

**From:** Ronda Field  
**To:** External-Clerks  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 323 Regina  
**Date:** Monday, January 24, 2022 10:47:20 PM

---

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.

> Dear Mayor and Council,

> I am writing (this time!) to express my concern about the proposed development of 323 Regina. I attended the community meeting where we had a large number of QP residents, with almost no support for this project. Specific concerns included:

> -If a house doesn't have enough heritage to qualify for the HCA, how can it be seen to have enough character to designate? And how/ why can it be retroactively included once the heritage features have been altered or removed? There is no heritage gain or benefit to retroactively designating a property after the character has been removed - in this case, it is a question of personal gain rather than benefit to the community.

> -The proposed infill house is too large and exceeds guidelines. The infill house and associated parking will also take up most of the green space on the lot and since the proposed entrance is on the street rather than the alley, it will greatly affect the streetscape. Furthermore, it will affect the landscape and the character of this neighbourhood

> -There are multiple relaxations being sought such as floor space ratio and side yard setbacks which will again impact the neighbourhood

> -The proposed design of the infill house is not sympathetic to the character of the neighbourhood

> -This is not considered 'gentle densification' by the neighbourhood. However, there was some support for having a laneway house that meets current guidelines (max 958sf) and does not have a basement.

> -The required sun shadow study was not done

> -The designer of this project was questioned about the posted design materials and the survey design which was very flawed and she did state that she had never created a survey before. Any survey responses cannot be considered as accurate when the actual survey was flawed. This is not a new problem, however I would respectfully ask that for future development projects and surveys, that there is complete transparency about the project and that information presented in surveys etc includes all the relevant details so that residents can make a truly informed decision while completing surveys.

> -The process of soliciting resident feedback and then patently ignoring that feedback is problematic. It seems to be 'status quo' for this council to decide first and ask for feedback later, when the decision has already been made. It seems deceptive to ask for feedback that is not going to be considered since the decision has already been made.

> All in all, I think that it is important to acknowledge that there are significant issues with this application. In view of the circumstances, I cannot support this proposed development. Even though there have been some design changes based on feedback, I still feel that this proposal does not qualify as 'gentle densification'. I wanted to voice my concerns prior to the public hearing. Thank you for your consideration.

> Ronda Field

>