



November 14, 2016

Township of Langley
20338 65 Avenue
Langley, BC
V2Y 3J1

ATTN: Teresa Hansen

RE: CLARIFICATION OF STAFF REQUESTS WITHIN FILE REVIEW FOR HAP NO. 100845 DATED 2016/10/21

Dear Ms. Hanson,

I am in receipt of the file review for Heritage Alteration Permit No. 100845, dated October 21, 2016, regarding our boutique hotel proposal in Fort Langley at the corner of Glover Road and Mary Avenue. Thank you for that very extensive file review.

However, before we can complete a more detailed assessment of the file review, considering what revisions to undertake, I must initially request that you please clarify a few items. We require these clarifications to be able to proceed with a revised application.

Use:

1. You have asked me to confirm how the two live/work units proposed "fit within the existing Community Commercial C-2 Zoning" (1(a)). I do not know how we would do that beyond the floor plans and elevations we have already submitted. I do not know how to address this request to your satisfaction.

For the two units referenced, the ground level use proposed and shown is commercial, while the use shown directly above is residential, both of which are permitted within the zoning bylaw. If it is staff's opinion that units with these uses but with an internal staircase connection and labelled "Live/Work" are not permitted within the C-2 Zone, while the two individual uses in those locations are, please specifically clarify that for us. And, if so, please simply direct us to remove the units labelled "Live/Work" from the proposal, if that is your preference.

Site Design:

1. Staff have outlined that a rear lane through the middle of the site via a municipal standard lane TLR 13 to developed properties "is required" for our proposal to be "in keeping with the Fort Langley Community Plan and the established development pattern in Fort Langley", and that the lane "may not be covered" (2(a)).

Please explain why this request contains a reference to the Fort Langley Community Plan. I am unable to find any reference to this lane specifically, or any reference regarding the provision of lanes whatsoever, actually, within the Fort Langley Community Plan.

Instead, the Fort Langley Community Plan speaks at length about the priority of adding additional parking (FLCP 2.10), improving the quality of the pedestrian realm (FLCP 2.9), and providing additional community open space (FLCP 2.7.3). We have prioritized these stated objectives within our proposed design. In my opinion, staff's requirement of an optional TLR 13 rear lane is in conflict with these objectives at it regards this specific proposal.

2. Please explain why a rear lane is now considered by staff to be the "established development pattern." I do not understand the basis for this assertion.

A provision for a TLR 13 lane that already exists to 96th Avenue, and could have served to eventually remove the now permanent vehicle access on 96th Avenue and other properties to its west, was not required of the recently completed Fort Professional Building. Many lanes *actually* shown within the Fort Langley Community Plan of 1987 remain unconstructed. There has been no staff attempt (that I am aware of) to eventually provide for the provision of rear lanes within adjacent infill residential areas. And, as you must know, the Township of Langley has even recently chosen to dispose of land designated for road/lane construction on Church Street very near to our site and the Lily Terrace proposal, with the support of staff.

3. Please confirm that staff are aware that a TLR 13 lane or any other rear lane provisions for already developed properties to the south via the subject site is incompatible with the proposed boutique hotel. Conceding to this request would require the boutique hotel's removal from the proposal. Therefore, please explicitly confirm that staff are requiring that I remove the boutique hotel as a component of the application.

We are unable to construct a minimally-viable boutique hotel of only two small floors and a small quantity of rooms, significant ground floor lobby and courtyard access requirements, and expensive below-grade parking, if the hotel is to overlook a parkade entry ramp and unsightly service vehicle-orientated rear area (ruined), for the purposes of providing access for "garbage trucks" and other utility vehicles to other properties, without additional floors.

Instead of an unsightly rear lane and garbage collection area, we have proposed a "green roof" community open space integrated with a modest meeting room/ballroom for staging weddings, corporate retreats, artistic performances, and miscellaneous events and general use throughout the day. This new "courtyard plaza" within the commercial area for community and public use, with quality family and child friendly areas, is absolutely necessary for the successful operation of the boutique hotel. This design also serves to cover and hide a parkade entry ramp, grade level parking, and all other unsightly elements such as garbage and recycling from the guest experience, exactly where staff are now requiring a "rear lane" be placed.

Myself and hundreds of other members of the Fort Langley community consider this proposal to be an extraordinary, creative design with significant economic, unique, and intangible potential that a lane permanently destroys. I am sincerely surprised staff seem to be opposing such a

creative, innovative, mixed-use, and superbly walkable proposal, instead choosing to prioritize optional, vehicle-orientated objectives.

4. Please explain why the staff requirement for a TLR 13 rear lane was not outlined to me in an extensive pre-application meeting between myself, yourself, Stephen Richardson and Robert Knall on February 24th, 2016. Other significant requirements now within in the file review were outlined to me at that time. As you know, we have now proceeded at considerable expense and time (an additional 8 months) to submit an application incompatible with this new staff request.
5. Please confirm if staff have considered the possibility that a TLR 13 lane for adjacent properties, as apparently now contemplated for the very distant future (50+ years or more), is actually not required from the subject site of the boutique hotel proposal. Unlike a recent rezoning application that proposed to “land lock” a specific property, it is important to me that staff recognize that this is not occurring with this specific “double block” section of Fort Langley’s commercial area.

These other “adjacent” properties already have and can have sufficient access via other viable, established and perfectly acceptable long-term alternatives at a mid-block location within the Fort Mall (9110 Glover Road). This location is ideal: a perfectly suitable, established, logical mid-block lane access location option under the existing high-voltage BC Hydro transmission lines that prevent (re)development there, without residents directly opposite.

I have noted that the Lily Terrace development proposed for Francis Avenue and Church Street has apparently agreed to provide a form of access to the properties to its north because three would be “landlocked” otherwise (not the case with our proposal), and because it does not materially impact their site design.

Therefore, rear utility vehicle access *can* be provided in the future to all properties south of our boutique hotel proposal via access at Francis Avenue and the Fort Mall property as future (re)development proposals are presented, without the cost of the community’s boutique hotel. Please confirm if this possibility has been considered, and, if it has, why this reasonable option is unacceptable to staff.

6. Please clarify the reasoning of the terms of reference for the traffic impact study requested, which include the relocation of McBride Lane and/or Mary Avenue, signalization of Glover Road and Mary Avenue, and a jaywalking management plan.

It remains a complete mystery to me under what scenario the signalization and/or relocation of Mary Avenue and/or McBride Lane would ever be desirable or needed, or ever occur, due to a modest increase in height within existing zoning (~30%). Also, I do not recall this possibility being raised with the addition of 50+ new townhomes on McBride Street, with the recent completion of McBride Station. Please clarify how staff expect that an outcome of relocating existing roads is even remotely possible under any scenario other than expropriation.

7. Please confirm if staff have also required a traffic impact study of the Lily Terrace application located at Francis Avenue and Church Street, which has similar variance requests. If so, we would like a copy of that study for reference purposes. If not, please explain. As you know, Lily


Terrace is proposing similar access to its site via Francis Avenue, with an identical proximity to Glover Road, also at an (un-signalized) T intersection at Glover Road.

Again, thank you very much for your detailed review of our proposal to *finally* establish a boutique hotel within the commercial core of Fort Langley, while we continue to retain the village's low-rise character, adjacent to and within the vicinity of other buildings of similar height. It is exciting to consider its eventual contemplation by Council for possible approval to proceed with this long-awaited and eagerly anticipated next step of Fort Langley's amazing revitalization, for a boutique hotel in the centre of our village.

A boutique hotel has been a difficult balance to achieve economically, with some work in that regard still to be done. Many members of the public have participated in the process to select and refine this proposal, which has been a crucial component to arriving at this proposed design for a boutique hotel, the most significant request at our very first public consultation meeting on October 8th, 2015, by far. All of the input we have secured to date, including yours, has been welcome and extremely valuable to us.

Please respond to this request for these necessary clarifications within 30 days, if you can, by December 16th. It will take a significant amount of time to conduct additional public consultation and potentially initiate minor or significant revisions, as I am sure you can understand. I remain committed to involving all interested members of the public at each and every stage, keeping them well informed of our progress, which I know you encourage. I would like to proceed further as soon as we possibly can.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eric Woodward', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Eric Woodward
President

Cc: Ramin Seifi, General Manager, Engineering and Community Development, Township of Langley
Stephen Richardson, Director, Development Services, Township of Langley
Colin Hogan, Architect AIBC, Focus Architecture