

**From:** [Susie Poulsen](#)  
**To:** [External-Clerks](#); [Ruby Campbell](#); [Patrick Johnstone](#); [Daniel Fontaine](#); [Tasha Henderson](#); [Jaimie McEvoy](#); [Paul Minhas](#); [Nadine Nakagawa](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Submission for 8th + 8th Development  
**Date:** Monday, March 27, 2023 6:09:25 PM  
**Attachments:** [Response to 8+8.pdf](#)

**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.

Hello;

Please find attached a PDF with our comments in response to the proposed development for 8th & 8th. HRA Bylaw No 8379, 2023 Heritage Designation Bylaw no 8380, 2023 for 802 & 806 Eight St and 809 Eight Ave.

I was surprised to see this project move forward without any changes to the original proposal we received one year ago, given that the neighbourhood is NOT in support of this.

I am in support of the increased density proposed in the OCP, and look forward to the opportunity to build a laneway home myself, but not in support of using the HRA to subsidize developers and go against the OCP and the wishes of the neighbourhood.

Further, the City needs to provide a plan for enhancements to the neighbourhood before any development takes place, specifically:

- Storm and sewer separation in our lane. Enhancement to our lane including paving and speed bumps. The entire neighbourhood was upgraded after the great flood of 2003, but our lane was missed.
- Sidewalk (or path in park) along 8th Ave from 8th St to 10th St. (we've been waiting 25 years for this)
- A plan for the old high school site. It looks like development is happening over there but what is the planning process and timeline? How will our neighbourhood be connected to this. Why hasn't the neighbourhood been included or notified?
- Traffic calming for 8th St between 10th Ave and 8th Ave. (images in the attached PDF).
- Solar powered speed readers on both sides of 8th Ave and 8th St for both playground speed zones

I look forward to a strong message going back to the developer from the City tonight, indicating development is welcome but not development that goes against the OCP and the neighbourhood's wishes.

Thank you,  
Susie Poulsen  
XXX 8th Ave  
New Westminster

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Susie Poulsen

**Subject:** Response to Proposal for 8th + 8th

**Date:** March 17, 2022 at 11:01:51 PM PDT

**To:** Jonathan Cote <[jcote@newwestcity.ca](mailto:jcote@newwestcity.ca)>, [pjohnstone@newwestcity.ca](mailto:pjohnstone@newwestcity.ca),  
[jmcevoy@newwestcity.ca](mailto:jmcevoy@newwestcity.ca), [nnakagawa@newwestcity.ca](mailto:nnakagawa@newwestcity.ca),  
[cpuchmayr@newwestcity.ca](mailto:cpuchmayr@newwestcity.ca), [mtrentadue@newwestcity.ca](mailto:mtrentadue@newwestcity.ca), [cdas@newwestcity.ca](mailto:cdas@newwestcity.ca)

March 17, 2022

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

**Re: 8<sup>th</sup> + 8<sup>th</sup> Townhome Development Proposal**

Please find enclosed my comments in opposition to the proposed density and development proposed by I4 Property Group for the 8<sup>th</sup> + 8<sup>th</sup> 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:**
  - **8<sup>th</sup> 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)
  - **8<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> Street between 8<sup>th</sup> Ave and 10<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> St is to improve safety, walkability, quality of life (see sample image of boulevard that could be planned for 8<sup>th</sup> St between 10<sup>th</sup> Ave and 8<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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.

- 12<sup>th</sup> 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 12<sup>th</sup> 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 6<sup>th</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Streets created websites and thousands signed petitions. Will we need to get out on the streets and protest, shut down the traffic at 8<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>?
- Why is this happening, and what will it take for our voices to be heard?

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Susie Poulsen  
XXX 8<sup>th</sup> Ave