the high speed of traffic coming from Canada Way and not being able to see what is coming with the big hedges on the neighbouring property. This would be better suited for the empty corner lot at 12th street and Dublin."* -**12:03 PM March 10th 2022**
11. *"redesign with less density pls"* -**6:20 PM March 10th 2022**
12. *"There is opportunity on the site to plant more large scale shade trees. Consider the west side of the site and the large shrub bed separating the proposed development from the neighbouring single family house. At least three large scale trees could be accommodated at locations that are opposite blank townhouse walls. There is opportunity to relocate the north bike rack at 8th street and enlarge the plant bed to*

allow for a large scale shade tree. Review the tree planting proposed along 8th Avenue in front of the townhomes, there does not appear to be any space to actually plant these trees and conform to the Canadian Landscape Standard for tree root volume. I appreciate the benches that have been provided for public use but suggest that 8th Street is a poor location. 8th Avenue although equally as busy at least faces south and has the benefit of being at the front of the units, i.e. eyes on the street and eyes on the benches.” -7:04 PM March 10th 2022

13. *“New West needs more housing
New West needs more variety in housing
We cannot build more housing and a variety of housing by leaving things as they are.
We need to accept change.” -9:20 PM 10th March 2022*
14. *“This looks like a great project and I hope the city encourages more like this.” -2:56 PM
March 11th 2022*
15. *“I support this project. It's a good balance of housing, design and parking where it's located. I think the restoration of the heritage house adds a special quality to the street, congratulations to the developer for working the house into a new development so well.” -4:40 PM March 12th 2022*
16. *“We strongly opposed to build new townhome at 8th ST and 8th Ave” -12:59 PM
March 14th 2022*
17. *“I would support this project. I think the developer has been very thoughtful about housing diversity, density, heights and design, and when it comes to parking has struck the right balance between the convenience of a family car, and the transit/walking/cycling options in this neighborhood.” -8:13 PM March 14th 2022*
18. *“I think these unit sizes and styles will appeal to a cross-section of people who want to live in New West and it's sop nice to see some modern influence. The architect did an incredible job with the orientation of the entries. 8th Street is so unattractive and a mess of cars and trucks all day long. That corner just fades into the background right now, and it deserves some presence. I appreciate the steps the developer is taking to notify the area and the consideration they've shown with regards to the heritage house. Most developers would have torn it down I'm sure. A developer who cares enough about the area history to retain such a landmark is the kind of developer this city needs. I hope they build more in the area.” -12:41 PM March 15th 2022*
19. *“This is a responsible developement company with a long track record of success. The Sapperton development had its challenges and they were acknowledged and overcome. These people will do what they say.” -3:32 PM March 15th 2022*
20. *“I was at the public information meeting. Most people were quiet like me. I was there to listen and learn. The same handful of people talked again and again. They don't want anything to change no matter how good the ideas are, and no matter what's really happening in the world. The traffic expert said it best, the evidence is that there's less*

demand for parking. So we should save our money and resources, build less parking and do all we can to move people into public transportation. Nothing will ever change if we ignore the evidence and juts keep doing what we've been doing.” -5:45 PM March 15th 2022

21. *“no” -3:40 PM March 16th 2022*

22. *“I think this is a very well conceived development. It's creative on housing diversity, parking and design. I support this project.” -8:50 PM March 16th 2022*

Summary:

In question 5 we asked participants if they had any additional feedback. We had a total of 25 survey responses.

Question 5 was more of an open-ended question and generated a multitude of responses. No two responses were the same and the theme for each comment was different, however the themes mentioned in question 3 and 4 were present in question 5 responses.

Email Correspondence

Subject: Response to 8+8 Proposal

Personal Information Removed Thu, Mar 17, 10:47 PM (7 days ago)
 to 8and8 DL, devfeedback@newwestcity.ca

ⓘ You are viewing an attached message. Pooni Group Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages. ⓘ

Please find enclosed my comments in response to a card I received in my mailbox from I4 Property Group regarding a new development proposal for 8th Ave. and 8th St.

I look forward to hearing form you.

Sincerely,
 Personal Information Removed



Personal Information Removed

March 9, 2022 at 7:46 PM

IH

Feedback of 8th ST and 8th Ave project

To: devfeedback@newwestcity.ca, 8and8 DL

Dear Sir,

Below is my feedback of 8th ST and 8th Ave project.

Do you have any comments on the townhome parking and accessible studios?

Only 15 parking place is limited and not enough for thirteen 3 and 4 bedroom townhomes people use. And no extra parking place at near curbside.

Because the position is very close to 8th ST and 8th Ave, both are too busy and heavy traffic.

The new townhome access is too close to the intersection. It is very dangerous.

One of the access is very close to the bus stop. It is unsafe for passengers especially many students.

So it is unsuitable to build townhome.

Do you have any comments on the proposed building design?

To build new townhome at the house area is incongruous.

Do you have any additional feedback?

We strongly oppose to build new townhome at 8th ST and 8th Ave.

March 17, 2022

Dear Mr. Myron Calof, I4 Property Group, Mayor and Council of New Westminster;

Re: 8th + 8th Townhome Development Proposal

Please find enclosed my comments in opposition to the proposed density and development proposed by I4 Property Group for the 8th + 8th Townhome Development that was dropped in my mailbox.

- I was an active participant in the City of New West OCP planning process
- I am in **full support of increased density in our neighbourhood and city, specifically the vision and plan that was created for our neighbourhood as laid out in the OCP:**
 - **8th Ave: residential detached and semi-detached** (in fact, we may end up building our own lane way home for our children, who can't afford to buy in this market, and my aging parents who are getting ready to downsize and need assistance)
 - **8th Street: residential infill townhouse** (I stopped by this development in New West on my way home from work today to take a photo of the type of housing I believe is allowed, appropriate, desirable, and expected for properties designated for infill townhome housing in existing single family neighbourhoods like ours)



- These land uses were decided based on **extensive** consultation and time and money spent (taxpayer money) on consultation with residents: we are so grateful that you asked and listened, and created a gentle increase in density that allows us to welcome new neighbours while continuing to live in our neighbourhoods and homes without a 3 or 4 story apartments being built beside us, resulting in a loss of privacy, sightlines, sunlight (for gardening), peace and quiet, and loss in property values etc. etc.
- Our family (and MANY neighbours I have spoken to) are **TOTALLY OPPOSED** to this development proposal in our neighbourhood.
- We do not support the heritage revitalization agreement that is proposed: the quality and merit of the character home that is being “preserved” is not at all commensurate with the variances that are being considered for the developer. This proposal does not offer an equal value exchange between the developer and the existing residents and community: the value that the developer receives in increased density and profit is NOT EVEN REMOTELY equal to the value the community gains (i.e. loses):
 - The number of homes being crammed onto these properties is not aligned to the plan for our neighbourhood, regardless of whether there is a heritage home on the properties or not. Our OCP allows for 3 single family homes to increase in density to double, or 6 family homes, not more than quadruple to 14!!!! During the OCP process, you asked, and we answered, and you listened: nothing has changed since then and we haven’t changed our mind as to the vision for change, and the type of housing and density that we will accept in our neighbourhood.
 - We (the current community and residents) are not going to pay the price for a previous owner application and subsequent city council/planning department approval of a heritage designation for this little home. There are MANY more properties in Kelvin that have much more heritage merit but no heritage designation. There are many other options, if the city or someone else wants to save this heritage home:
 - The developer can offer to sell it for \$1, so someone can move it to another property; if it does, in fact, have any heritage value or merit, someone will be willing to pay to move it
 - Best case scenario: the developer can preserve the heritage home by incorporating it into a beautiful new residential infill townhome development; I have seen many developers do this in a beautiful and sensitive way, which is a win, win, win for the existing residents, the heritage preservation, and the developer (in this case, the developer still makes a profit, just not as much as they would like – who gets to decide how much profit is enough? Why do the existing residents have to sacrifice our homes and neighbourhoods to subsidize the developer so they can make more money???)

- The only person benefitting from this proposal is the developer through increased profit. The “value” of preserving this particular heritage home is debatable, and even if a person supports the idea of heritage preservation, the irony is that the very heritage we are trying to preserve will be destroyed by a large development right beside it that is insensitive to the heritage of the property it is proposing to preserve
- There are a many more reasons why we cannot allow this development to proceed in our neighbourhood:
 - We will not support a 15 space parking lot to be built in our lane: this will destroy the community space and feel in our lane—this is a place where we connect, catch up, teach our kids to ride their bikes, lend tools to each other etc. etc. With the laneway model in the OCP, we can continue to create/build a sense of community in our lane and it can continue to be an important part of our neighbourhood, NOT A PARKING LOT
 - This development takes away important rental properties that the existing homes provide; the assumption is that the development would be a strata property and rentals would not be allowed
 - Our lane cannot handle the increased capacity of vehicles; they are already crumbling apart and have not been re paved in the 20 years since we moved here; we already have cars racing through the lane; we have no speed bumps or infrastructure to support increase traffic; even if these lots were developed into infill townhomes, per the OCP, we would still need to update the infrastructure in our lane
 - Our lane infrastructure cannot support increased development: we still do not have our storm and sewer separated; we have no storm drains in our lane; the rest of Kelvin roads and lanes have been updated and converted but our lane has never been done
 - Our neighborhood infrastructure needs to be updated: we still do not have a sidewalk on 8th Ave on the Moody Park side!
 - It sets a dangerous precedent for other neighbourhoods; we expect, TRUST, (and demand) that our city council and administration uphold the OCP that they asked us to provide input on, and subsequently created for our communities
 - We do not want developers (who don't live here or have any vested interested after they develop and leave) to shape the vision for our neighbourhood:
 - Before any development happens, we would like to know what the City plans for the old NWSS site? When will NWSS be torn down, what will replace it? How will we access the new park or amenities that will be there?
 - What is the plan for 8th Street between 8th Ave and 10th Ave? This road is way too wide for a residential neighbourhood with parks and schools. The traffic

volume and speed is a major problem (especially as traffic heads south into New West from Burnaby, speeding into the 30km zone beside Moody Park; we would like to know what the vision is for both the old school site and 8th St is to improve safety, walkability, quality of life (see sample image of boulevard that could be planned for 8th St between 10th Ave and 8th ave for safety, traffic calming, green areas/tree planting to help reduce carbon emissions etc. etc.

- We would like a vision from the City for 8th St and NWSS site, before letting developers in to create a mish mash of different housing types and styles, amenities, and landscaping; we would much rather the City have a vision that we can then asking developers to contribute to....



- Why would the City even consider this proposal, when they know this is not what the neighbourhood wants? We have already provided input through the OCP, and that part of the neighbourhood has been zoned for residential infill townhomes, which we trust you will move forward with and consider for future developments
- I totally understand there is an increasing demand for housing of all different types, which is why we created the OCP in the first place. It provides developers with a very detailed plan of the opportunities they have to build different types of housing across the entire city. Any density in this proposal, over and above what has been approved and planned for in the OCP, can and should occur in a different area that is zoned for that land use. The only party that benefits here is the developer: they are able to buy 3 residential properties, at residential property pricing, and turn them into 14 unit apartment buildings instead of 6 8 unit infill townhomes.
- There are so many areas of New Westminster that are in desperate need of redevelopment, the City should be working with developers to breathe new life into these stagnant and declining neighborhoods that are sitting vacant and wasted, which makes no sense with such a desperate need for affordable housing.

- 12th St is in desperate need of redevelopment. This could be one of the most amazing places to live in the city, centrally located with walking to commercial business, parks, schools, and transit, all in close proximity. While there are some apartments on 12th St, it is totally underdeveloped, and it is mostly sad and crumbling commercial properties. This could be a vibrant community with increased residential to support the commercial businesses and an amazing walkable neighborhood. Very little has changed here in the last 20 years since we moved to New West. Why would we allow developers to apply for variances for single family neighborhoods, when we are desperate for investment and redevelopment in so many other areas?
- What will it take for us to stop this development from happening, and make sure that you will not consider any developments, other than land use that has been planned for, and approved of, in our neighborhood? Petitions and websites don't seem to work...
- Why did the City approve the apartment building on 6th St. across from the new high school? I fully support this beautiful 96 unit affordable housing development for Black and Indigenous families, Elders and individuals in New Westminster, but there are a MILLION other locations you could have helped the developers and agencies find for this development. This is NOT a case of NIMBY: we welcome the development that is planned in the OCP for our neighbourhoods, and we want to be part of the solution to the affordable housing crisis for so many. So why, then, do you approve housing that is in violation to the approved land use, against the resident's wishes? Why do existing residents and neighbourhoods have to pay the price (effectively subsidizing the developments), instead of the developers working with the City to find locations that have the appropriate land use and zoning?
- What will it take to be heard? We thought when you asked in the OCP you wanted to know; we thought you heard us in the OCP process. Residents on 5th and 6th Streets created websites and thousands signed petitions. Will we need to get out on the streets and protest, shut down the traffic at 8th and 8th?
- Why is this happening, and what will it take for our voices to be heard?

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Postcard: 195 postcards posted on the 17th of February 2022



GIVE US YOUR FEEDBACK

Virtual Open House

March 10th, 2022 – 5:30pm to 7:30pm


Join Zoom Meeting: <https://bit.ly/3GWKEoF>

Meeting ID: 845 2899 3597

Passcode: 748151

8and8.ca

802, 806 Eighth Street & 809 Eighth Avenue,
New Westminster, BC, Canada



The Developer I4 Property Group is proposing the redevelopment of three lots at 802 & 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue (the "Site") at the North-West corner of Eighth Street and Eighth Avenue through the restoration of the historic Sincok Family Residence at 806 Eighth Street, and the construction of thirteen new 3 and 4

bedroom townhomes and four accessible studio homes. The Site is directly across Eighth Avenue from Moody Park, and the Massey Theater is located directly East across Eighth Street. The Moody Park neighbourhood includes several schools, and the Site is less than an eight minute walk from Royal City Centre and numerous shops and services including Walmart, Save-On Foods, Winners and Shoppers Drug Mart, Starbucks and much more. Moody Park comprises a mix of interwar, postwar and contemporary housing.

Visit our site www.8and8.ca to give us your feedback about the project. The site includes the project details, map, variances requested, historic significance, as well as contact details, and survey. The website will be **active for community feedback until March 17th, 2022** which will all be forwarded to the City of New Westminster.

Newspaper Advert: February 24, 2022 Placement

12 THURSDAY, February 24, 2022 • New West Record

VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE REGARDING PROPOSED HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT


802 & 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue

When: 10th of March, 2022 - 5:30pm to 7:30pm

WHERE: Online @ www.8and8.ca

I4 Property Group has applied to the City of New Westminster for Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) and Development Permit applications. The Developer is proposing the redevelopment of three lots at 802 & 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue (the "Site") at the North-West corner of Eighth Street and Eighth Avenue through the restoration of the historic Siscook Family Residence at 806 Eighth Street, and the construction of thirteen new 3 and 4 bedroom townhomes and four accessible studio homes. The Site is directly across Eighth Avenue from Moody Park, and the Massey Theater is located directly East across Eighth Street. The Moody Park neighbourhood includes several schools, and the Site is less than an eight minute walk from Royal City Centre and numerous shops and services including Walmart, Save-On Foods, Winnies and Shoppers Drug Mart, Starbucks and much more. Moody Park comprises a mix of interwar postwar and contemporary housing. The heritage house would be restored and legally protected through a Heritage Designation Bylaw.

THE PROPOSAL



Location of proposed site

THE INFORMATION

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and in order to help protect public health, I4 Property Group has created a website with information regarding the development proposal for 802 & 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue and will be available for viewing on the website. We will be able to answer any questions you may have and welcome your input and comments. There will be information on the website on how to submit your questions and comments. Please note any submissions may become part of the public record.

For more information, please contact

Developer: 8and8@i4pg.ca • Phone: 604-688-4155

City of New Westminster: www.bcheardnewwest.ca/802-eighth

Community



Cutline Bold: Black-and-white photographer by Kevin Green is featured in a newshow at the Plaskett Gallery. PHOTO KEVIN GREEN

Gallery show in black and white

Kevin Green wouldn't have imagined 10 years ago that today he'd be shooting with film once again.

But his dive back into the "old" technology has led him down new artistic

roads – and now his work will be on display at the Plaskett Gallery.

B&W On Film: Photography by Kevin Green runs from Feb. 15 to March 31.

"Why use such an old technology? Because there's something more real than real life about black-and-white film," Green said in an artist statement. "It is difficult to put your finger on or express with words why that is. Maybe it is just the grain or the enjoyable memories of watching old movies late at night when there is nothing else on."

Green attributes it to the "perfection of imperfection" that's inherent in any analog media type or items made by hand.

"They just feel more

human," he said.

For Green, film seems to dive deeper into the soul of a place, object or person.

"I would say that's the very objective of photography," he said.

The photos in the exhibition were shot in various locations around B.C., including New Westminster, Burnaby, Tofino and Qualicum Beach.

You can view it at the gallery Tuesdays to Fridays between 1 and 4 p.m., during performances at Massey Theatre or by appointment. Call 604-517-5900.

Plaskett Gallery is at Massey Theatre, 735 Eighth Ave. See www.masseytheatre.com for more.

VANCOUVER
COCKTAIL
WEEK //

presented by **Alchemist**

CINQ À SEPT HAPPY HOUR SERIES

March 6-9, 2022

Once the work day is done head to one of these participating venues to experience an elevated happy hour. Expect Vancouver Cocktail Week signature cocktails, appetizers and special programming. Event times vary so please check thealchemistmagazine.ca/vow or the venue websites.

- Ancora Waterfront Dining and Patio
- ARC Restaurant at the Fairmont Waterfront
- Bar Corso
- Brass Fish Tavern
- Cago and The Spritz
- Carline
- Gotham Steakhouse & Cocktail Bar
- Gult & Co.
- Havana Vancouver
- Hawksworth Restaurant
- Homer Street Cafe and Bar
- Hy's Steakhouse & Cocktail Bar
- MILA
- Pourhouse Restaurant & Cocktail Bar
- Published on Main
- St. Regis Bar & Grill
- Tableau Bar Bistro
- Tutto Restaurant & Bar
- Queen's Cross Pub

SHARE PHOTOS FROM YOUR CINQ À SEPT VISIT ON INSTAGRAM!

Tag @thealchemistmag and your favourite sponsor brand for your chance to WIN a GASTOWN gift

ALL-NEW ONLINE CHOICES

NOW HERE

Newspaper Advert: March 3, 2022 Placement

HUB Cycling hands out award to local advocate

Theresa McManus
trmcmanus@newwestrecord.ca

A local cycling advocate and a New West school were among the winners in HUB Cycling's 2022 Bike Awards.

For the past nine years, HUB Cycling has been celebrating the people who are making cycling more accessible across the region. This year's awards recognized municipalities, organizations, schools and community volunteers for their contributions to making people of all ages and abilities feel more comfortable and safer on two wheels.

Fulton Tom of HUB Cycling New West received a Volunteer Appreciation Award for his efforts in local committee advocacy.

The New Westminster School District received Bike-Friendly Building Certification – Gold for its cycling efforts at the new New Westminster Secondary School.

"It's only with our entire community coming together that cycling is becoming safer and more accessible to everyone. Whether you're a young student biking to school or a senior biking to the grocery store for milk, cycling is an option for you," Kate Shen, HUB Cycling's event manager, said in a press release. "We're so thankful for the work of individuals and organizations in building a safe and connected active transportation network."

Winners of this year's Bike Awards winners were

selected based on their effort and investment in the following areas: commitment to cycling education; buildings with bike-friendly amenities; commitment to bike-related research; event and advocacy initiatives; cycling infrastructure improvements; and event participation in Go by Bike Week, Bike to School Week, and Bike to Shop.

In 2021, HUB Cycling presented the City of New Westminster with its Biggest Leap Award in recognition of its efforts to introduce initiatives that improve local cycling.

Mayor Jonathan Cote was one of 12 elected officials from across the region who presented this year's Bike Awards in February.



THE METROPOLIS
WASHED ASHORE ART EXHIBIT
 FEATURING SCULPTURES
 MADE ENTIRELY OF MARINE DEBRIS
 FEBRUARY 23 – APRIL 30
METROPOLISARTSOCIETY.COM

METROPOLIS
 Burnaby now



Anvil Theatre presents a Musical TheatreWorks in association with Western Canada Theatre production

Hey Viola!

VIOLA DESMOND
 The Soundtrack of a Life

Starring
 KRYSTLE DOS SANTOS

Created by
 KRYSTLE DOS SANTOS
 & TRACEY POWER

MAR 16 - 27
anviltheatre.ca

ANVIL THEATRE
 NEW WESTMINSTER
 777 COLUMBIA ST, NEW WESTMINSTER

NEW WESTMINSTER
 WESTERN CANADA THEATRE

VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE REGARDING PROPOSED HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT

802 & 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue

When: 10th of March, 2022 - 5:30pm to 7:30pm
 WHERE: Online @ www.8and8.ca

I4 Property Group has applied to the City of New Westminster for Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) and Development Permit applications. The Developer is proposing the redevelopment of three lots of 802 & 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue (the "Site") at the North-West corner of Eighth Street and Eighth Avenue through the restoration of the historic Sincock Family Residence at 806 Eighth Street, and the construction of thirteen new 3 and 4 bedroom townhomes and four accessible studio homes. The Site is directly across Eighth Avenue from Moody Park, and the Massey Theater is located directly East across Eighth Street. The Moody Park neighbourhood includes several schools, and the Site is less than an eight minute walk from Royal City Centre and numerous shops and services including Walmart, Save-On Foods, Winners and Shoppers Drug Mart, Starbucks and much more. Moody Park comprises a mix of infotour, postwar and contemporary housing. The heritage house would be restored and legally protected through a Heritage Designation Bylaw.

THE PROPOSAL




Location of proposed site

THE INFORMATION

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and in order to help protect public health, I4 Property Group has created a website with information regarding the development proposal for 802 & 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue and will be available for viewing on the website. We will be able to answer any questions you may have and welcome your input and comments. There will be information on the website on how to submit your questions and comments. Please note any submissions may become part of the public record.

For more information, please contact
 Developer: 8and8@i4pg.ca • Phone: 604-688-4155
 City of New Westminster: www.beheardnewwest.ca/802-eighth

8TH + 8TH HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT AND TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT

802 & 806 8TH ST, 809 8TH AVE, NWM

VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2022




REV 3005



AERIAL VIEW, LOOKING SOUTH

AERIAL VIEW OF LOT

8TH + 8TH HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT AND TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT





MATERIALS LEGEND

SYMBOL	QTY	DESCRIPTION
[Symbol]		PAVING TYPE 1 Concrete Unit Pavers
[Symbol]		PAVING TYPE 2 Various Sizes, Two Colours
[Symbol]		PAVING TYPE 3 Antislip Porcelain Pavers
[Symbol]		PAVING TYPE 4 48" x 24" Running Bond
[Symbol]		PAVING TYPE 5 AspaPave Standard by Abbotsford
[Symbol]		PAVING TYPE 6 Herringbone Pattern
[Symbol]		STEPS Cast-in-Place Concrete Steps
[Symbol]		CITY OF NEW WESTMINSTER SIDEWALK Cast-in-Place Concrete Refer to Civil
[Symbol]		PLANTING TYPE 1 Planting Bed
[Symbol]		PLANTING TYPE 2 CIP Concrete Planter
[Symbol]		PLANTING TYPE 3 H/L Series, Refer to Details
[Symbol]		PAVING TRELLIS Overhead Cable Trellis
[Symbol]		HERITAGE TRELLIS Thermally Modified Wood Trellis
[Symbol]		ENTRY TRELLIS Powdercoated Metal Pergola Refer to Arch
[Symbol]		RAIL TYPE 1 Glass Guard Rail 4'-0" HT.
[Symbol]		RAIL TYPE 2 Stainless Steel Hand Rail
[Symbol]		WALL TYPE 1 Cast-in-Place Retaining Wall Height Varies, Refer to Details
[Symbol]		WALL TYPE 2 Cinder Fence 4'-0" HT.
[Symbol]		PAD MOUNTED TRANSFORMER Refer to Architecture
[Symbol]		SITE FURNISHING By Unit Owners, For Graphic Information Only
[Symbol]		SITE FURNISHING Class B Bin Rack Product TBD
[Symbol]		SITE FURNISHING Wood Bench Product TBD
[Symbol]		HOSE BIB One per unit/patio.
[Symbol]		EXISTING UTILITIES LEGEND
[Symbol]		OVERHEAD UTILITY (HYDRO)
[Symbol]		UTILITY POLE
[Symbol]		TRAFFIC SIGN
[Symbol]		UTILITY POLE
[Symbol]		UTILITY ACCESS
[Symbol]		WATER VALVE



SITE PLAN

8TH + 8TH HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT AND TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT





Harris Home No. M-1006


Size 30 ft. x 29 ft. 6 in.
Including Addition

5 Rooms
and Bath


THIS is also a new design that is offered at an exceptionally low price, due directly to modern machinery, standardization of material, great volume production and the elimination of all waste.

At a glance one can see how the well balanced exterior harmonizes in every respect with the spacious front porch, and studying the floor plans it is easy to tell that the architect has given considerable study to housewife's convenience. Housekeeping will be a real joy in this remarkably well planned home.

Here we also offer two floor plans, "A" and "B." Note how in each plan every square inch of floor space is utilized to best advantage—the Living Room is large and well lighted, having four good sized windows and large glazed front door. From




the Living Room a door gives access to a hall connecting the two bedrooms. Between these a convenient bathroom—note also door connecting kitchen with this hall. This is a feature that is well liked in this home for it saves many unnecessary steps. The kitchen opens upon a stairway which leads to the grade entrance and to the basement. The icebox can conveniently be placed on the grade landing as shown.



The Santiam Fenner Home No. 188

JUST the thing for two people, and a little beauty, at that!" This was the exclamation of a woman who lives in a Fenner home when she saw the first plans of "The Santiam." Other people liked it, too, so we decided to put it into the catalog. It certainly makes a cozy little home, and the big front porch with the heavy pillars add an artistic touch that makes it look a much larger house than it actually is. The floor plans will show you



how conveniently arranged this little home can be made. There is nothing elaborate, nothing fancy about it, but it certainly is a pretty little house, and for the money it is one of the nicest four-room homes that can possibly be built.

See price list just inside front cover

Specifications on pages 11 to 14.

Wall and floor sheathing not furnished.



Size:
28 x 24 ft.



HOME BW-4264

AFTER all there is nothing so pleasingly home-like as a simple little Colonial bungalow of shingle construction, especially if it is designed properly. It would almost be inappropriate to describe the little home pictured above in building terms, it is such an attractive, appealing little place

that anyone could become attached to. It would not be hard to imagine this design as a very desirable home for some young couple, as the interior layout will provide very comfortable living quarters for a small family.


This design in Siding construction would be just as attractive.

Proposed south elevation (front)



Existing elevation

Elements in blue to be removed/replaced to achieve conservation objectives, see below.





Proposed west elevation (side)



Existing elevation

*Elements in blue to be removed/
replaced to achieve conservation
objectives, see previous page and
below.*







FAMILY ORIENTED APARTMENTAL UNITS



SECURED BIKE STORAGE



INTEGRATED PUBLIC SEATING



EV CHARGING STATIONS IN PARKADE FOR RESIDENTS



NEW BUS SHELTER W/ BENCH & ACCESSIBILITY PAD



CONTROLLED IRRIGATION STRATEGIES



NEW SIDEWALK



ROAD IMPROVEMENTS



PEDESTRIAN-LEVEL DOWN LIGHTING

COMMUNITY BENEFITS

8TH + 8TH HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT AND TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT

Project Report


29 October 2020 - 31 January 2023

Be Heard New West City

802 & 806 Eighth Street & 809 Eighth Avenue



Visitors Summary



Highlights

TOTAL VISITS	MAX VISITORS PER DAY	
545	10	
NEW REGISTRATIONS		
1		
ENGAGED VISITORS	INFORMED VISITORS	AWARE VISITORS
2	149	366

Aware Participants		Engaged Participants	
366		2	
Aware Actions Performed	Participants	Engaged Actions Performed	Registered Unverified Anonymous
Visited a Project or Tool Page	366	Contributed on Forums	0 0 0
Informed Participants	149	Participated in Surveys	0 0 0
Informed Actions Performed	Participants	Contributed to Newsfeeds	0 0 0
Viewed a video	0	Participated in Quick Polls	0 0 0
Viewed a photo	0	Posted on Guestbooks	0 0 0
Downloaded a document	145	Contributed to Stories	0 0 0
Visited the Key Dates page	0	Asked Questions	2 0 0
Visited an FAQ list Page	0	Placed Pins on Places	0 0 0
Visited Instagram Page	0	Contributed to Ideas	0 0 0
Visited Multiple Project Pages	139		
Contributed to a tool (engaged)	2		

QANDA

Ask a Question about 802-806 Eighth Street & 809 Eighth Avenue

Visitors 9	Contributors 2	CONTRIBUTIONS 3
-------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Q

Personal information redacted

08 January 22

Why a bus stop road widening proposed. Buses will have hard time going back to traffic. Should be aligned with the rest of roadway.

A

Publicly Answered

Thank you for your comment about the bus stop in front of the proposed project site. Currently, buses using this stop on Eighth Avenue need to stop in the middle of the travel lane to load and unload passengers. Through this application, there is an opportunity to address roadway, accessibility, and public realm improvements to help create a better condition for this bus stop, especially since Eighth Avenue is identified as a potential Frequent Transit Network route. With a proposed bus pullout, boarding and unboarding would not need to take place within a travel lane, and it could also help reduce the risk of vehicles extending into the intersection behind a stopped bus.

QANDA

Ask a Question about 802-806 Eighth Street & 809 Eighth Avenue

Q

Personal information redacted

08 January 22

There's a good opportunity to implement road diet on Eighth Avenue with this project. Currently the street is too wide for NWSS students to cross. Almost 6 lanes. Can be easily reduced to 4 narrow lanes with no complications on traffic situation. Maybe even 3 lanes.

A

Publicly Answered

Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback for the proposal. As part of the City's transportation priorities, there is a focus on various transportation modes with a goal of creating a more sustainable transportation system. Through the City's Master Transportation Plan, the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, and transit are placed first before commercial vehicles and cars. For the Eighth Street and Eighth Avenue intersection, some recent improvements include changing the placement of curb letdowns and adding curb extensions to help shorten the pedestrian crossing distances. This proposed project will bring further enhancements as part of off-site works, such as improving sidewalk conditions for pedestrians and providing better bus stop infrastructure for residents taking transit.

Q

Personal information redacted

09 December 22

Will these units be non-strata lots? If not, has the city considered introducing non-strata row houses in future infill projects?

A

Publicly Answered

Thank you for your questions – for the proposed development at 802 & 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue, the individual townhouse units would be stratified, while the heritage house proposed to be restored would be placed on its own subdivided lot. As part of the City's broader Infill Housing Program, both townhouses (strata title developments) and rowhouses (fee simple developments – no strata) are currently permitted under the Residential – Infill Townhouse (RT) and Residential – Ground Oriented Infill Housing (RGO) designations.

From: [Dilys Huang](#)
To: Personal information redacted
Cc: [External-Dev Feedback](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] 8and8.ca
Date: Wednesday, April 6, 2022 2:20:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good afternoon Personal information redacted

Thank you very much for your email and for taking the time to send us your comments on the proposed project at 802 & 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue. All feedback received regarding this project will be summarized and included in a report to Council as part of their consideration.

Prior to Council's consideration, there will also be an opportunity for community members to provide further feedback as part of an upcoming Public Hearing. For additional project information and updates, please visit the City's Be Heard New West webpage: <https://www.beheardnewwest.ca/802-eighth>

Kind regards,

Dilys Huang, RPP, MCIP, LEED Green Assoc. | Development Planner
T 604.527.4562 | E dhuang@newwestcity.ca
City of New Westminster

From: Personal information redacted
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2022 7:11 PM
To: Mike Watson <mwatson@newwestcity.ca>; External-Dev Feedback <devfeedback@newwestcity.ca>
Cc: Personal information redacted
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 8and8.ca

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of New Westminster's network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Personal information redacted Eighth Avenue
New Westminster, BC
V3M 2R4, CANADA

The City of New Westminster
511` Royal Avenue
New Westminster, BC
V3L 1H9

City Clerk,

ATTENTION: Mayor, Planning, Building, Permits, Licensing, Zoning and Variance staff teams

SUBJECT: The proposed/draft/notes/hints/of an attempt to redevelop 802 & 806 Eighth Street and

809 Eighth Avenue by 14 Property Group.

On March 10, 2022 the “developer” held a virtual open house wherein his presentation and staff consumed over 60% of the time and failed to listen to the community with any sincerity, rather the developer repeatedly engaged sales-speak in attempt to overcome the objections and ignore the valid concerns of the residents.

I feel that the community would be well served by Council and or staff hosting an in-person open house where-in the developer was limited to a brief (5 minutes or so) introduction and the balance of the time devoted to hearing the community.

The issues with this development from my point of view (which can all be resolved with appropriate direction and guidelines from council) are as follows:

1. The proposed development and developer did not and still does not have an adequate understanding of the site. Both major roads adjoining the site have no available parking. The neighbourhood streets are currently over-run with parked vehicles from Moody Park Events, Massey Theatre Events, NWS school events and commercial vehicles from the Moody Apartments across the street. The request for any parking variance should be denied and the city should consider imposing a greater than normal requirement for parking. The notion that the e-car entitlements that would accompany four of the units does not even consider where those cars might park. The city might want to consider a restrictive covenant on each title limiting the owner to one vehicle and make all the adjoining streets residential parking only for existing residents and NOT provide any street parking to the development.
2. The height, given the size of foot print should be extremely restricted and no allowance should be made for the faux integration of the “heritage” house.
3. The site should provide adequate lawn and landscaping to provide for appropriate on site storm water detention.
4. The storm water system in the alley behind the site does not commence till $\frac{3}{4}$ way down the alley. When the basements on Eighth Avenue flooded some years ago the city made a temporary fix and curbed the alley on the south side promising that the storm water system and alley would be repaired and upgraded to municipal standards when the high school was built. This has not been done. There appears no consideration for the additional unretained water.
5. The patchwork surface repairs in this alley are crumbling under the stress of the new garbage collection system and any additional traffic generated by the site parking (whether 15 or 25) would necessitate a complete rebuild of the alley with proper drainage and engineered to meet the increased traffic volume and loads.
6. The city should reserve/increase the DCC charges so that additional park land proportional to the density increase can be acquired (If these charges need to be increased the city should encourage the developer to let the future generations participate in the capital windfall permitted by the permits.)
7. I favour densification, however the current proposal is a real-estate transaction and not a neighbourhood improvement plan.

8. The sidewalks adjoining the site and the roadways need to remain handicap open to all residents and students during the entire construction period.

9. Having observed the developer's inability to prune the hedges that overhang the sidewalk and their inability to effect snow removal as required I would urge council to exact a larger than normal surety to be sure that ALL the undertakings are delivered.

Thank-you in advance for your consideration and action.

ELECTRONICALLY SIGNED

Personal information redacted

cc 14 Property Group – 8and8@i4pg.com
Development Planner – mwatson@newwestcity.ca
Development Services – devfeedback@newwestcity.ca
Personal information redacted

From: [External-Post Master - Pln](#)
To: Personal information redacted
Subject: RE: Attention: Mayor, Council and Planning Department
Date: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 4:49:25 PM
Attachments: [image002.jpg](#)

Good afternoon Personal information redacted

Thank you very much for your email and for taking the time to send us your comments on the proposed project at 802 & 806 Eighth Street and 809 Eighth Avenue. All feedback received regarding this project will be summarized and included in a report to Council as part of their consideration.

Prior to Council's consideration, there will also be an opportunity for community members to provide further feedback as part of an upcoming Public Hearing. For additional project information and updates, please visit the City's Be Heard New West webpage:

<https://www.beheardnewwest.ca/802-eighth>

Kind regards,

Adrian McLeod, MPP, CP3 | Planning Assistant

T 604-527-4532 | E amcleod@newwestcity.ca

City of New Westminster | Climate Action, Planning and Development Department
511 Royal Avenue, New Westminster, BC V3L 1H9
www.newwestcity.ca

From: Personal information redacted
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 12:43 PM
To: Info <Info@newwestcity.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Attention: Mayor, Council and Planning Department

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of New Westminster's network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Personal information redacted

Edinburgh Street

New Westminster, BC

V3M 2V2

Personal information redacted

April 18, 2022

City of New Westminster

511 Royal Avenue

New Westminster, B.C.

V3L 1H9

For the Attention of Mayor, Council and Planning Department:

-

To Whom it May Concern:

We have been residents of Edinburgh Street since 1994. We understand the need for affordable housing to increase density within the city for a growing population. Our concern is the proposed development at 8th and 8th as we feel this development is to a high structure and the parking is not adequate for the number of residences.

With the number of residences proposed on the site and the buildings only being set back to the minimum requirement this will make the structure very imposing in the local landscape. We are already impacted with the parking of ride share vehicles, patrons attending Massy Theater, sporting events in Moody Park and resident parking from the existing rental units in the proposed development. There are 15 parking spaces for eighteen 3 and 4 bedroom units, Heritage house and 4 studio apartments. The four studio apartments will be sold with the premise of a two year membership to Ride Share, but no available parking. Our concern is not only where these vehicles will park but also if these studio apartments have a vehicle anyways or the 3 and 4 bedrooms units and Heritage house have more than one vehicle?

It is our feeling that the City and developers should concentrate on the Sixth Street corridor which already has approval for a six story multi residential building. This would help to revitalize an area that has already committed to redevelopment. 12th street could build ground floor retail with second and third floor residential units to increase density and revitalize this dated corridor.

With Concern,

Personal information redacted

March 17, 2022

Dear Personal
information
redacted

lof, I4 Property Group, Mayor and Council of New Westminster;

Re: 8th + 8th Townhome Development Proposal

Please find enclosed my comments in opposition to the proposed density and development proposed by I4 Property Group for the 8th + 8th Townhome Development that was dropped in my mailbox.

- I was an active participant in the City of New West OCP planning process
- I am in **full support of increased density in our neighbourhood and city, specifically the vision and plan that was created for our neighbourhood as laid out in the OCP:**
 - **8th Ave: residential detached and semi-detached** (in fact, we may end up building our own lane way home for our children, who can't afford to buy in this market, and my aging parents who are getting ready to downsize and need assistance)
 - **8th Street: residential infill townhouse** (I stopped by this development in New West on my way home from work today to take a photo of the type of housing I believe is allowed, appropriate, desirable, and expected for properties designated for infill townhome housing in existing single family neighbourhoods like ours)



- These land uses were decided based on **extensive** consultation and time and money spent (taxpayer money) on consultation with residents: we are so grateful that you asked and listened, and created a gentle increase in density that allows us to welcome new neighbours while continuing to live in our neighbourhoods and homes without a 3 or 4 story apartments being built beside us, resulting in a loss of privacy, sightlines, sunlight (for gardening), peace and quiet, and loss in property values etc. etc.
- Our family (and MANY neighbours I have spoken to) are **TOTALLY OPPOSED** to this development proposal in our neighbourhood.
- We do not support the heritage revitalization agreement that is proposed: the quality and merit of the character home that is being “preserved” is not at all commensurate with the variances that are being considered for the developer. This proposal does not offer an equal value exchange between the developer and the existing residents and community: the value that the developer receives in increased density and profit is NOT EVEN REMOTELY equal to the value the community gains (i.e. loses):
 - The number of homes being crammed onto these properties is not aligned to the plan for our neighbourhood, regardless of whether there is a heritage home on the properties or not. Our OCP allows for 3 single family homes to increase in density to double, or 6 family homes, not more than quadruple to 14!!!! During the OCP process, you asked, and we answered, and you listened: nothing has changed since then and we haven’t changed our mind as to the vision for change, and the type of housing and density that we will accept in our neighbourhood.
 - We (the current community and residents) are not going to pay the price for a previous owner application and subsequent city council/planning department approval of a heritage designation for this little home. There are MANY more properties in Kelvin that have much more heritage merit but no heritage designation. There are many other options, if the city or someone else wants to save this heritage home:
 - The developer can offer to sell it for \$1, so someone can move it to another property; if it does, in fact, have any heritage value or merit, someone will be willing to pay to move it
 - Best case scenario: the developer can preserve the heritage home by incorporating it into a beautiful new residential infill townhome development; I have seen many developers do this in a beautiful and sensitive way, which is a win, win, win for the existing residents, the heritage preservation, and the developer (in this case, the developer still makes a profit, just not as much as they would like – who gets to decide how much profit is enough? Why do the existing residents have to sacrifice our homes and neighbourhoods to subsidize the developer so they can make more money???)

- The only person benefitting from this proposal is the developer through increased profit. The “value” of preserving this particular heritage home is debatable, and even if a person supports the idea of heritage preservation, the irony is that the very heritage we are trying to preserve will be destroyed by a large development right beside it that is insensitive to the heritage of the property it is proposing to preserve
- There are a many more reasons why we cannot allow this development to proceed in our neighbourhood:
 - We will not support a 15-space parking lot to be built in our lane: this will destroy the community space and feel in our lane—this is a place where we connect, catch up, teach our kids to ride their bikes, lend tools to each other etc. etc. With the laneway model in the OCP, we can continue to create/build a sense of community in our lane and it can continue to be an important part of our neighbourhood, NOT A PARKING LOT
 - This development takes away important rental properties that the existing homes provide; the assumption is that the development would be a strata property and rentals would not be allowed
 - Our lane cannot handle the increased capacity of vehicles; they are already crumbling apart and have not been re-paved in the 20 years since we moved here; we already have cars racing through the lane; we have no speed bumps or infrastructure to support increase traffic; even if these lots were developed into infill townhomes, per the OCP, we would still need to update the infrastructure in our lane
 - Our lane infrastructure cannot support increased development: we still do not have our storm and sewer separated; we have no storm drains in our lane; the rest of Kelvin roads and lanes have been updated and converted but our lane has never been done
 - Our neighborhood infrastructure needs to be updated: we still do not have a sidewalk on 8th Ave on the Moody Park side!
 - It sets a dangerous precedent for other neighbourhoods; we expect, TRUST, (and demand) that our city council and administration uphold the OCP that they asked us to provide input on, and subsequently created for our communities
 - We do not want developers (who don't live here or have any vested interested after they develop and leave) to shape the vision for our neighbourhood:
 - Before any development happens, we would like to know what the City plans for the old NWSS site? When will NWSS be torn down, what will replace it? How will we access the new park or amenities that will be there?
 - What is the plan for 8th Street between 8th Ave and 10th Ave? This road is way too wide for a residential neighbourhood with parks and schools. The traffic

volume and speed is a major problem (especially as traffic heads south into New West from Burnaby, speeding into the 30km zone beside Moody Park; we would like to know what the vision is for both the old school site and 8th St is to improve safety, walkability, quality of life (see sample image of boulevard that could be planned for 8th St between 10th Ave and 8th ave for safety, traffic calming, green areas/tree planting to help reduce carbon emissions etc. etc.

- We would like a vision from the City for 8th St and NWSS site, before letting developers in to create a mish mash of different housing types and styles, amenities, and landscaping; we would much rather the City have a vision that we can then asking developers to contribute to....



- Why would the City even consider this proposal, when they know this is not what the neighbourhood wants? We have already provided input through the OCP, and that part of the neighbourhood has been zoned for residential infill townhomes, which we trust you will move forward with and consider for future developments
- I totally understand there is an increasing demand for housing of all different types, which is why we created the OCP in the first place. It provides developers with a very detailed plan of the opportunities they have to build different types of housing across the entire city. Any density in this proposal, over and above what has been approved and planned for in the OCP, can and should occur in a different area that is zoned for that land use. The only party that benefits here is the developer: they are able to buy 3 residential properties, at residential property pricing, and turn them into 14 unit apartment buildings instead of 6-8 unit infill townhomes.
- There are so many areas of New Westminster that are in desperate need of redevelopment, the City should be working with developers to breathe new life into these stagnant and declining neighborhoods that are sitting vacant and wasted, which makes no sense with such a desperate need for affordable housing.

- 12th St is in desperate need of redevelopment. This could be one of the most amazing places to live in the city, centrally located with walking to commercial business, parks, schools, and transit, all in close proximity. While there are some apartments on 12th St, it is totally underdeveloped, and it is mostly sad and crumbling commercial properties. This could be a vibrant community with increased residential to support the commercial businesses and an amazing walkable neighborhood. Very little has changed here in the last 20 years since we moved to New West. Why would we allow developers to apply for variances for single family neighborhoods, when we are desperate for investment and redevelopment in so many other areas?
- What will it take for us to stop this development from happening, and make sure that you will not consider any developments, other than land use that has been planned for, and approved of, in our neighborhood? Petitions and websites don't seem to work...
- Why did the City approve the apartment building on 6th St. across from the new high school? I fully support this beautiful 96-unit affordable housing development for Black and Indigenous families, Elders and individuals in New Westminster, but there are a MILLION other locations you could have helped the developers and agencies find for this development. This is NOT a case of NIMBY: we welcome the development that is planned in the OCP for our neighbourhoods, and we want to be part of the solution to the affordable housing crisis for so many. So why, then, do you approve housing that is in violation to the approved land use, against the resident's wishes? Why do existing residents and neighbourhoods have to pay the price (effectively subsidizing the developments), instead of the developers working with the City to find locations that have the appropriate land use and zoning?
- What will it take to be heard? We thought when you asked in the OCP you wanted to know; we thought you heard us in the OCP process. Residents on 5th and 6th Streets created websites and thousands signed petitions. Will we need to get out on the streets and protest, shut down the traffic at 8th and 8th?
- Why is this happening, and what will it take for our voices to be heard?

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Personal information redacted

8th Ave