DATE: April 24, 2017
TO: Land Use and Planning Committee
FROM: Greg St. Louis, Acting Director of Planning and Development Services
SUBJECT: Imagine 2045 - Official Community Plan Review Progress Report 6

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Land Use and Planning Committee receive for information the corporate report dated April 24, 2017 from the Acting Director of Planning and Development Services, titled “Imagine 2045 – Official Community Plan Review Progress Report 6.”

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This report provides the Land Use and Planning Committee with an update on the Official Community Plan Review process. An Engagement Summary of Phase 4 is presented for information, with details of feedback received from the public at an open house and pop-up events and comments from various stakeholder groups. The draft OCP will be refined and finalized for consideration of adoption based upon input received.

BACKGROUND
The current Official Community Plan (Bylaw 1837) was adopted in 2008. Work commenced in 2015 on a comprehensive review of the OCP (Imagine 2045), with the process separated into four Phases as outlined in Figure 1. The following progress reports have been presented to Council:

- **Progress Report 1** (June 15, 2015): This report outlined the Community Engagement Program for the OCP Review. An informal advisory body to staff was recommended in the form of the OCP Working Group.

![Figure 1: OCP Review Process Chart](Figure 1: OCP Review Process Chart)
• **Progress Report 2** (July 27, 2015): This report provided the results of the Community Visioning Survey. Staff’s selection of the OCP Working Group members was also provided.

• **Progress Report 3** (November 23, 2015): This report summarized the community involvement in the OCP Review and presented a Vision and 13 Goal Statements for Council’s endorsement. Clarification was provided on population projections. Also provided was the revised list of members of the OCP Working Group together with a summary of meetings staff held with the Group.

• **Progress Report 4** (September 12, 2016): This report outlined the public engagement scheduled for Phase 3 of the OCP Review. It was noted that the consulting firm DIALOG Design had been retained to assist staff with the final phases of the OCP. A summary of the OCP Working Group meetings was provided and the members were acknowledged for their involvement in the process.

• **Progress Report 5** (January 16, 2017): This report introduced six guiding principles that would help shape the draft OCP. Also provided was a summary report for Phase 3 that included background analysis on existing conditions and trends and a summary of public engagement sessions held in Phase 3.

The first draft of the City’s new OCP was presented at a Land Use and Planning Committee meeting on March 6, 2017 to introduce the Plan to Council and the public. A report prepared by staff highlighted the documents that informed the OCP Review process, outlined the structure of the new draft, and summarized the key differences between the current OCP and the new draft OCP. The report also included a summary of the next steps in the OCP Review.

**ANALYSIS**

Staff hosted a series of public consultation events following the release of the draft OCP to gather feedback from the public. In addition to hosting a public open house and several pop-up events, staff met with City Committees and referred the draft Plan to various external agencies and groups for feedback.

**Public Open House**

A public open house was held on March 9, 2017, from 5:00-8:00pm at the Centennial Arena Hall. Key components of the draft OCP were presented on poster boards, and complete copies of the draft OCP were available for review. Approximately 65 people attended the event.

**Pop-Up Events**

In an attempt to reach as many members of the public as possible, pop-up events were held at various locations throughout the City between March 8 and April 1, 2017. The following is a list of all of the pop-up events that were put on by City staff:

• March 8, 4:30 p.m.to 8:00 p.m. – Centennial Arena
• March 10, 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. – White Rock Community Centre
• March 14, 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. – White Rock Library
• March 14, 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. – White Rock Community Centre
• March 28, 10:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m. – White Rock Community Centre
• March 30, 4:00 p.m.-8:00 p.m. – White Rock Community Centre
• April 1, 9:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m. – White Rock Community Centre
• April 1, 11:00 a.m.-3:00 p.m. – Memorial Park/White Rock Museum Plaza
**Stakeholder Meetings**

Meetings were scheduled between March 8 and April 5, 2017 to discuss the draft OCP with members of City Committees, with the intent of gathering feedback from various different perspectives. City staff met with the following Committees:

- Economic Investment Committee – March 8 and 29, 2017
- Cultural Advisory Committee – March 28, 2017
- Advisory Design Panel – April 4, 2017
- Environmental Advisory Committee – April 5, 2017

City staff also received a letter from the White Rock/South Surrey Healthy Community Steering Committee providing feedback on the draft OCP.

**External Referrals**

A copy of the draft OCP was forwarded to the following external agencies and groups for review and feedback:

- Metro Vancouver
- City of Surrey
- School District No. 36
- Semiahmoo First Nation
- Fraser Health Authority
- TransLink
- White Rock RCMP
- Ministry of Environment
- Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations
- Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
- Department of Fisheries and Oceans
- Transport Canada

City staff are still working with several external agencies and groups noted above to finalize their feedback on the draft OCP.

**Engagement Summary**

DIALOG, the consultants working with City staff on the OCP Review, have compiled the feedback received at the open house, the pop-up events, and the stakeholder meetings in an Engagement Summary. Comments from the external referrals have not been included in the Summary, as feedback from all groups and agencies has not yet been finalized. A copy of the Engagement Summary is attached as Appendix A.

**Potential Revisions to the Draft OCP**

The draft OCP will be revised in response to the information contained in the Engagement Summary as well as the feedback from external groups and agencies. The following is a list of
potential revisions to the draft OCP:

- Adjustments to heights and densities in areas around the Town Centre
- Clarification on the height transitions throughout the City
- Modifications to rental housing policies
- Additional policies regarding appropriate locations for duplexes and triplexes
- Expanded wording around green building requirements
- Inclusion of definitions for ‘secured market rental’ and ‘non-profit’ housing
- Additional policies regarding accessible and adaptable units

CONCLUSION

The City of White Rock is in the process of completing a comprehensive review of the Official Community Plan that will result in a renewed vision for the community and a regulatory framework to guide the growth and evolution of the city. An Engagement Summary of Phase 4 is presented for information, with details of feedback received from the public at an open house and pop-up events and comments from various stakeholder groups. The draft OCP will be refined and finalized for consideration of adoption based upon input received.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg St. Louis, P.Eng.
Acting Director of Planning and Development Services

Comments from the Chief Administrative Officer:

This corporate report is provided for information and serves as an opportunity for the Committee to provide feedback prior to staff bringing forward an Official Community Plan bylaw for Council’s consideration of first and second reading.

Dan Bottrill
Chief Administrative Officer

Appendix A: Engagement Summary for Draft OCP Review (Phase 4)
APPENDIX A

Engagement Summary for Draft OCP Review (Phase 4)
Introduction

PURPOSE

The City of White Rock is growing and changing. To help manage growth and shape development in White Rock, the City is updating its Official Community Plan (OCP). This new Plan is informed by important input provided by citizens throughout the process.

This engagement summary outlines input that was received in Phase 4 during review of the draft OCP in March and April 2017. Engagement activities included:

- A public open house,
- Eight mobile booths;
- Stakeholder discussions; and
- Electronic and other input (i.e. emails and letters).

Planning Process Diagram
Open House

OVERVIEW

The final public open house was held on Thursday March 9, 2017 from 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Centennial Arena Hall. The draft OCP was presented on interactive boards, which provided detailed information on the draft OCP as well as opportunities for participants to offer input. Complete copies of the draft OCP were also available at the open house. City staff and consultants attended to answer questions and track participant input.

Approximately 65 people attended. The input received is summarized on the following pages, and verbatim comments are included as appendix.

INPUT RECEIVED

Vision + Principles

Six comments were left on the board dealing with vision and principles. Comments indicate support for maintaining views, need for rental or subsidized housing, and sustainable transportation. There were also different views on how strictly the OCP should be followed.

Goals

Five comments were left on the board dealing with goals. Comments included: limiting high rises in Town Centre; maintaining trees, parks and green spaces; using the waterfront for heritage, arts and culture; and providing more specific definition of terms within the OCP.

Character

Three comments were left on the board dealing with character. Comments included: limiting towers within Town Centre and not pre-zoning for 10 - 20 years worth of development; protecting views from low-rise building and not just high rise buildings; and providing stronger regulatory control for character.

Growth Management

Five comments were left on the board dealing with growth management. Comments focused on density and included diverse perspectives, with some in support of greater densities (e.g., along North Bluff Road) and others wanting to see little to no growth outside of the Town Centre. There was also a desire to see the OCP process completed and strictly followed.

Land Use

17 comments were left on the board introducing land use. Comments included:

- Diverse perspectives on height and density overall, and specific areas noted for higher or lower density, including:
  - higher density (4 storeys) on North Bluff East;
  - single-detached on North Bluff east of Findlay and west of Oxford;
  - higher density on Everall Street;
  - no high density east of Findlay;
  - higher density on arterial routes;
  - no density increase east of 5 corners and
  - a general comment that the plan seems too low density.

- There were specific comments that the Star of the Sea as 6 storeys appears out of place and should only be 3 or 4 storeys.

- There is a desire to have annual reviews of the OCP and ensure strict adherence.

Land Use Plan (Map)

There were 8 comments received on this board. Comments included: the towers on Oxford do not fit with the proposed OCP or previous OCP, and the OCP should not allow for spot up zoning and should be strictly followed.
Land Use Policies (Board 1): Town Centre, Town Centre Transition, Lower
Town Centre

Participants indicated their level of support for land use policies by placing a
stickers in the columns of the table shown on the opposite page. In general, land
use policies for Town Centre, Town Centre Transition and Lower Town Centre
were supported, with the following qualifiers:

- There was a split between “support” and “non-support”/“support with
  changes” for:
  - 18 storeys in Town Centre Transition
  - Transitional heights and densities in Town Centre Transition
  - 8 storeys in Lower Town Centre

- Creating a welcoming edge along Johnston Road adjacent to White Rock
  elementary school was not supported (6, versus 3 for “support”/“strongly
  support”).

In addition to rating level of support, participants were invited to provide open-
ended comments. There were 14 comments received on this board including
diverse comments about density and height. Comments included:

- More residential density in Lower Town Centre
- More residential density along Johnston
- No development higher than six storeys outside of the Town Centre
- Some indicated preference for higher densities on Everall Street while others
disagreed
- More residential density along North Bluff Road
- The Star of the Sea is out of place at 6 storeys

Each Land Use area included diagrams illustrating the land use building typologies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Centre Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Type and Height – Allow multi-storey mixed use buildings, primarily mid rises and high rises, to a maximum of 25 storeys.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Allow mixed use (commercial and residential), multi-unit residential, and civic uses.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Densities and Heights – Concentrate the highest densities and heights in the areas bounded by North Bluff Road, Johnston Road, Russell Avenue, and George Street. Transition to lower heights to the south and west. Densities are also to transition down to the south and west.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Streets – Strengthen existing retail streets by requiring continuous street-facing commercial uses on Johnston Road, Street-Facing commercial uses are encouraged on North Bluff Road and on Thrift and Russell Avenues adjacent to Johnston Road and will be considered on George Street. Small-scale commercial uses may be appropriate in other areas of the Town Centre.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design – Enhance the built and public realms through policies identified in Section 9 and guidelines in the Town Centre Development Permit Area in Part D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Centre Transition Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Type and Height – Allow multi-storey residential buildings with heights up to 18 storeys.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Allow multi-unit residential uses. Allow commercial uses on George Street and adjacent to the hospital.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Densities and Heights – Allow the highest heights and densities adjacent to the Town Centre along North Bluff Road. Transition to lower heights to the east, west, and south. Densities are also to transition down to the south and west.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design – Enhance the built and public realms through guidelines included in the Multi-Family Development Permit Area in Part D. Focus on the establishment of a gateway between the Town Centre and Centennial Park, as per Sections 13 and 15.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Town Centre Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Type and Height – Allow multi-storey mixed use buildings and residential buildings to a maximum of 8 storeys.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Allow mixed use (commercial and residential), multi-unit residential, and civic uses.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Densities and Heights – Allow the highest densities and heights at Johnston Road and Thrift Avenue. Transition to lower heights to the east, west, and south. Densities are also to transition down to the east, west, and south.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Streets – Strengthen existing retail streets by requiring street-facing commercial uses on Johnston Road, and on Pacific Avenue from Johnston Road to Fir Street.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design – Enhance the built and public realms through guidelines included in the Lower Town Centre Development Permit Area in Part D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edges – Explore opportunities to create a welcoming edge along Johnston Road adjacent to White Rock Elementary School.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views – Strengthen the village and seaside character of the Lower Town Centre by optimizing views to the water from the public realm and as per the Lower Town Centre Development Permit Area guidelines in Part D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use Policies (Board 2): Urban Neighbourhood, North Bluff East and West; Mature Neighbourhoods, East Side Large Lot Infill

Participants indicated their level of support for land use policies by placing stickers in the columns of the table shown on the opposite page. In general, Urban Neighbourhood, Mature Neighbourhood and East Side Large Lot policies were supported.

There was a split between “support” and “do not support” for 3 storeys along North Bluff East and West. While East Side Large Lot Infill was generally supported, it should be noted that there were was some non-support along all policies related to this area.

In addition to rating levels of support, participants were invited to provide open-ended comments. There were 11 comments received on this board. While there were diverse comments about density and height, the majority of comments support higher density. Comments included:

- Higher density on:
  - North Bluff East and for mixed use buildings
  - Stayte Road near Thrift
  - Urban Neighbourhood
  - North Bluff West
- No buildings above 5 storeys outside of Town Centre and North Bluff Road
- Support for rental housing

Each Land Use area included diagrams illustrating the land use building typologies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Neighbourhood Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height and Type – Allow multi-storey residential buildings including low rise and townhouses. Heights must not exceed 4 storeys. On streets adjacent to Mature Neighbourhoods, a maximum of 3 storeys is encouraged.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Allow multi-unit residential uses.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design – Enhance the public and built realms as outlined in the Multi-Family Development Permit Area guidelines in Part D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Bluff East and West Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height and Type – Allow townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, and single-detached houses. Heights must not exceed 3 storeys.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Allow multi-unit and single-detached residential uses.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mature Neighbourhood Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height and Type – Allow single-detached houses, duplexes, and triplexes. Allow secondary suites in single-detached houses.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Allow single-detached and semi-detached residential uses.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Side Large Lot Infill Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height and Type – Allow mixed use buildings, townhouses, low-rise apartments, and single-detached dwellings. Heights must not exceed 6 storeys for mixed use buildings and 3 storeys for apartments and townhouses.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Allow townhouses, apartments, single-detached uses, and mixed-use buildings with a medical focus.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution – Allow semi-detached houses south of Russell Avenue on Finley Street, mixed use buildings with residential above medical uses on Finley Street between Russell Avenue and North Bluff Road, ground-oriented townhouses on Maple Street between Russell Avenue and North Bluff Road, and townhouses and low-rise apartments on North Bluff Road.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design – Enhance the public and built realms as outlined in the East Side Large Lot Infill Development Permit Area guidelines in Part D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use Policies (Board 3): Waterfront, Neighbourhood Commercial, Institutional and Utility, Open Space and Recreation Area, General

Participants indicated their level of support for land use policies by placing stickers in the columns of the table shown on the opposite page. In general, policies were supported or strongly supported. There was some diversity in perspective for neighbourhood commercial policies related to building height and type.

In addition to rating level of support, participants were invited to provide open-ended comments. There were 13 comments received on this board. Themes were related to the character, use and type of development, as well as height and density. Comments included:

- No “spot” zoning
- Desire for fibre optic connection to support home-based businesses
- Support for community amenity contributions for seniors and affordable family housing
- Desire for greater densities in the Town Centre to take advantage of views
- Move City Hall to Town Centre
- Amalgamate library with Surrey library
- Develop the land that City Hall currently occupies
- Improve Johnston Rd pedestrian realm and consider pedestrian-only areas

Each Land Use area included diagrams illustrating the land use building typologies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterfront Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height and Type – Allow mixed use and residential buildings with heights not exceeding 4 storeys.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Allow mixed use (commercial and residential), multi-unit residential uses, and single-unit residential uses.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Areas – Strengthen existing retail areas by requiring street-facing commercial uses on Marine Drive between Oxford Street and Forder Street, and between Village Street and Maple Street. Allow street-facing commercial uses elsewhere on Marine Drive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Housing – Require the ground floor of new residential buildings outside of existing retail areas to be designed as flex spaces for potential future use as retail or office space.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design – Enhance the built and public realms through policies identified in Section 10 of the Waterfront Development Permit Area in Part D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access – Strengthen access to the waterfront through strategies identified in Section 13 of the Neighbourhood Commercial Development Permit Area guidelines in Part D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Commercial Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height and Type – Allow 1-2 storey commercial buildings and multi-storey mixed use buildings. Heights must not exceed 2 storeys for commercial buildings. For mixed-use buildings, heights must not exceed 3 storeys except on North Bluff Road where heights may be up to 5 storeys.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Allow mixed use (residential and commercial) and commercial uses.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design – Enhance the built and public realms as outlined in the Neighbourhood Commercial Development Permit Area guidelines in Part D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional and Utility Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height and Type – Determine the scale and height of buildings based on compatibility with surrounding developments.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Allow institutional and utility uses, and mixed-use buildings (institutional, residential, and accessory commercial).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space and Recreation Area Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses – Provide for recreation areas and protected areas.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Policies</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Support with Changes</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Amenity Contribution – Require community amenity contributions in accordance with the City's Density Bonus/Amenity Contribution Policy.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-Based Businesses – Enable home-based businesses in neighbourhoods throughout the City.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care – Creatively encourage child care uses in areas with higher concentrations of housing, including in multi-family and mixed-use areas.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant and Under-Utilized Lands – Encourage the redevelopment of vacant lands and parking lots, particularly those on retail streets.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waterfront

There were 12 comments received on this board. Comments were focused on: specific uses and users; ideas for where to increase density; and support for public realm concepts.

Housing

There were 13 comments received on this board. A major theme was increasing density with some specific locations identified; however, a minority of comments were opposed to specific types of density. Affordable housing and rental housing were supported.

Environmental Management

There were 4 comments received on this board indicating support for stormwater management, community gardens, edible landscapes and park/tree protection.

Transportation and Mobility (2 Boards)

There were 10 comments received on these boards. Comments indicated support for policies but lack of clarity on implementation; concern about traffic noise; support for traffic control and enhanced pedestrian safety/experience; accommodating electric and self driving cars; and better managed parking.

Economic Development

There were 7 comments received on this board. Themes were support for incentives for business development such as fibre optics and worker housing; and retail-supportive densities. There were a couple comments about some (e.g. developers, businesses outside Marine Drive) benefiting from the OCP more than others.

Parks and Recreation

There were 7 comments received on this board. Comments focused on: quality of open space including reducing erosion; more natural character in plazas; increased tree preservation; and new child play and dog areas. There were also concerns that Council is not following the OCP.

Infrastructure

There were 6 comments received on this board. Themes included support for rainwater collection incentives; and ideas for improving drinking water source and capacity; and implementing undergrounding of utilities.

Arts, Culture, and Heritage

There was 1 comment received on this board, suggesting that students create a model of the future Town Centre and Waterfront areas.

Quality of Life

There were 3 comments received on this board. Comments included: a desire for a diversity and inclusion document and City Committees with diversity of age and gender; a desire for an OCP "implementation report card"; and a desire to amalgamate emergency services.
Mobile Booths

OVERVIEW

An interactive mobile booth was situated at eight pop-up events in four locations between March 8 and April 1, 2017. Locations were Centennial Arena, the Community Centre, the Library and the waterfront. Four information boards provided highlights of the OCP, including process background, vision, and goal statements; overall growth and urban form plan; land use plan; and other policy areas objectives. A fifth board captured input, inviting participants to leave comments.

INPUT RECEIVED

Topics receiving five or more comments are as follows:

Land Use — 64 comments were received about height, density, and zoning. The strongest themes relating to height included support for stepping down of heights in transition areas and generally; a desire for reducing heights and/or not permitting heights greater than 3-6 storeys south of Thrift Avenue; and questions about why Star of the Sea should be permitted to have greater height than in neighbouring areas.

The strongest themes for density included: a desire for increasing density along North Bluff Road near the hospital and concerns about the impact of increased density on infrastructure, and the impact of increased heights on character. There were also comments in support of greater densities in the Town Centre and elsewhere (e.g. to support housing choices).

The strongest theme for zoning included support for low rise multi-family homes along North Bluff Road.

Transportation and Mobility — 24 comments were received about transportation, with the strongest themes including: a need to consider congestion and parking shortages and related issues in residential and commercial areas; and ideas for people-moving systems such as trolleys and shuttles.

Waterfront — 22 comments were received about the waterfront, with the strongest themes including: a desire to maintain the current heights and scale of the area; a need to improve the safety and accessibility of pedestrian access of the waterfront; ideas for improving character and upkeep of businesses; and a desire to allow dogs on the promenade.

Parks and Recreation — 14 comments were received about parks and recreation, with the strongest themes including: a desire for more green space generally or specifically in higher-density locations; and ideas for recreational opportunities such as child play areas and Sandcastle Days.

Infrastructure — 11 comments were received about infrastructure, focusing mainly on ensuring that infrastructure can accommodate proposed growth, and on maintaining quality infrastructure for water and more.

Housing — 10 comments were received about housing, focusing on the need for affordable or rental housing.

Community Character — 9 comments were received about community character. Comments focused on the desire to maintain existing character — such as by reducing the scale of new development and enhancing heritage elements — and to support upkeep and enhancement of storefronts.

Environmental Management — 5 comments were received about environmental management, including concerns about rail transport of toxic materials, and water sustainability.

OCP Document — 30 comments were received about the OCP itself, including general feedback and the engagement process. The most dominant theme was a desire to see Council adhere to the OCP and to meaningfully incorporate the input of citizens.

Other — 14 other comments were received on the town centre, economic development, growth management, quality of life, and arts, culture, and heritage.

Verbatim comments are enclosed in the appendix.
Emails and Letters

OVERVIEW

Eighteen emails and letters were submitted offering input on the draft OCP.

INPUT RECEIVED

Comments included the following suggestions, recommendations, and other input:

- Allow greater densities (e.g., 4-6 storey mixed use) and affordable housing on a number of specific properties on North Bluff Road near the hospital (these property owners undertook a petition in support of this)
- Address the abrupt transition from 6 to 3 storeys proposed along the north-south Finlay/Maple Streets property lines between North Bluff Road and Russell Avenue, by allowing four storeys on the west side of Maple Street
- Add more density in uptown areas or more generally, including for rental and affordable housing
- Agree with public realm directions for Johnston Road
- Allow no high rises south of Thrift Avenue
- Support local Waterfront businesses through lower parking fees and allowing dog access on paved waterfront pathway
- Provide accessible connections (e.g., ramp) to East Beach area
- Add “light” commercial uses along Stayte Road
- Increase the pedestrian friendliness of Johnston Road, including traffic calming
- Capitalize on views throughout the city such as through mini-plazas, and include tourism maps and way-finding signs
- Focus on density in the Town Centre before making a decision about density in the Lower Town Centre
- Create incentives for waterfront business owners to maintain their properties
- Focus on design, including opportunities to create a sense of openness in streets and active uses (e.g., shops) in alley
- Attract a resort hotel in the uptown area
- Replace overhead wiring with underground wiring in order to improve views to the water
- Replace waterfront parking with programmable space, and implement a people moving system from the uptown to the beach

Stakeholder Meetings

OVERVIEW

Five stakeholders groups provided input into the draft OCP. Four groups provided input during meetings, and one group (White Rock / South Surrey Healthy Community Steering Committee) provided input via a letter.

INPUT RECEIVED

Input from each group is as follows:

Economic Investment Committee – Meetings held on March 8 and 29, 2017

Recommendations

- Promote the City as a place to live and work
- Develop a specific design theme for the Waterfront
- Focus on attracting additional ‘quality’ businesses
- Include in the OCP provision(s) to attract construction of hotel/condominium/convention centre
- Include in the OCP provision(s) to build more office/commercial space beyond ground level (second and third floor) within the Town Centre
- Include in the OCP provision(s) for live/work in the same building
- Direct staff to explore motorized people movement between the Town Centre and the Waterfront and East and West along Marine Drive
- Include in the OCP provision(s) that encourage healthy living options
- Direct staff to review previous work/study/analysis (2009-2011) in regard to moving City Hall to the Town Centre area
- Adopt within the City’s Design Guidelines and Vision encouragement of a West Coast Contemporary theme
- Direct staff to engage a design consultant to provide a concept design rendering or vision (West Coast Contemporary) for development within the City and to encourage current building owners within the Lower Town Centre to embrace the theme, and offer a City cost sharing program to help initiate revitalization of these existing buildings
- Include in the OCP provision(s) maintaining a flow of height transition from the Town Centre to the Lower Town Centre, not reliant only on density
- Include in the OCP provision(s) in regard to the proposed 2.5 FAR in the Lower Town Centre allowing for further consideration in regard to the FAR ensuring decisions can be made from an economically viable perspective
- Continue the Vision / Rendering with the West Coast Contemporary theme at the Waterfront
- Employ a trolley or golf cart service on a permanent basis May – September; with a graduated timeframe until school is out, for either a designated loop from the Town Centre to the Waterfront or just from East to West along the Waterfront.
- Support a year-long attraction at the beach that will be included for budgetary purposes within the City’s Community Amenity Contribution Policy
- Explore the possibility of having the Amtrak train stop in White Rock
- Form a Wayfinding Committee to develop a signage plan for the City of White Rock

Addition Discussion

- Consider requiring a ratio of commercial and office space in all towers in the Town Centre
- Look at ways to attract education and high tech sectors
- Consider upgrading lighting on the north/south stairs (‘Mill Walls’)
- Explore opportunities to improve connectivity to the Peace Arch Hospital
- Consider a greater focus on connectivity, healthy living, and wayfinding for pedestrians and motorists

Cultural Advisory Committee – Meeting held on March 28, 2017

- Explore opportunities to route through traffic (cars) away from Johnston Road and make Johnston Road more pedestrian friendly
- Encourage year-round events/activities across the City (not just on the Waterfront)
- Build plazas, view views for buskers, artists, etc. throughout the City (e.g., Johnston and Russell)
- Provide more parking in the Town Centre, and advertise free parking at Community Centre
- Create more spaces that are destinations, reasons to stop
- Explore opportunities for a gymnasium/auditorium multi-use space, or other space for performances
- Encourage a range of options for artists/performers, including studios and performance venues
- Improve wayfinding throughout the City for pedestrians and motorists
- Support large-scale festivals and outdoor fests
- Consider upgrading Five Corners as a venue for community events

Advisory Design Panel – Meeting held on April 4, 2017

- Encourage a higher standard for building, design, and creativity
- Focus on quality of materials, robustness, and response to environment/context
- Consider benefits to having a design theme (e.g., Town Centre doesn’t necessarily relate directly to the Ocean) – scale may be more important than a theme
- Reconsider the angle of containment along Marine Drive
- Incorporate more stringent environmental requirements for buildings
- Consider looking at arcades along commercial streets (to address local climate)
- Explore the possibility of developing a topographic model of the City that would allow new proposals to be viewed in context with existing buildings

Environmental Advisory Committee – Meeting held on April 5, 2017

- Clarify types of marine activities contemplated in Policy 10.4.2 (motorized)
- Look at requiring fire-resistant building materials for new buildings
- Include policies to help prevent light pollution and light spill
- Consider additional policies related to vertical gardens, green roofs, and pocket parks
- Encourage improved coordination with Surrey and Semiahmoo First Nation
- Consider adding additional language to the Environmental DPAs that will encourage the enhancement of these areas
- Ensure shadowing and view impacts are considered in the design of new buildings
- Consider including the railway on the maps/schedules

White Rock/South Surrey (WRSS) Healthy Community Steering Committee – Letter received April 2017

- Many of the OCP’s principles align with the goals of the WRSS Healthy Community Steering Committee’s Strategic Plan
- Consider placing an even greater importance on the health of citizens in the OCP
- Review all plans and studies listed in the implementation section with a “health in all policies” approach, with the ultimate goal being to improve the health of the population
- Consider utilizing a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) tool to evaluate the potential health-related outcomes of all planned activities
Open House Comments

Comments are organized by display board.

Note: If comments received 'votes' of support in the form of a sticky dot or check mark then the number in brackets following the comment indicates the number of votes plus the original comment.

Vision + Principles

1. Please maintain views from low rise (4 storey) buildings.
2. Very little rental or subsidized housing currently. Even basement rentals are very expensive.
3. You think you have a view from your high-rise until they put another one in front of you.
4. Include in transportation: aesthetically and environmentally efficient vehicles. Low Noise, low Pollution.
5. the OCP needs TEETH not just soft words as guidelines. Limit spot zoning amendments.
6. the OCP is not a bible. It is a concept vision. Visions evolve. OCP Amendments mean your plan is old.

Goals

1. High rise growth should occur from Town Centre out not outside towards TC
2. No expansion of park at expense of trees / greenspaces
3. Protection of parks and trails from erosion and degradation is very important
4. Goal #1: "Great" is a very loose term. Is it defined?
5. Goal #5: does the OCP intend to limit housing at the beach? Why not use waterfront for arts, culture, heritage too? (2)

Character

1. Contain the towers within Centre not pre-zone for 10 - 20 years more
2. protect views from low-rise building not just high rise buildings
3. Character needs more teeth qualification

Growth Management

1. Developer's dream this is not what the people of White Rock asked for! Only agreed to high growth in the Town Centre. We are already one of the most dense cities in the Lower Mainland.
2. OCP NEEDS TEETH & NOT JUST SOFT "Guidelines" LIMIT SPOT ZONING
3. WAITING FAR TOO LONG TO GET THIS GOING, WAITING TO SEE DEAL BUILDING GONE!
4. No to duplexes and triplexes in residential areas
5. Higher density on North Bluff arterials route 15400 - 15000

Land Use

1. Provisions to review yearly the following of this plan
2. Oxford Tower variance seems to be counter to this and the former plan!
3. Higher density on North Bluff East allowing a extra floor will over double the amount of residences on the same space and under ground parking and elevator over 3 storey townhouses with stairs. Condos are more affordable then townhouses.
4. We need teeth for the OCP
5. OCP should be firm so community and developers know what to expect.
7. Shocking! Pack 'em in!
8. Higher density on Everall Street
9. This sketch is already redundant - due to ill conceived high rise tower on Oxford (refers to East - West Section)
10. No Higher density east of Findlay
11. Current Council is already allowing structures in exact opposition to proposed plan
12. higher density on arterial routes 15400 - 16000
13. WHAT IS WITH THE 6 STOREY "STAR OF THE SEA"? LOOKS FISHY!!
14. I agree - why is Star of the Sea Church & Hall @ 6 storeys in an area of 3 & 4 storey buildings
15. This plan seems too low density
16. Height AND Density should be in town center for business to survive. Gives life to retail.
17. No Density increase east of 5 corners; Keep Star of the Sea + City Hall etc.

Land Use Plans

1. Have color zone map with height/density that's written on the map and get a 3 D version
2. STOP the OCP amendment UP zone & spot changes developers do
3. Please control the zeal for spot up zoning
4. Design standards not overly sterile Metrotown
5. Town Centre makes sense. Towers many blocks West of 12 - 24 floors are ridiculous and hypocritical.
6. OXFORD TOWERS APPEARS TO BE WAY OUT OF CONTEXT ACCORDING TO YOUR PLAN. PLEASE RECONSIDER FOR THE SAKE OF OUR COMMUNITY.
7. No OCP Amendments - make it mean something.

Land Use Policies (1)

1. 2045 VISION! This OCP is lacking in vision. The town centre should be 40 STOREYS. This is very rare land with views. Use the heights for views in exchange for parkland and ____ (illegible word)
2. Overall street needs higher density. There is enough park area on Everall to accommodate the density.
3. No thanks (in response to the previous comment).
4. Agree 2045 Vision using Johnston Road as a centre height and density should be across the street to five corners. 35 North Bluff and to 10 at five corners.
5. Why are some of lower town centre buildings less dense than they were 10 years ago under this OCP. Some of these properties have been downsized. Where the vision for future growth!!!
6. WHAT IS WITH THE ‘STAR OF THE SEA’ 6 STOREY EXCEPTION KIND OF LOOKS FISHY. CAN’T REMEMBER SEEING THE ‘BOOKEND’ CONCEPT BEFORE.
7. Do realistic transition high rises in downtown core and north bluff but outside of that area nothing higher than 5 floors
8. I THINK YOU NEED MORE RESIDENTIAL DENSITY TO SUPPORT THE RETAIL IN THE LOWER TOWN CENTRE.
9. I AGREE (in response to the previous statement).
11. Johnston Road offers commercial and residential and should be higher density than the apt bldg 1 block away.
12. lower town centre should have less height to allow concrete construction (above & stories) to avoid fire potential like five corners fire and have longevity for the future vision 2045.
13. “25” is a false number. If I have 14’ ceilings can I still have 25?

Land Use Policies (2)
1. White Rock needs higher density on North bluff East 4 + stories.
2. NEED MORE DENSITY AND MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING ON EAST OF PINLAY OPPORTUNITY HOSPITAL. WE NEED MULTIFAMILY office building.
3. North Bluff 6 stories and commercial.
4. Very low level changes from last OCP. Underwhelming.
5. Support for renting housing is definitely needed in WR.
6. More than 1.5 FSR.
7. Stayte Road near thrift needs more density last parcel left.
8. higher density on north bluff rd 15400-16000.
9. No buildings above 5 floors except for City Centre and North Bluff. Kil proposed Joyce Tower.
10. North Bluff E & W isn’t visionary. Need to go higher FSR too low.
11. Higher density on North Bluff 15400 - 15800, 6 - 8 stores

Land Use Policies (3)
1. No “spot” zoning please (2)
2. Stop ugly concrete towers!
3. Home based businesses would be more visible if they had fibre optic connection usable by all corners (sic), not just Telus.
4. How does a VILLAGE have 4 storey buildings?
5. Community amenity contributions would go to seniors or family affordable housing.
6. Explain not just buried in binder.
7. Town Centre.
8. Be honest about the boundaries concentrating towers, now spot zoned Findlay to Oxford HIGH.
9. The FSR in Town Centre should be 7.0 or more to go higher and capture the beautiful view. Need more density in Town Centre.
10. give teeth to “we’re not Langford”
11. Good idea to move City Hall to Town Centre. Get rid of the WR Library and amalgamate it with Surrey Library. Develop the land that City Hall currently occupies.
12. Kindly mix density gently flow e - w contained 3 floor town / 3 floor apt - 6 - 8 etc.
13. Johnston Rd is not very car friendly at present. Maybe it could become a pedestrian mall with only emergency vehicles allowed.

Waterfront
1. The view in white rock is real. We should allow to build 4 - 5 storey on Marine Drive.
2. easier access to beach. provide parking somewhere else and shuttle people.
3. Enable buildings of commercial space to have worker rental units above them and market units.
4. too expensive use electric buses or alternative (re moving sidewalks)
5. parking should be eliminated through winter months public do no want to pay for it.
6. allow dogs
7. massive amount of White Rock residents are dog owners. Access to the promenade massive amount of White Rock residents are dog owners. Access to the promenade for walking dogs should be allowed for at least 6 months of the year.
8. #4 increased rail traffic and horrible fencing has created a ‘dying’ beach area.
9. No dogs, that what dog parks are for.
10. Arterial roads s/b used to create higher density buildings not with the city centre.
11. support rail relocation.
12. Expand the pier to include restaurants amenities.

Housing
1. higher density on arterial road north bluff.
2. house prices are very high, the only way to get prices lower is to density. Higher density is higher supply of housing.
3. incentives $ & tax “Fed” come to integrate rental in new development. Be ready to encourage.
4. Current density of WR, sits on bubble of medium to high. Need to increase high density projects to help with affordability and grow tax base to pay for needs of community.
5. It is an established fact that more density has never lowered taxes.
6. higher density on arterial routes 6 - 8 storey on 15400 - 15800 North Bluff.
7. Integrate rental housing in condos as amenity v sculptures (sic).
8. *flier attached* - Invitation reminder to the Semiahmoo Peninsula Homeless Count
9. Is Oxford towers what the OCP is indicating? Consider
10. yes - elegant throws out key elements of plan (in response to previous comment)
11. Please no duplexes and triplexes in residential areas. No 2 suites her home (sic)
12. higher density along town centre (Johnston Road) we bring younger people and will offer affordability for them.
13. Do not allow a wall of towers and density on N.B. from Kent to Centennial

Environmental Management
1. Rainwater runoff - encourage residential storm after collection (see utilities comments) they do not have a shortage of water for lawns, gardens, car washing, etc.) just poor management of our rainwater
2. Larger/more community gardens
3. Plant edible everywhere
4. Protect centennial park green space and trees

Transportation and Mobility (1)
1. Policy statements nice - the implementation is ... hard to see/slow?
2. Traffic noise! Flow control!

Transportation and Mobility (2)
1. Buses are not always the answer!
2. #17 Yes! give us something unique and charming
3. Good for electric cars why don't they pay for a charging station
4. Parking what will be the effect of self driving cars? they should not need parking spots except at their home base. maybe we should be actively promoting them.
5. Less noise, less pollution, transport.
6. this example is great but if "residents only parking" is in place on the street - the laneway and garage is not use.
7. Traffic controlled Oxford is needed - speed kills!
8. Need pedestrian controlled crosswalk Oxford and Russell for pedestrian access to park

Economic Development
1. Helpful to give incentive for workers housing apts like Whistler 1st vs. sculptures and set backs
2. Is the OCP creating winners and losers? ie Marine Drive business closures?
3. Developers win! Residents lose (in response to previous comment)
4. Mobilize people who live here - show up, speak up, vote, shop local
5. High rises on 16th and commercial on lower 3 floors
6. Density on Johnston will lead to more "walkable" retail for owners - business will do better with more people
7. New Westminster and Coquitlam have installed fibre optic to all addresses to encourage high tech businesses to locate. Some of these may be home business startups that will grow. Telus is installing their own system but monopolies are not usually the best option.

Parks and Recreation
1. further erosion control needed for ravines
2. #11 Oxford Towers - hmmm - counter again!
3. Minimize the patio / stone style bare plazas permeable surfaces please natural planting
4. very upsetting council is not listening!
5. If the city cares about trees and parks then why allow the elegant, chemical plant and new wall that removes trees and green spaces
6. We need some nice playground for small children
7. need to develop new dog park with more grass and separate area for small dogs

Infrastructure
1. stormwater - some jurisdictions encourage rainwater collection (not just barrels) to relieve pressure on storm sewers during large rainfall events that could be encouraged by 1) paying us to install tanks (ie like Nanaimo) 2) eliminating the storm sewer tax for those who do 3) eliminating the minimum water bill and just charging for usage (ie Surrey) 4) encouraging home owners to use the collected rainwater for lawns, gardens and trees
2. why would people move to White Rock if they are aware of the inferior water source?
3. need to address the hard water from the wells which is terrible. Better idea to get water from same source as Surrey, GVRD.
4. Need to address water capacity. Aging infrastructure water treatment! Aging wells water capacity for ______ (illegible words)
5. What happened to our water supply? for as long as I remember we had the best water anywhere that all changed
6. Underground utilities when roads are rebuilt some neighborhoods do not want to pay for undergrounding. Could conduit be installed under the rebuilt streets at locations where the utilities will be installed when they do agree without having to dig up the streets again.

Arts, Culture, and Heritage
1. Have students make a model of our city a) town centre now - future b) waterfront now - future

Quality of life
1. Diversity and inclusion document and city have committees gender and age as well mix
2. a "report card" on the implement parts to follow progress and changes useful (website)
3. emergency agencies should be amalgamated it must be confusing when a call comes in and the person thinks they live in White Rock when they actually live in Surrey.

Pop-Up Event Comments

Community Character

1. Why do we not take into account a community’s vision and aspirations?
2. The character of the entrance to White Rock is being destroyed.
3. The city now has a general unkempt look and feel. It doesn’t seem like businesses are invested in the community. Store fronts are dirty, windows unwashed, empty lots are full of debris. An influx of even a few thousand people, as projections would have us anticipate will not necessarily increase a sense of civic pride, especially when it’s not there to start with. White Rock is not a big city and attempts to put up 23, 25 and even 18 storey buildings will do nothing to give it identity. We should decide who and what we are before inviting the world to move in. Make the town centre clean and user-friendly (sidewalks, cafes, one of a kind shops, definitely not thrift store) with benches and small doses of colour with year round garden or small clusters that would make it a pleasure to walk around year round.
4. Community character is important and I don’t think there is a character in White Rock. It’s rather hodge podge. Lots of buildings (commercial) are run down and reaching their life span. New developments should have character. Should encourage good landscaping setbacks, public spaces, plazas.
5. Redo some store fronts to look like older brick, stone heritage buildings. Paint each building different colours like some EU villages, or the Maritimes.

6. New brewery with tasting room, trendy shops, more public events, movie nights in the park, busking and arts.
7. Preserve what little heritage we have especially Elm St.
8. We’re well on the way to paving paradise – White rock is unique and worth preserving.
9. We live in WR since it is special! Keep it that way – different.

Growth Management

1. What is gentle residential growth? Very arbitration to mood of City Council?
2. My comment would be that White Rock is developing too fast. Will we even have enough water for all the people that want to move here?

Land Use

1. I think Everall St should allow 6 storey construction anywhere on the street because it can accommodate density.
2. Follow the transitions ie. No buildup like Elegant at 1454 Oxford. That should be 6-8 storey tower. No spot zoning.
3. Along Johnston at Thrift Rd, only 3 years ago I was told along with residents in saltaire that no more than 4 storeys were to be built below thrift.
4. Why the 6 storeys for Star of the Sea?
5. As per the last OCP and the draft OCP the 20 and 21 storeys on Oxford are out of character, disrespects the wishes of 99% of the residents.
6. Yes, step down heights!
7. Lower Town Centre buildings 5 storeys not 8.
8. Step down heights is great idea but not followed in practice. Should be legislated.
9. Landmark on Foster St. I think a lower height would be more in keeping with the existing 7 story condo on Foster St.
10. Maintain current elevations for new development on current existing properties. Preserve views for all current and future residents.
11. 3 storey limit. % of businesses building go to art in the city.
12. We need to keep tall buildings north of Thrift Ave.
13. Very concerned!! I purchased a condo in 2014 and was told by Townhall Council: no higher than 4 storeys would be built below Thrift and Johnston. My condo is in 1420 Johnston (Saltaire).
15. No towers south of Thrift: 6-4-3-2 only.
16. Feel Johnston south of Thrift should be urban neighbourhood – max 3 storeys.
17. 4 storey buildings south of Thrift between Vidal and close to Johnston will block the view from quite a few good 3 storey buildings.
18. South of Thrift, please reduce building height to 3.
19. Please keep height restrictions south of Thrift at Johnston to a maximum of 5 storeys and step down further on Johnston. No multi-storey high-rises.
20. Keep over 18 storeys in Martin, Thrift, George, 16th area. Outside this area 8 stories on Oxford, Thrift, Best. All the rest of 3 storey homes. 4 Storeys on waterfront absolute max.
21. Change in height of towers in uptown area of city – very disturbing. It destroys the neighbourhood of existing residents. Height should be capped at 15 floors. We are going to become the eyesore that Vancouver has become.
22. Construction south of Thrift should not be higher than 6 to 8 maximum height. If you want to keep a certain harmony to the town.
23. No high-rises south of Thrift Avenue. Up to 8 storeys between Thrift and Roper. 4 storeys further down.
24. I still believe we don’t need 12 storey buildings. Would create a block of high-rises in downtown area.
25. On Foster – Landmark building too high. Parking already an issue and will increase once it’s built.
26. How can you designate five corners area as a gateway and that gives you permission to increase the density of Star of the Sea site to 6-1 (?). The OCP was 3 storeys.
27. Good to keep highest buildings along North Bluff areas.
28. Star of the Sea land – why make it allowable for more height that areas across the street and beside it? Views, ambience for existing residents.
29. Should be 4 instead of 6 at five corner church.
30. Could be more of a transition east on North Bluff (i.e. 18-12-8-6-4 not 18-12-4-3-6).
31. Don’t understand design logic for 6 storey zone at Fir between Royal and Pacific. It will literally stand out like a sore thumb! Should be same height as adjacent buildings.
32. Some current development proposals asking for more height than proposed OCP land-use (e.g. Best at Roper, 1300 Block Johnston should be required to resubmit and comply).
33. 4 Storeys along Marine Drive too much. 3 storeys is appropriate.
34. 8 storeys in lower town too high. Keep more people oriented.
35. North Bluff West – this was explained as a “gentle transition” area with increased density through 3 storey townhouses. But there is nothing to transition to. Not in favour.
36. Higher density on North Bluff East close to hospital, highway access, Surrey to North, bus route, schools.
37. Suggest more intensity (density) to support South part of Town Centre and Lower Town Centre for two reasons: Encourage property owners to develop, instead of delaying their plans for many years in anticipation of a more growth-oriented OCP sometime in the future; avoid problem of future growth having to be absorbed outside of TC/LTC due to underdevelopment of TC/LTC in the meantime.
38. Densification along arterial route of North Bluff by hospital.
39. Higher density east of hospital along North Bluff. 6 storey to Kent Street. Is arterial route. Higher density required to pay for services (water, sewer, etc.)
40. I would like to see increased density on Everall Street. The street can handle high density and it has a big park area there and a wide road.
41. Higher density on North Bluff East, close to hospital.
42. Should have higher density east of hospital and along North Bluff. Could be rentals or smaller suites for seniors or hospital staff.
43. I encourage high density in the Everall neighbourhood as it can handle the higher density. Also a higher FAR would be acceptable.
44. South side of Thrift Ave between Oxford and Everall could be multi family. These are older homes on large lots and the majority of owners would support this. Thrift is busy and the only block left single family west of City Centre.
45. Great! Density is the way to go.
46. Keep density and height lower.
47. I encourage town centre density to increase from 5.4 to 7.0 – then reduce east and west along North Bluff to 4.0 at Oxford and Maple.
48. Very worried with more density in White Rock – water ability, hospital too small. Can’t cope now, so do not want this problem exacerbated.
49. Increase density with more duplex, triplex, fourplex for affordability (rental or owner).
50. Market condos and higher density on North Bluff East and surrounding area near the hospital.
51. The FAR formula will work as long as council doesn’t exceed those numbers all the time, most of the time, or repeatedly, (i.e. 2.5 goes to 2.7 or so, but not 3.0 to 3.5 or 4.5).
52. Personally I don’t think increased density has to mean high rises. White Rock has a limited area to develop traffic flow and congestion could be a huge issue.
53. It’s important when you increase density that you look at community amenities (schools, parks, community centres, hospitals, parking, traffic congestion is already and issue).
54. This council knows that the majority of White Rock home owners do not want high rises, sub-divided lots or large homes. We do not have the schools or parking for more people.
55. Please no more increase in density we are already having problems keeping up with infrastructure (water, hospital, parking).
56. Zone and maintain 4 storey multifamily buildings in areas close to waterfront (e.g. Victoria Avenue). Zone and maintain 3 storey multifamily building limits on streets abutting mature neighbourhoods.
57. North Bluff Rd West should have duplex and triplex.
58. Apartments close to hospital would be ideal!
59. Finlay St. Proposal makes sense and is needed mixed use across from hospital.
60. Saying that North Bluff can have duplex and triplex is great as long as the codes also change to allow it to happen. i.e. frontage rule needs to be amended for the properties along that corridor to allow them to be able to actually apply for building a triplex or at least applying for it.
61. North Bluff East and West would like to see more commercial on bottom residential on top.
62. North Bluff East should be designed to match the other side of the road, Surrey.
63. Monster houses in mature neighbourhoods should be capped. Infill with multiple dwellings not solid single family.
64. Good to keep mature homes as designated: just don’t keep allowing spot changes to zoning that don’t fall within OCP.

Town Centre
1. Johnston Road is signed as the major exit route out of White Rock in an emergency – God help us! The new plans (if I’m reading them correctly) appear to remain as a narrow bottleneck (really) – you should be ashamed.
2. Revitalize Johnson Road – option 3 will make me want to get away from this road. Too busy! Bad idea.

Waterfront
1. Keep existing height requirements for the waterfront instead of 4 storey maximum.
16. RE: Policy Area Objectives - Waterfront access not comfortable and convenient. Since tragic incident caused by one person's carelessness and inattention, access to shoreline and water is extremely difficult and restrictive, especially to people with chairs, coolers, and those with mobility issues.

17. Develop a theme for Marine Dr. Area.

18. Glad to see that there is a concentrated effort to address the demise of the waterfront. Buildings need to be upgraded. Primo is going to be a good addition to the waterfront. Suggestions for retail, convenience store, gift shop selling beach toys, Candy store selling candy/homemade fudge/cookies.

19. Pave a path on other side of tracks.


21. Dogs allowed on the promenade.

22. Allow dogs on promenade labour day to May long weekend.

Housing

1. Rental/Non rental at 15704 North Bluff (and 15724, 15728, 15738, 15748, 15758, 15770). 6 Storey arterial route.

2. Page 45 of Draft OCP include (15704, 15724, 15728, 15738, 15748, 15758, 15770) in potential affordable rental housing site. Figure 9.

3. Apartment rentals are in short supply in White Rock and are very much needed.

4. Affordable housing needed.

5. Affordable housing is definitely a necessity in White Rock!

6. Too many vacant condos only rich can afford – too bad.

7. On North Bluff close to hospital market condos or stacked townhouses for hospital staff or White Rock citizens looking to downsize.

8. Let's see laneway coach houses for infill.

9. Expand housing choices.

10. Increase low rental subsidized housing.

Environmental Management

1. I worry about the toxic materials that travel on the rail line. Safety is the issue.

2. Relocate the tracks. I don't care about coal dust or horns. I do care about all the toxic chemical tankards. If there was a spill, the water front would be ...

3. Bring the trees back to make the city beautiful again. Make a law to stop those who wants to cut down. Demand a hefty payment.

4. What are you doing re clean water and sewage?

5. Water Sustainability

Transportation + Mobility

1. Need more parking.

2. Be considerate of parking issues in both residential and commercial areas. Stop allowing developers to push for more units!

3. More sidewalks!

4. Parking – West Beach Garage Ok, but what about East Beach?

5. Parking concerns

6. Congested Roads

7. More sidewalks are needed in side streets as White Rock and South Surrey have a growing older population group.

8. Parking up-town with EV shuttles to and from Marine Drive.
9. As traffic on Johnston Rd. is already very busy, drivers are using Foster St. in increasing numbers and speed. I suggest taking speed limit within the city down to 30 or max 40 km/hr.
10. Parking! We are tourist dependent.
11. Bike racks at White Rock Beach. Maybe have 1 parking stall have a rack.
12. Solve the parking problem. Road use.
13. Happy to see parking moved underground/out of sight.
15. Needs to solve parking issues at beach.
16. Have Amtrak train stop here.
17. Bring back the tour trolley.
18. Provide Shuttle Service for people in the evening who are drinking.
20. More high rise = more traffic. Gridlock avoidance plan?
21. There is lots of parking uptown. Build a gondola to allow unique breathtaking views as tourists come to beach without cars. Get rid of rail tracks while at it.
22. Stop blaming parking. This is a scapegoat to avoid real action.
23. Gondolas from centennial arena to beach.

Economic Development
1. Please consider business success in new town centre as well as Marine Drive. Something needs to be done to enhance our City by the Sea - council please save White Rock!
2. Where will all of our small stores and services go?
3. Restaurants Marine Drive and Uptown.

4. Some newer businesses that I like The Blue Frog Studio, the Wooden Spoon. It's fun having thrift stores along Johnston - draws the thrifters from outside White Rock. The little home decor store in Saltaire, Islands, Laura's coffee shops.
5. Shops and restaurants open! Steveston is a great example.
6. Theme for commercial could be retro - IE 50's.
7. More businesses and less high rises.

Parks + Recreation
1. I wish that instead of four 4 storey buildings, there was one 16 storey building with green space covering the rest of the area. I believe we need more green space.
2. Would love to have a city park/plaza at North east corner of Russell and Johnston Rd. Especially since it will be 3 years before Bosa finishes other towers.
3. When will you have a new community center indoor courts etc?
4. More community gardens!
5. Need a Tree Height bylaw like we have for buildings.
6. There needs to be more green, park space with benches in downtown area.
7. Bring back sandcastle day.
8. Maintenance, OCP Amendments needed for city owned treed areas.
9. Bring back Sandcastle day.
11. Remove sideshows and put in a kids' amusement park.
12. More park space.
13. Parks on East Beach - All abilities park.
14. Roof top gardens you can see from the beach pier and promenade.
Infrastructure

1. Water infrastructure, water capacities, refresh rates for water, aquifer and well lifespan?
2. Water treatment plans? Plant locations? Delivery improvement? Will there be enough capacity?
3. Very important to make sure there is appropriate infrastructure everywhere.
4. Infrastructure needs to be addressed including but not limited to roads transport, water, schools and very importantly hospital services.
5. Too many towers planned without supporting infrastructure. Water supply is particularly worrisome. One fire caused major problems.
6. More direction on water infrastructure – OCP is mandated to stipulate statements on water capacity, water flow, and fire protection with increased density.
7. Roads?
8. City Planning should start with infrastructure and services – they cannot sustain the present growth of the town as it is. Water, public transport, medical, basic shopping etc. and Traffic and parking already crowded.
10. Peach Arch hospital bursting at the seams now, how will we have the care we need at 27,000 population in White Rock?
11. Fix our water supply.

Arts, Culture + Heritage

1. White Rock needs a top quality (aesthetically/acoustically) auditorium for musical presentations (such as Encore Concerts).
2. Before we build any parkade – which would only encourage more traffic and emissions, White Rock needs a top-notch auditorium for musical presentations. Badly needed!!
3. Organize evening and events.
4. Appeal to artisans to open galleries so there is a reason to come to the beach.

Quality of Life

1. More family friendly.

General Comments

1. If the OCP is followed properly then we can have a beautiful attractive place to live and work.
2. Defer development of OCP until we reach a memorandum of agreement with Semiahmoo Reserve (Treaty of Oregon) and attempt a concerted OCP that will include the ownership of forshore rights (similar to what Tsawwassen Tribe has done)
3. Generally an excellent plan, as long as council abides by it.
4. What is the architectural theme? Random?
5. Why do you want to make White Rock a mini Vancouver or Beijing with so many high-rises and pollution? Ridiculous what is happening!! It’s all about $$
6. The document itself is well done.
7. Do we know the occupancy rate of the current Bosa Towers? (Hollowed out)
8. It’s 2017 – hard to tell by much of our outdated and beat up ‘downtown’ core. Let’s catch up to the rest of the world.
9. The concept of transition is great. A good looking plan much like the original OCP. But superimpose all the proposed developments, for transparency, and let us all see – public, city staff, council – how the OCP looks versus what applicants would like to see.
10. Hopefully the mayor and council will read the OCP so they can make better decisions.
11. The city should pay attention to the recommendations of the OCP and planning dept.
12. Great job maintaining and developing a livable, walkable community. Look forward to more connections through the community.
13. When you make a community plan. Will you stick to it? Only White Rock residents to take part at development meetings.
14. When can we join Surrey?
15. Don’t like to sound like a complainer, but we could be so much better. Quality civic leadership is sadly lacking.
16. Give the new OCP some teeth by confirming these statements as firm but flexible within common sense (i.e. instead of 6 storeys maybe 8 would be okay, but not start with zoned for 3, or 4, or 6 then approve a 10, 15, or 24 storey development.
17. A lot of interesting ideas and vision if the city can stick to the plan.
18. Lived here 11 years, love it here.
19. Try to encourage developers to stay within OCP, less spot proposals that council approves (defeats OCP – a lot of dollars goes into developing OCP and residents want it followed -- PLEASE).
20. Vancouver eyesore.
22. Enforce bylaws - Dogs especially.
23. More kids.
24. Get a mayor who listens to the residents.
25. Room for growth is room for improvement.
26. Policy 11.2.1 duplication error.
27. Pg. 133 e and f almost identical why?
28. Growth Plan (Panel 2) northeast and corner of Russell and Finlay zoned for 6 stories, but Land Use (Panel 3) the same plot is designated East Side Large Lot Infill area. Which is it? The above plan shows 6 stories in this spot!
29. Like the concept for future height and density transition, but diagrams and maps don’t match land use – it’s misleading as land use map allows higher buildings. All in all quite a comprehensive thoughtful plan.
30. Growth plan and display does not match land use (i.e. 8 storeys in lower town centre is shown at 4 stories).
31. The accepted towers OCP exemptions must be included in the 2017 OCP to be honest and transparent.
32. Every year I find myself not wanting to show up at community meetings/OPC because most council hasn’t listened to even charrette feedback (5 years ago?) and new city employees don’t even realize it exists. Why waste our tax dollars and public time. As long as the coalition is in power ... and I’m all about towers moving.
33. The lack of “real” community consultation in the formulation of this OCP is astounding to say the least.