

To: [External-Clerks](#)
Cc:
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on the 102 Seventh Avenue development project
Date: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 6:32:57 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.

To the Mayor and Council, the Chief Administrative Officer and the Director of Development Services

Regarding the application for 102 Seventh Avenue – The HRA proposes retention of the 1941 heritage house with rental secondary suite and construction of a new stratified infill duplex.

For over 45 years, my spouse and I have lived in and raised a family in New Westminster – the first and only home we have owned! It is on First Street in the Glenbrooke North neighbourhood very near the proposed development at 102 Seventh Avenue. Our home is one of those “1920-30's bungalow boom homes” referred to in the developers ‘HCP Maddock House [statement of significance](#)’, as a “*neighbourhood house design likely copied from house plan catalogues.*”

I wish to state that I do not support this project.

The densification proposed is **excessive**; please only allow **gentle or moderate density**.

The proposed duplex building design does not fit in with the surrounding homes and neighbourhood character.

Please consider the following:

There is minimal benefit to the Tudor heritage house proposed revitalization.

- The Tudor house south side will have three significant original wooden framed windows removed then boarded over and covered with stucco, making it less attractive, devalues its heritage asset and reducing the natural lighting to the building interior.
- The Tudor house is losing the entire south face streetscape view because the developer wants to build a duplex building within 4 feet of the Tudor building, leaving no meaningful street view of the Tudor building south face and making it visually unacceptable overall. You will then have a building that has 25% of its exterior visibility missing. That is not heritage preservation!

- The requested rear yard setback relaxation from 12.8 feet to 2.9 feet is unacceptable. This places the Tudor building too close to the property line and the adjacent proposed duplex building, reducing the aesthetic value and functionality for access and maintenance. The Tudor building lot will remain RT-1 zoning. The relaxations request is for is a **50% floor space ratio increase** and **77% decrease to rear yard setback!**

The rezoning for a duplex on such a small lot is unacceptable.

- The developer is asking for excessive re-zoning and variance relaxations for a duplex on a small lot with very high setback and floor space ratio requests. The subdivided lot for the duplex is RT-1 zoning. The relaxations request is for is a **52% floor space ratio increase** and **80% decrease to side yard setback!**
- The proposed duplex design looks out of place and distracting: it is positioned too close to the existing Tudor style building. Please see the city policy wording: The Duplex, Triplex and Quadraplex: Interim Development Review Policy, states that design considerations **do have expectations for the size, shape, and placement of buildings to help them fit in the neighbourhood. The setbacks and height of the proposed duplex have been designed with consideration of the adjacent heritage properties. For example, the massing is located at the centre of the site, improving the transition to the adjacent properties. Landscaping will also contribute to the streetscape and neighbourhood context.** The duplex building looks like a Townhouse, it is not designed as a contemporary and understated interpretation of Tudor revival period (p.6), and is poorly placed on the small lot.
- The proposed duplex property will have a lane accessed, 4 car parking lot positioned up against the featureless wall of the duplex building south face. The 4 car parking lot and the city waste and recycle bin storage area will take up 79% of the width of the lot. The view from First Street at the lane will be unsightly and aesthetically unpleasant.
- There is very little green space on this duplex property. If this is truly a Family-Friendly Housing design, where will the children play outdoors? I understand that the City of New Westminster Family-Friendly Housing Policy (July 2016), does not address outdoor play space for children, like other Metro Vancouver municipalities do, although the city document does shows 7 photos of children play areas in the 16 page brochure.

Regards,

Michael MacDonald

First Street New Westminster B.C.