

AGENDA

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Monday, July 27, 2015

7:00 p.m.

Committee Room, Municipal Hall

355 West Queens Road,

North Vancouver, BC

Council Members:

Mayor Richard Walton

Councillor Roger Bassam

Councillor Mathew Bond

Councillor Jim Hanson

Councillor Robin Hicks

Councillor Doug MacKay-Dunn

Councillor Lisa Muri



www.dnv.org

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

7:00 p.m.
Monday, July 27, 2015
Committee Room, Municipal Hall,
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver

AGENDA

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. July 27, 2015 Committee of the Whole Agenda

Recommendation:

THAT the agenda for the July 27, 2015 Committee of the Whole be adopted as circulated, including the addition of any items listed in the agenda addendum.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1. July 13, 2015 Committee of the Whole p. 7-10

Recommendation:

THAT the minutes of the July 13, 2015 Committee of the Whole meeting be adopted.

3. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

3.1. Workshop Discussion of Reunification Report p. 13-39 File No. 01.0470.20/001.001

Memo: General Manager, Corporate Services

3.2. Development Services Update and Early Input Opportunity p. 41-43 File No. 13.6410.01/000.000

Presentation: General Manager, Planning, Properties and Permits

3.3. Naming of the New Community Recreation Facility in Delbrook p. 45-48 File No. 13.6410.01/000.000

Memo: Deputy Municipal Clerk

4. PUBLIC INPUT

(maximum of ten minutes total)

5. RISE AND REPORT

Recommendation:

THAT the July 27, 2015 Committee of the Whole rise and report.

MINUTES

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

**DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Minutes of the Committee of the Whole Meeting of the Council for the District of North Vancouver held at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, July 13, 2015 in the Committee Room of the District Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, British Columbia.

Present: Acting Mayor J. Hanson
Councillor R. Bassam
Councillor M. Bond
Councillor R. Hicks
Councillor L. Muri

Absent: Mayor R. Walton
Councillor D. MacKay-Dunn

Staff: Mr. D. Stuart, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. B. Bydwell, General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits
Ms. C. Grant, General Manager – Corporate Services
Mr. D. Milburn, Deputy General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits
Mr. G. Houg, Manager – Facility Engineering
Ms. L. Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk
Ms. S. Dal Santo, Section Manager – Planning Policy
Ms. S. Dale, Confidential Council Clerk
Mr. R. Taylor, Planner
Mr. D. Veres, Planner

Also in

Attendance: Mr. Lance Berelowitz, Urban Forum Associates

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. July 13, 2015 Committee of the Whole Agenda

MOVED by Councillor MURI

SECONDED by Councillor BOND

THAT the agenda for the July 13, 2015 Committee of the Whole be adopted as circulated, including the addition of any items listed in the agenda addendum.

CARRIED

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1. June 22, 2015 Committee of the Whole

MOVED by Councillor MURI

SECONDED by Councillor BOND

THAT the minutes of the June 22, 2015 Committee of the Whole meeting be adopted.

CARRIED

With the consent of Council, Acting Mayor Hanson varied the agenda as follows:

3. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

3.2. Names for Lower Capilano Village Centre, Lower Lynn Town Centre and the new Community Recreation Facility in Delbrook

File No. 01.0380.20/074.000

MOVED by Councillor MURI

SECONDED by Councillor BASSAM

THAT it be recommended to Council:

THAT “Lions Gate” as the new name for the Lower Capilano Village Centre is endorsed.

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor MURI

SECONDED by Councillor HICKS

THAT it be recommended to Council:

THAT “Lynn Creek” as the new name for Lower Lynn Town Centre is endorsed.

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM

SECONDED by Councillor MURI

THAT the discussion regarding the naming of the new community recreation centre in Delbrook be referred to a Regular meeting of Council.

CARRIED

Opposed: Councillor BOND

3.1. Lower Lynn Town Centre Industrial Lands Strategy

File No. 13.6480.30/002.001

Ms. Sarah Dal Santo, Section Manager – Planning Policy, provided an overview of the preliminary findings of the Lower Lynn Town Centre Industrial Lands Strategy noting the role of this area and its relationship to the rest of the Town Centre. Ms. Dal Santo advised that through a series of stakeholder workshops with local business operators and land owners, the District was able to collect information on the key issues, opportunities and regulatory constraints for local business. Changes to the Zoning Bylaw would allow for more flexible zoning which would be beneficial to encourage business investment and expansion in this area.

Mr. Lance Berelowitz, Urban Forum Associates, advised that input received from the Lower Lynn Town Centre Branding Workshop and Lower Lynn Town Centre Industrial Lands Strategy Workshop helped to inform the analysis and findings of the Lower Lynn Industrial Lands Strategy.

Mr. Berelowitz highlighted the vision for the Lower Lynn Town Centre Industrial Lands as follows:

- Eclectic mix of smaller businesses;
- Encourage growth and strengthening of industrial businesses;
- Encourage full, innovative and adaptive use of existing buildings;
- Continue to encourage small lot sizes and business frontages;
- Support existing uses with appropriate zoning and licensing regulations; and,
- Create a pedestrian-friendly environment.

Mr. Berelowitz advised that feedback from the stakeholder sessions suggested the following opportunities for the subject industrial lands which include:

- Incubator area for new businesses;
- Affordable and flexible building stock;
- An emerging town centre will bring new demand for goods and services;
- Housing, transit and services for employees; and,
- Considering a range of complementary commercial retail and service uses.

Mr. Berelowitz noted that feedback from the stakeholder sessions suggested the following issues and constraints for the subject industrial lands:

- Limited parking;
- Traffic congestion;
- Infrastructure for pedestrian and cyclists;
- Outdoor patio regulations;
- Leasing unused building space;
- Complementary commercial and retail services; and,
- Potential increased taxes and lease rates.

Ms. Dal Santo highlighted the regulatory tools and support mechanisms as follows:

- Zoning Bylaw amendments: I3 (Light Industrial) or EZ-LI (Employment Zone – Industrial);
- Tax exemptions;
- Business improvement area;
- Pedestrian and cycling infrastructure;
- Design guidelines; and,
- Shared and/or public parking.

Ms. Dal Santo advised that next steps include:

- The review of zoning and other tools; and,
- Preparing the Zoning Bylaw amendments, and other strategies, for Council's review and consideration in the fall of 2015.

Council provided comments regarding Lower Lynn Town Centre Industrial Lands Strategy as follows:

- Commented that residential housing should not be included in an industrial area;
- Generally spoke in support of the proposed vision of the Lower Lynn Town Centre Industrial Strategy;

- Expressed concerns that beautifying the area could increase taxes to businesses;
- Opined that retail businesses should be kept outside the industrial land area;
- Commented on the importance of preserving employment opportunities;
- Opined that storage rental units are not a good use of this area;
- Commented that the current industrial area is busy and provides lots of services to the North Shore;
- Suggested that the industrial land area evolve naturally;
- Commented that weekends are quieter and may be opportunities for complementary uses; and,
- Commented on the potential of the area.

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor BASSAM
 THAT it be recommended to Council:

THAT the June 7, 2015 joint report of the Section Manager – Policy Planning and Policy Planner entitled Lower Lynn Town Centre Industrial Lands Strategy be received for information;

AND THAT staff be directed to proceed with preparing, for Council's consideration, new zoning regulations for the Lower Lynn Town Centre industrial area.

CARRIED

4. PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Corrie Kost:

- Commented that there previously were four gas stations in Edgemont Village and now there is just one as a result of change; and,
- Opined that industrial land areas should not be diluted.

5. RISE AND REPORT

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor BASSAM
 THAT the July 13, 2015 Committee of the Whole rise and report.

CARRIED
 (8:01 pm)

Mayor

Municipal Clerk

REPORTS

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



Memo

July 15, 2015
File: 01.0470.20/001.001

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Charlene Grant, General Manager, Corporate Services

SUBJECT: Workshop Discussion of Reunification Committee Report

This memo is to redistribute the October 6, 2014 report of the Reunification Committee for Council's further review and discussion at the Committee of the Whole meeting on July 27, 2015.

Summary

Following its presentation on October 6, Council resolved to bring the report of the North Shore Reunification Committee (the Committee) forward for additional discussion at a Council Workshop.

Council may recall that the mandate of the Committee was to determine the depth and breadth of analysis required to develop a fulsome understanding of the complexities of reunification of North Vancouver District and City. The Committee deliberated intensively over a six week period and developed a framework of issues related to reunification, along with the type of information required to address them. These issues were grouped into six categories:

- Governance
- Organization
- Financial
- Operational
- Planning and Regulatory
- Cultural

The report outlines subsets of issues and core questions within each of these categories.

With Council's receipt of the report, the Committee's mandate was fulfilled and determination of next steps became subject to Council's further deliberation and direction.

Since the presentation of October 6, 2014, the Committee's report was distributed to the City of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver. Discussion of reunification, and related issues, has continued among Council and staff through strategic and priority-setting activities. As a result, the 2015-2016 Corporate Services divisional workplan includes undertaking additional background research to address the identified issues and core questions, and funding for a research assistant has been included in the current budget.

Members of the North Shore Reunification Committee have been specifically invited to attend the July 27, 2015 Committee of the Whole meeting where Council may further examine the issues and questions identified through the Committee's work and consider areas of focus for the ongoing background research efforts.



CMG

Attachment: *North Shore Reunification Committee Report to Council*

North Shore Reunification Committee

Report to Council

In August, 2014 the District of North Vancouver Council created a Committee to examine the potential impacts of the reunification of the three North Shore municipalities, or a combination thereof. The Committee members deliberated extensively and shared thoughts, ideas, and observations around the notion of reunification.

The Committee developed a framework of issues and information required to address them. The issues were grouped into the following six broad categories:

Governance	In what ways would the North Shore community, operating as a combined municipality with a population of over 175,000 residents, change by having a single voice?
Organizational	How would the internal management structure change and how would public perception of it be impacted by a reunification?
Financial	Is it more cost effective to operate as one instead of three separate municipalities?
Operational	How compatible are business practices and operational standards?
Planning and Regulatory	How would the planning and regulatory considerations be dealt with in order to respect the varying characteristics of each municipality?
Cultural	All things considered, does the public in the three municipalities have an appetite for proceeding with further examination of reunification?

Within each of these categories the Committee has provided sub sets of issues and core questions, as well as noting the information required to examine them.

The Committee's mandate was to determine the depth and breadth of analysis required to develop a fulsome understanding of the complexities of reunification. This mandate has been fulfilled.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Murl, Chair

Table of Contents

Committee Composition.....	3
Purpose of the Committee	3
Committee Findings.....	4
Committee Conclusions	5
Framework of Issues and Information Requirements.....	5
GOVERNANCE CONSIDERATIONS	6
ORGANIZATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	7
FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS	9
OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS	11
PLANNING & REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS.....	12
CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS	13
Appendix 1: Expanded Examples of Information Required	14
GOVERNANCE INFORMATION	14
ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION.....	15
FINANCIAL INFORMATION	16
OPERATIONAL INFORMATION	19
PLANNING & REGULATORY INFORMATION.....	21
CULTURAL INFORMATION	23
Appendix 2: Resources.....	24

Committee Composition

The committee comprised of nine citizens with representation from each of the three municipalities. There is a wealth of land use and infrastructure planning, governance, management and amalgamation experience in the committee.

The appointed members are:

1. Mohammad Afsar
2. Bob Boase
3. James Boyd
4. Helen Goodland
5. John Hetherington
6. Greg Lee
7. Jeff Murl
8. Terri Rear
9. James Ridge

The Committee was supported by Graham Fane, contracted by the District of North Vancouver, who facilitated discussions and prepared drafts of the document.

Purpose of the Committee

As cited in the mandate for this committee, “The purpose of this committee will be to conduct a high level analysis of the approach that should be taken in arriving at a thorough understanding of the reunification issue.”

The committee will develop a framework which identifies the relevant factors that should be examined in order to fully assess reunification.

On completion of the work there will be a comprehensive framework for an analytical process that will guide a systematic and fulsome analysis of the proposition to reunify the City of North Vancouver, the District of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver back into a single North Shore municipality.

Committee Findings

The overarching finding of the committee is that any analysis of the impact of reunification should be conducted through a lens that focuses on changes to service levels and standards that might result from a reunification of municipalities.

During committee discussions it became clear that the following questions need to be addressed regarding service levels and standards.

1. Do all the municipalities offer the same types of service?
2. Will the operational costs of sustaining service levels reduce, increase or remain the same with reunification?
3. Are there some services that are offered in one municipality that are not in the others (e.g. energy, WIFI, etc.) that should be extended or discontinued and what are the potential benefits or costs to do so?
4. If there are differences in service levels, quality, and standards of delivery among the municipalities, how would reunification deal with this, i.e. bring services up to the best, articulate an average or leave the difference intact?
5. Are there philosophical or business practice differences between the municipalities in providing services that would be impacted by an reunification?
6. How would the planning and regulatory services be dealt with given the varying characteristics of each municipality?
7. Will an amalgamated municipality that would become the fifth largest in Metro Vancouver provide the North Shore with improved access to and relationship with other government entities?

During committee discussions it became clear that the following question also needs to be addressed regarding public support.

8. Given the above, will a well-informed community support continued investigation of reunification?

These questions were formulated after the basic framework had been developed. In other words, the committee brainstormed an exhaustive list of issues, sorted them into logical groups, discussed the characteristics that defined the groups, and then developed the overarching questions to be answered.

Committee Conclusions

1. The key questions for the individual citizen are:
 - Will my public services improve, deteriorate or stay the same?
 - Will reunification result in a property tax increase, decrease or will it stay the same?
 - Will the new municipality better serve citizen and community interests?

Our framework shows that factual information could be assembled to calculate most costs and benefits so as to give the public and officialdom a reasonably accurate objective assessment of reunification. However, there are also qualitative elements that all stakeholders will have to assess and draw their own conclusions.

2. Gathering the information on reunification is a simple task on some fronts, e.g. the services provided by each municipality, but a complex one on other fronts, e.g. what the new organization would look like and what would be the human resource implications? The conclusion here is that resources will have to be brought to bear in the form of municipal personnel put to the task and the contracting of consultants to undertake the more complex and potentially contentious issues.
3. If this exercise is to proceed it will be important to engage all citizens so that they can provide their perspective.
4. There is a need to assess the level of interest of all North Shore citizens whether they would value the benefits of reunification sufficiently highly to justify the cost of doing so.
5. Should there be a next phase of examination, there is value in forming a citizen led committee to oversee the examination process.

Framework of Issues and Information Requirements

The framework which follows gives no weight or ranking of the issues but further work may suggest a ranking or weighting. The “Information required” column contains a high level reference to the type of information which is needed to further examine an issue.

A more detailed description of the information requirements is presented in the appendix.

GOVERNANCE CONSIDERATIONS

In what ways would the North Shore community, operating as a combined municipality, change by having a single voice?

	CORE QUESTIONS OR ISSUES TO BE EXAMINED	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Scope & Vision	Would a reunification encourage a broader vision and scope than is currently the case in the three individual municipalities?	An analysis of whether and how a larger vision will result in more influence and better outcomes with neighbouring communities, relevant labour unions, greater Vancouver, the province and beyond.
Community Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be any change to existing community consultative processes? • Will there be any change to the ability of individual citizens to access elected officials, or senior staff? • Would this be an opportunity to rethink the engagement processes? • Would voter turnout change in an amalgamated municipality? 	There needs to be an understanding of the current processes (list of community engagement policies, committee structures, etc.) in each of the three municipalities for a comparison of similarities and differences along with an assessment of how these could or would change under reunification.
Resulting Governance Structure	What is the desired political structure of the amalgamated municipality and how would the existing structures be molded into a new structure?	Research needs to be done on the form and structure of a municipal governance structure for an entity of the proposed size and the proposed structure should be compared to existing structures. An analysis of other Canadian reunifications would be conducted for comparative purposes.
Relationship with other entities	Would the increase in size bring any change in the relationship with other governing entities?	Establish a liaison with other governing agencies (Metro Vancouver, neighbouring First Nations, etc.), to determine possible impacts on their service models.

ORGANIZATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

How would the internal management structure change and how would public perception of it be impacted by a reunification?

	CORE QUESTIONS OR ISSUES TO BE EXAMINED	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Organizational Process Review	Are there opportunities for improved organization as work is re-organized and streamlined? Perhaps best practices from the three can be knitted into one organization.	An exploration of existing business process including recent process reviews, with a view to discovering best practices. In addition we need to examine the portability of best practices to the new entity.
Organizational Culture	Is there is an opportunity to bring the best work cultures from the municipalities into the new organization?	An exploration of the current organizational culture in each of the three municipalities, and an assessment of the impact of reunification on those cultures, as well as an analysis of opportunities and challenges of bringing a new culture to the new entity.
Service Expectations of Our Communities	In each of our North Shore communities, taxpayers, citizens and passers-by have come to expect a level of service quality. The question to examine is whether or not a reunification would impact service quality, and perspectives on service quality	There are at least two distinct elements of service to our communities. 1) Citizens who use services to enhance or protect quality of life. 2) Developers and business people who rely on the city or district to enhance economic opportunity and stimulate business success. The information to be gathered would address the possible impact that unification would have on these groups and their perception of service quality.

	<p>Currently, the three municipalities work with external stakeholders. The question to address is whether or not an amalgamated entity would be more or less effective in working with Squamish nation, the Port, city of Vancouver, etc.?</p>	<p>Develop an understanding of any and all stakeholders, their formal or informal relationships and their level of satisfaction with current arrangements.</p>
<p>Expectations of external stakeholders</p>	<p>What will the impact be on the various non-profit agencies that operate on the North Shore? Any impact on their funding sources?</p>	<p>Need to discuss with the various non-profit agencies. (North Shore Community Resources Society, Family Services of the North Shore, North Shore Family Court and Youth Justice Committee, etc.) to determine the level of integration they have with the current three municipalities, and how that integration might change if there was an amalgamated entity.</p>

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Is it more cost effective to operate as one instead of three separate municipalities?

	CORE QUESTIONS OR ISSUES TO BE EXAMINED	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Commonly applied definition of service levels	In order to facilitate comparison between municipalities there needs to be common benchmarks that can be used to match costs to service levels	An inventory of current service levels and models for each municipality, an identification of those that are common, and those that are unique.
Operating Budget - Staffing	What will be the impact on number of management positions, staffing economies of scale, consolidation of service locations, etc., and will the impact result in cost savings?	An 'all in' analysis of staffing costs which identifies current total costs for each municipality, current costs related to a commonly applied definition of service levels, and a projection of what those costs would be under an amalgamated entity as well as current and projected costs for unique service models.
Operating Budget-unionized personnel	What will be the impact on the number of unionized personnel that may come with economies of scale, consolidation of services etc., and what is the status of current collective agreements?	An 'all in' analysis of the costs of unionized personnel, which identifies current total costs for each municipality, current costs related to a commonly applied definition of service levels, and a projection of what those costs would be under an amalgamated entity as well as current and projected costs for unique service models.
Operating Budget - Service levels/Models	What will be the impact on direct operating costs, economies of scale, consolidation of service locations, etc., and will the impact result in cost savings?	An 'all in' analysis of the costs of operating service levels (excluding staff and union personnel), which identifies current total costs for each municipality, current costs related to a commonly applied definition of service levels, and a projection of what those costs would be under an amalgamated entity as well as current and projected costs for unique service models.

Operating Budget - Overhead	What will be the impact on overhead costs, economies of scale, consolidation of service locations, etc., and will the impact result in cost savings?	An 'all in' analysis of overhead costs which includes total overhead (HR, IT, Finance, Corporate Planning etc.) for an amalgamated entity.
Capital Assets & Liabilities	How well matched are the capital structures of the organizations in terms of long term fixed assets and the liabilities associated with those assets?	A comparative analysis of capital assets and liabilities attached thereto as well as an analysis of redundancies or efficiency gains that could come from a reunification of capital assets.
Financial Assets & Liabilities	Would the reunification subject one party to unreasonable exposure to the unfunded liabilities of the other?	A comparative analysis of financial assets including a listing of all unfunded liabilities by municipality with the amounts attached.
One Time costs	There may be significant one-time costs associated with reunification, including management buyouts, systems harmonization, physical moves, and other one-time work.	A projection of all one-time costs attributable to each municipality, and to the new combined entity.
Taxation	Each municipality has a different tax rate for residential and business taxation. To the taxpayer there is the possibility that a reunification will alter their taxes in either a positive or negative way.	A comparative analysis of all classes of taxpayer in each of the three municipalities as well as a projection of the tax obligation of each class of taxpayer in an amalgamated entity.
Other Revenues	How well do the sources of other revenue match between organizations?	A comparative analysis including a listing of other current revenues (i.e. revenues not already included above) by category and amount for each municipality, as well as a projection of opportunities for revenues in a combined entity
Credit Rating & Borrowing Capacity	What is the current borrowing capacity of each municipality and how would total borrowing capacity be impacted by a combined entity?	A comparative analysis of each municipality's current leverage position and a projection of how that leverage position might be impacted through reunification

OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

How compatible are business practices and operational standards?

	CORE QUESTIONS OR ISSUES TO BE EXAMINED	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Infrastructure compatibility	The three municipalities have significant investments 'in ground' and above ground infrastructures. In order to experience efficiency gains or cost savings we must understand the degree to which infrastructures are or can be homogenized.	A comparative analysis of infrastructures including inventory and specifications of current infrastructure assets, an assessment of the degree of compatibility of those assets, and a projection of the impact on the management of those assets going forward as a combined entity.
Equipment Compatibility	How well do operational pieces fit together such as field equipment, software and other operating assets?	A comparative analysis of equipment including inventory lists of functional equipment by type, a statement as to their condition and whether mobile or fixed in place. (Can they be used by the new municipality in a new way)?
Asset Management	How compatible are the systems for asset management and how comparable are assets in terms of condition and maintenance history?	A comparative analysis of asset management practices by municipality, including an analysis of the degree of compatibility moving forward.
Shared Services	Some of the benefits of reunification have already been realized through shared service agreements. The question is whether or not reunification is necessary to realize savings and efficiency gains, or can those gains be realized through enhanced shared service agreements?	A comparative analysis of shared services includes a listing of all current shared service arrangements with description of the agreement, as well as an (best available practice); analysis of the potential for increased shared service arrangements going forward.

PLANNING & REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

How to deal with planning and regulatory considerations, respecting the uniqueness of each municipality while capitalizing on planning for an amalgamated municipality?

	CORE QUESTIONS OR ISSUES TO BE EXAMINED	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Land use & transportation planning	Currently, each of the three municipalities engage in land use and transportation planning independently of each other, although all function within the various regional planning frameworks. Reunification could create an environment of integrated planning for three diverse regions of the north shore.	A comparative analysis of the differences and the challenges of resolving issues such as pace of development, the value of development as a means to support public amenity investment, pace and scope of response to climate change, tolerance for innovation, etc. between the three municipalities.
Regulation and bylaws	Are there benefits in consolidating regulations and bylaws, harmonizing business licensing for cross-jurisdiction businesses?	A comparative review of building by-laws and history of interpretations for each municipality, including an analysis of the similarities, differences, and possibly conflicting by-laws currently in existence.
Risk Management	What are the differences in risk exposure and risk tolerance and how might those differences affect risk management? What complexities will arise if we try to develop a unified North Shore risk management strategy?	A comparative analysis of risk and hazard management programs that are unique to each municipality, programs that are currently shared by all three, and programs that would change or be created under an amalgamated approach going forward.
Ecosystem services	Are there benefits expanding and harmonizing the valuation of ecosystem services?	Ecosystem services have been evaluated by CNV but not DNV and DWV. The CNV study should be brought forward for evaluation.

CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

All things considered, does the public in the three municipalities have an appetite for proceeding with further examination of reunification?

	CORE QUESTIONS OR ISSUES TO BE EXAMINED	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Community Characteristics	<p>Does each municipality have its own identity?</p> <p>Would reunification change the culture of the new community?</p> <p>Is it important to preserve distinct municipal characteristics?</p> <p>Is each community willing to make the investment of time and money to continue the dialogue towards unification?</p>	<p>A thorough and complete representation of views from each municipality, gathered from a variety of means to ensure there has been an open and encouraging dialogue about the issues.</p>

Appendix 1: Expanded Examples of Information Required

These are not exhaustive lists of required information. They are starting points in the search for relevant information.

GOVERNANCE INFORMATION

	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Scope & Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current scope and vision statements from each of the municipalities in order to evaluate the compatibility of the three • An assessment of the prospect of creating a single vision and scope that builds on the three municipalities while incorporating the implications of a larger entity.
Community Engagement	<p>“There needs to be an understanding of the current processes (list of community engagement policies, committees’ structure, etc.) in each of the three municipalities for a comparison of similarities and differences.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • list of community engagement policies, committees’ structure, etc.
Resulting Governance Structure	<p>“Research needs to be done on the form and structure of a municipal governance structure for an entity of the proposed size and the proposed structure should be compared to existing structures.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the options (wards, at-large, etc.)? • What is the optimal Council size? • What are the implications for managing the school system? • Are there additional municipal legal responsibilities that come from an increase in size (population or geographical)?
Relationship with other entities	<p>“Establish a liaison with other governing agencies (Metro Vancouver, neighbouring First Nations, etc.), to determine possible impacts on their service models.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro Vancouver, • Province of BC, • North and West Vancouver School Districts, Neighbouring First Nations, etc.)?

ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION

	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Organizational Process Review	<p>“An exploration of existing work processes including recent process reviews, with a view to discovering best practices. In addition we need to examine the portability of best practices to the new entity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business process reviews • Existing business process/procedures
Organizational Culture	<p>“An exploration of the current organizational culture in each of the three municipalities, and an assessment of the impact of reunification on those cultures, as well as an analysis of opportunities and challenges of bringing a new culture to the new entity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural assessment surveys, employee satisfaction, etc.
Service Expectations of our Communities	<p>There are at least two distinct elements of service to our communities.</p> <p>3) Citizens who use services to enhance or protect quality of life.</p> <p>4) Developers and business people who rely on the city or district to enhance economic opportunity and stimulate business success.</p> <p>The information to be gathered would address the possible impact that unification would have on these groups and their perception of service quality.</p>
Expectations of external stakeholders	<p>“There is a need to establish a liaison with the various non-profit agencies (North Shore Community Resources Society, Family Services of the North Shore, North Shore Family Court and Youth Justice Committee, etc.) to determine the level of integration they have with the current three municipalities, and how that integration might change if there was an amalgamated entity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreements, MOUs, etc. • Develop a list of any and all stakeholders • Are there current commitments in terms of services, projects, programs or other initiatives?

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Commonly applied definition of service levels and models	<p>“An inventory of current service levels and models for each municipality, an identification of those that are common, and those that are unique.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inventory (and benchmarking exercise) that includes: Service definition and description, Service Level, Service Objectives and influencing conditions (e.g. Access, demographics and economic conditions).
Operating Budget - Staffing	<p>“An ‘all in’ analysis of staffing costs which identifies current total costs for each municipality, current costs related to a commonly applied definition of service levels, and a projection of what those costs would be under an amalgamated entity as well as current and projected costs for unique service models.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of positions in each municipality, • Remuneration and termination costs, • Attrition/retirement estimates • Estimates of positions needed in combined entity • An accurate projection of staff costs, with and without reunification going forward. • Comparison across entities to allow for new benchmark
Operating Budget- Collective Agreements	<p>“An ‘all in’ analysis of the costs of unionized personnel, which identifies current total costs for each municipality, current costs related to a commonly applied definition of service levels, and a projection of what those costs would be under an amalgamated entity as well as current and projected costs for unique service models.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A listing of all collective agreements and their termination dates • -Financial commitment for current contracts • Flexibility in Contracts for terminations/reorganization • Stakeholder listing – Unions involved
Operating Budget - Service levels/Models	<p>“An ‘all in’ analysis of the costs of operating service levels (excluding staff and union personnel), which identifies current total costs for each municipality, current costs related to a commonly applied definition of service levels, and a projection of what those costs would be under an amalgamated entity as well as current and projected costs for unique service models.” i.e. Services provided in only one municipality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing and description of all services provided by municipality highlighting any different services and different service levels • Cost of differential for service levels not found in all municipalities

<p>Operating Budget - Overhead</p>	<p>“An ‘all in’ analysis of overhead costs which includes total overhead (HR, IT, Finance, Corporate Planning etc.) for an amalgamated entity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing and description of all Major Overhead costs provided by municipalities highlighting any differences, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Administration (support within a service area) ○ Corporate (HR, Finance, IT, Corp Planning) ○ Facility (space allocations) ○ Fleet (managed centrally) ○ Project Technical Services (supporting project planning, design and implementation) • Cost savings from removing duplicates • more detailed financials and reconciliation of line items to allow for comparison
<p>Capital Assets & Liabilities</p>	<p>“A comparative analysis of capital assets and liabilities attached thereto as well as an analysis of redundancies or efficiency gains that could come from a reunification of capital assets.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of fixed assets, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ current value, ○ any debt owed on the assets and ○ replacement date • Comparison of Capital asset budgets • Pro Forma combined capital Budget
<p>Financial Assets & Liabilities</p>	<p>“A comparative analysis of financial assets including a listing of all unfunded liabilities by municipality with the amounts attached.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of all unfunded liabilities by municipality with the amounts attached. • List of all non-capital assets, including reserves. • Listing of all Financial assets at FMV (Fair Market Value) • Reconciliation of unmatched financial line items due to differences in accounting practice
<p>One Time costs</p>	<p>“A projection of all one-time costs attributable to each municipality, and to the new combined entity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of all one-time costs showing calculation of the cost by municipality. • A projection of one-time costs to be incurred by the new entity.
<p>Taxation</p>	<p>“A comparative analysis of all classes of taxpayer in each of the three municipalities as well as a projection of the tax obligation of each class of taxpayer in an amalgamated entity.”</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of the tax revenues by category for each municipality • Comparison of Tax rate for each zone, tax base for each zone • scenario analysis for various methods of combining and reconciling the differences • Are the tax bases different? • How are the different tax bases in each municipality changing? • What are the multipliers/tax rates for each class in each municipality?
Other Revenues	<p>“A listing and comparative analysis of other current revenue by category and amount for each municipality, as well as a projection Opportunities for revenue in combined entity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of other revenue by category and amount for each municipality • Opportunities for revenue in combined entity, • impact of opportunities not used in other municipalities
Credit Rating & Borrowing Capacity	<p>“A comparative analysis of each municipality’s current leverage position and a projection of how that position might be impacted through reunification.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial valuation of impact of different credit rating on Borrowing level, interest costs and PV (Present Value) for each municipality • Different borrowing types and limits, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MFA (Municipal Financing Authority debt, ○ Letters of Credit, ○ non-bank borrowing (e.g. vendor) • An analysis of credit rating and borrowing capacity of an amalgamated entity.

OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Infrastructure compatibility	<p>“A comparative analysis of infrastructures including inventory and specifications of current infrastructure assets, an assessment of the degree of compatibility of those assets, and a projection of the impact on the management of those assets going forward as a combined entity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing reports about and differences in the municipalities’ deferred maintenance requirements • Differences in existing long term plans for future projects development, i.e. need, location, cost estimates • Differences in the definition of infrastructure and what it includes / does not include? • Differences in the design, investment, operational policies, practices and accomplishments related to public infrastructure that have to be addressed, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ water pressure, ○ system and component maintenance schedules, etc.
Equipment Compatibility	<p>“A comparative analysis of equipment including inventory lists of functional equipment by type, a statement as to their condition and whether mobile or fixed in place (can they be used by the new municipality in a new way?).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory lists of functional equipment including specifications • A report on potential aspects of incompatibility relating to equipment, software licensing, etc. • Statement of condition for all classes of equipment • Location and potential mobility of all classes of equipment
Asset Management	<p>“A comparative analysis of asset management practices by municipality, including an analysis of the degree of compatibility moving forward.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of asset management policy and practice by municipality highlighting any differences • An assessment of the need for and complexity of achieving a uniform approach going forward.

<p>Shared Services</p>	<p>“A listing and comparative analysis of shared services of all current shared service arrangements with description of the agreement, as well as an (best available practice), analysis of the potential for increased shared service arrangements going forward.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of all current shared service arrangements with description of the agreement • An analysis of how existing shared service arrangements might be impacted by a reunification? • An analysis of potential opportunities for shared services coming from existing service models for each municipality. • An analysis of how shared services are currently, or could be extended to neighbours (such as the Squamish nation, the port etc.)
------------------------	--

PLANNING & REGULATORY INFORMATION

	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Land use & transportation planning	<p>“A comparative analysis of the differences and the challenges of resolving issues such as pace of development, the value of development as a means to support public amenity investment, acceptance of climate change, tolerance for innovation, etc. among the three municipalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Shore (NS) development maps and projected growth studies (e.g. City of North Vancouver (CNV) 100 year plan, University of British Columbia (UBC) 4m people study, etc.). • Comparisons & review of regional, provincial and national commitments (signatory to climate goals, etc.), Official Community Plan zoning policies, development bylaws, planning and development strategies and projects. Review of Metro Vancouver regional growth strategy, affordable housing targets, transportation plans • Memberships in city “clubs” such as C40, ICLEE, etc. and commitments implied from such memberships. • Review of NS transportation and ridership studies (CNV transportation study - 85% of Single Occupancy Vehicle journeys within the north shore). • Review of building stock – age, type, use, etc. • Map of distribution of demographics and aging – Brooks & Associates GIS map of age of homeowners in Edgemont /Delbrook, etc. • Surveys of development industry: Urban Development Institute, National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, Canadian Home Builders Association • Comparison of total annual development and building permit revenues and costs and as % of total revenues • List of citizens’ commissions and advisory boards and their terms of reference • Extent and impacts of sea-level rise and other natural hazards. • Comparison of development cost charges (DCCs) and total cost of development (NAIOP survey) <p>Comparison of funding strategies for community amenities and other capital investments (e.g. how to evaluate the fact that the users of recreation centres are in CNV but DNV has the land and therefore pays for them). CNV builds amenities into residential development projects, DNV & DWV do not.</p>

Regulation and bylaws	<p>“A comparative review of building by-laws and history of interpretations for each municipality, including an analysis of the similarities, differences, and possibly conflicting by-laws currently in existence.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of building by-laws and history of interpretations. • Review of fees and processes • Number of experts (such as green building, social housing, healthcare liaisons, etc.)
Risk Management	<p>“A comparative analysis of risk and hazard management programs that are unique to each municipality, programs that are currently shared by all three, and programs that would change or be created under an amalgamated approach going forward.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of all insurance policies coverage, deductibles, etc. for limits, type of coverage and any self-insurance programs • Review all other risk and hazard management programs
Ecosystem services	<p>Ecosystem services have not been evaluated by DNV and DWV.</p> <p>RE. CNV study http://www2.cnv.org/CityShaping/papers/Discussion%20Paper%20-%20Sustaining%20Our%20Natural%20Capital.pdf</p>

CULTURAL INFORMATION

	INFORMATION REQUIRED
Community Characteristics	<p>“A thorough and complete representation of views from each municipality, gathered from a variety of means to ensure there has been an open and encouraging dialogue about the issues.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demographic analyses required for each of the municipalities• An assessment of ethnic diversity in the North Shore communities Input from the communities – survey, town hall meetings, community gatherings.• Any past surveys done?• Input from the various neighborhoods and communities.• List of arts and cultural services offered in each of the municipalities.

Appendix 2: Resources

- Terms of Reference
- DNV 2013 Annual Report
- CNV 2013 Annual Report
- DWV 2013 Annual Report
- Comparison Data for 2012
- Too Big, Yet Too Small The Mixed Legacy of the Montreal and Toronto Amalgamation (2014)
- Merging Municipalities is Bigger Better (2013)
- Quantifying the Costs and Benefits to HRM, Residents and the Environment of Alternate Growth Scenarios Final Report (2013)
- Bibliography of Rescaling and Regional Cooperation (2010)
- St. John's Amalgamation Review (2011)
- Inter-Municipal Collaboration Through Forced Amalgamation A Summary of Recent Experiences in Toronto & Montreal (2007)
- Are Services Delivered More Efficiently After Municipal Amalgamation (2005)
- Citizen Satisfaction with Municipal Amalgamation (2005)
- Why Municipal Amalgamation Halifax, Toronto, Montreal (2003)
- The Financial Implications of Amalgamations The Case of the City of Toronto (2001)
- Local Government Amalgamations Discredited Nineteenth-Century Ideals Alive in the Twenty-First (2001)
- Transitional Impacts of Municipal Consolidations (2000)
- Amalgamation vs. Inter-Municipal Cooperation Financing Local and Infrastructure Services (2000)
- Municipal Consolidations in the 1990s An Analysis of Five Canadian Municipalities
- Reducing Costs by Consolidating Municipalities New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Ontario (1996)
- North Vancouver City and District The Amalgamation Issue (1987)
- Staff Amalgamation Study Committee Report on Joint Services of the City and District of North Vancouver (CNV DNV 1977)
- Amalgamation Correspondence (1974-1983)
- Amalgamation Correspondence (1969-1971)
- Amalgamation Brochures (CNV DNV 1968)
- Proposed Amalgamation Agreement (CNV DNV 1968)
- Staff Amalgamation Study Committee Report on Facilities (CNV DNV 1968)
- Staff Amalgamation Study Committee Report on Finances (CNV DNV 1968)
- A Statement on Amalgamation (DNV CNV 1968)
- North Shore Amalgamation Study Committee Final Report and Recommendations (DNV 1966)

- Integration of the City of North Vancouver and The District of North Vancouver An Economic Analysis (CNV 1966)
- A Perspective on Amalgamation (CNV 1966)
- City Hall Study Preliminary Report on Space Requirements (CNV 1965)
- City Hall Report (CNV 1965)
- Amalgamation Study (CNV DNV DWV 1963)
- Amalgamation of CNV and DWV Fire Departments (DNV 1960)
- Saskatchewan Ministry of Government Relations A Guide to Voluntary Municipal Restructuring (2008)
- BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs Managing Changes to Local Government Structure in British Columbia A Review and Program Guide (2000)
- CNV Restructure Report to Council (2014)

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



3.2

Memo

July 17, 2015

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Brian Bydwell, General Manager, Planning, Properties & Permits

SUBJECT: Development Services Update and Early Input Opportunity

At the Committee of the Whole on July 27, 2015, staff will provide a midyear update on building permit and development application statistics and trends. Staff will also present, for Council's early input, the preliminary application received for the Best Western /Comfort Inn site in Lions Gate (**Attachment A**).

Brian Bydwell GM Planning Permits and Properties

The following summary was provided to Council by email on April 3, 2015:

Preliminary Application - Best Western Comfort Inn (Lower Capilano Marine Village): This is a preliminary planning application for redevelopment of the two hotel sites on the east side of Capilano Road immediately north of the Petro Canada Station, see an air photo below. The Lower Capilano Marine Village Implementation Plan supports an OCP amendment for this site if hotel rooms can be provided. The proposal is for a 10 storey full service hotel with 170 rooms, 33 rental units and a 22 storey strata residential building with 246 units and underground parking. A new extension of Curling Road will be constructed through the site to join Curling west of Capilano Road with McGuire Avenue in compliance with the transportation planning for Lower Capilano Marine Village. The images below include an air photo, site layout, renderings from Capilano and a connectivity plan showing bike, bus and pedestrian routes. The applicant intends to hold an early public input meeting on April 23. This is an application where staff will seek early council input in accordance with the direction provided at the pace of development agenda item on February 16th.





THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



Memo

July 14, 2015
File: 01.0380.20/074.000

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Linda Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk

SUBJECT: Names for the New Community Recreation Facility in Delbrook

At the July 13, 2015 Committee of the Whole meeting Council recommended that the following resolutions be brought forward to Council for approval:

THAT "Lions Gate" as the new name for the Lower Capilano Center is endorsed.

AND THAT "Lynn Creek" as the new name for Lower Lynn Town Centre is endorsed.

As consensus was not reached regarding the name for the new community recreation centre Council recommended:

THAT the discussion regarding the naming of the new community recreation centre in Delbrook be referred to a Regular meeting of Council.

Linda Brick
Deputy Municipal Clerk

Attached:
Staff Report dated July 6, 2015

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



Memo

July 6, 2015
File: 01.0380.20/074

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Karen Rendek, Community Planner, Chair of the Place Naming Committee

SUBJECT: Names for Lower Capilano Village Centre, Lower Lynn Town Centre and the new Community Recreation Facility in Delbrook

Council has previously considered new names for Lower Capilano Village Centre, the new community recreation centre in Delbrook and Lower Lynn Town Centre. While Council has expressed a preference for Lions Gate to replace Lower Capilano Village Town Centre, decisions are needed for the other two as well as formal motions for all three.

It is recommended that Council endorse:

1. "Lions Gate" as the new name for the Lower Capilano Village Centre;
2. "Delbrook Community Recreation Centre" as the name for the new community recreation centre in Delbrook; and
3. "Lynn Creek" as the new name for Lower Lynn Town Centre.

New Community Recreation Centre

While the new community recreation centre is scheduled to open in the Fall of 2016, ongoing public communications regarding the status of the project and need for signage on the site has elevated naming of this facility to high priority.

The Naming Selection Criteria and Procedures Corporate Policy offers the following community facility specific selection criteria to guide the naming of a new community facility:

- reflect geographic location (e.g. well-known street, natural feature, neighbourhood);
- reflect or share the name of an adjacent park;
- commemorate an historic event or event of cultural significance;
- help create an identity appropriate to public communications and marketing as well as civic and community goals;

SUBJECT:

Names for Lower Capilano Village Centre, Lower Lynn Town Centre and the new Community Recreation Facility in Delbrook

Page 2

- reflect user programs and services as a secondary naming consideration; and
- generally avoid the use of honourific names.

In applying both the general and community facility specific naming selection criteria, the Place Naming Committee considered and evaluated a number of different names for this new community recreation facility including Queens, Edgemont, Mosquito Creek and Delbrook. "William Griffin" was excluded given that redevelopment permits an opportunity to find a new name that is not an honourific name. While all four names are consistent with the policy, the Place Naming Committee supported Delbrook. Council has been split between Mosquito Creek and Delbrook.

Recommendation:

That Council endorse "Delbrook Community Recreation Centre" as the name for the new community recreation centre in Delbrook.

Lower Lynn Town Centre

Staff need to complete planning work, centres branding and the new District web site's neighbourhood pages.

The Naming Selection Criteria and Procedures Corporate Policy offer the following place naming specific selection criteria:

- take cues from the local, geographic, historical, social or cultural context;
- have a strong positive connection to the local community;
- consider the emerging identity and character for town and village centres; and
- contribute to the establishment of community identity and sense of place.

In applying both the general and specific place naming selection criteria, as well as community and stakeholder input the Place Naming Committee recommended the name "Bridge District". Council has not supported "Bridge District" and instead suggested the name should reflect a geographic or historic reference such as Seylynn, Seven Bridges or Lynn Creek.

Recommendation:

That Council endorse "Lynn Creek" as the new name for Lower Lynn Town Centre.

Following the selection of a new name, District staff will notify relevant public utility organizations, government agencies, emergency responders, internal departments (for updates to databases and GeoWEB), Google Maps, and other groups as needed, of this change. Updates to various plans and/or bylaws may also be needed, as appropriate.