

**DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**Click on icon to view the complete Council Meeting** 

REPORT of the Public Hearing held in the Council Chamber of the District Municipal Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, B.C. on Tuesday, November 6, 2012 commencing at 7:02 p.m.

**Present:** Mayor R. Walton  
Councillor R. Hicks  
Councillor M. Little  
Councillor D. Mackay-Dunn  
Councillor L. Muri  
Councillor A. Nixon

**Absent:** Councillor R. Bassam

**Staff:** Mr. D. Stuart, Chief Administrative Officer  
Mr. B. Bydwell, General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits  
Mr. B. Dwyer, Manager – Development Services  
Mr. J. Gordon, Manager – Administrative Services  
Mr. R. Malcolm, Manager, Real Estate and Properties  
Ms. E. Geddes, Section Manager – Transportation  
Ms. J. Paton, Section Manager – Development Planning  
Mr. M. Hartford, Planner  
Mr. B. Dunsford, Confidential Council Clerk

---

**Bylaw 7955 The District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1286**

**Purpose:** Bylaw 7955 will amend the existing high density, mixed use zoning for 'Seylynn Village,' the property north of Fern and east of Mountain Highway.

**Bylaw 7957 Phased Development Agreement (Seylynn Village) Bylaw 7957, 2012**

**Purpose:** Bylaw 7957 will authorize the Mayor and Municipal Clerk to execute and deliver a Phased Development Agreement with Seylynn (North Shore) Properties Corp. (Inc. BC0920285) in the form attached as Schedule A to Bylaw 7957.

---

**1. OPENING BY THE MAYOR**

Mayor Walton welcomed everyone and advised that the purpose of the Public Hearing is to receive input from the community on the proposed Bylaws as outlined in the notice of Public Hearing. He also informed those in attendance of the procedural rules that will be followed.

**2. INTRODUCTION OF BYLAWS BY CLERK**

Mr. James Gordon, Municipal Clerk, introduced the proposed Bylaws.

**3. PRESENTATION BY STAFF**

Presentation: Michael Hartford, Planner, and Erica Geddes, Section Manager –Transportation.

Mr. Michael Hartford, Planner, began by stating that due to increased certainty around the nature of the development proposed, a number of changes to the Bylaw and legal package have been possible. The proposed zoning has been simplified, and the affordable rental housing component of the project is proposed to be built rather than being a project requiring the future participation of a non-profit housing partner.

Staff provided the following information points in regard to the Bylaws and legal package:

- Development covenant is a manual for development that will note the items to be resolved prior to construction;
- Development covenant is intended to give certainty to the development commitment; and,
- Development guidelines regulate aspects of the project that are not fully addressed in the District's Official Community Plan (OCP) Development Permit guidelines.

Staff identified the Seylynn Village site as consisting of 5.7 acres north of Fern Street, east of Mountain Highway and south of the Trans Canada Highway.

Staff advised that Council approved the original rezoning Bylaws for the site in Fall 2009, no Development Permit has been issued to date and that Lynmour Grocery is now part of the site on the west side.

Staff advised that the Lower Lynn Town Centre was designated with the adoption of the OCP and that property within the Town Centre is designated for mixed residential and commercial uses at an average floor space ratio (FSR) of up to 3.5. Implementation planning for the town centre is currently in progress and the proposed development has been reviewed for compliance with the OCP. Staff advised that the proposed development has a gross FSR of approximately 3.32.

Staff advised that the currently approved site plan for the project allows for:

- 620 market dwelling units in eight buildings in a mix of low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise buildings;
- Approximately 43 000 square feet of commercial space;
- A District parcel of slightly more than half an acre would accommodate seventy future affordable rental units in a low-rise building; and,
- Potential for approximately ten additional dwelling units and 10 000 square feet of project floor area on the convenience store property.

Staff advised that the Seylynn Village development as currently proposed consists of:

- An amended site plan with the proposed Keith Road extension along the north side of the property;
- A narrowed Fern Street as a cul-de-sac at the south side;
- Three high rise buildings of twenty-four, twenty-eight and thirty-two storeys;
- Commercial space reduction to 11 000 square feet with the remaining 32 000 square feet of commercial space reconfigured as residential units; and,
- Seventy affordable rental units constructed in a six storey building.

Staff advised that Bylaw 7955 would create a new Comprehensive Development zone called CD67.

Staff advised that the British Columbia Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure has reviewed Rezoning Bylaw 7955 and that further consultation will take place with the Ministry on road and intersection design issues.

In regard to the Phased Development Agreement, Bylaw 7957, staff provided the following points for information:

- Agreement secures the amenity provisions in the development and confirms the site's development potential for a ten year period;
- Bylaw 7957 repeals the previous Phased Development Agreement Bylaw for the site;
- Agreement sets out timing and commitment for features such as the Lynmour Connector Trail, on-site child care, green building features and the need for a District Energy connection.

Staff referred to digital renderings of the proposed development and summarized community benefits by highlighting the following points:

- \$2.5 million toward neighbourhood improvements;
- Connector trails to the north and south;
- Construction of a seventy unit affordable rental housing building;
- Child-care space of 2500 square feet;
- Public art;
- Adaptable housing features;
- Five car share vehicles;
- District Energy connectivity; and,
- Offsite servicing upgrades.

In regard to rental housing staff noted that:

- Original rezoning provided a parcel to the District for future construction of affordable rental housing;
- Current development incorporates the District parcel into the development and constructs the seventy affordable rental units in a six-storey building;
- The District would attain ownership of the airspace parcel that contains the rental building and associated parking; and,
- Operation of the rental housing, including rents and the framework for rent adjustments, would be specified in the lease of the airspace parcel to the building owner.

Staff compared the development potential of the project as approved to currently proposed, noting that the proposed development equates to an increase of ninety units total and approximately 46 000 square feet of project floor area.

Staff addressed the change in building heights stating that the smaller proposed floorplates combined with smaller developable area and fewer buildings results in the proposed buildings having greater height. Staff also noted that, while taller, the slimmer buildings proposed should assist with reducing shadow impacts and allowing for views between them.

Ms. Erica Geddes, Section Manager – Transportation, took the floor and outlined the benefits of the new Keith Road extension which is proposed as an East-West connection in the area as follows:

- Implemented sooner and at a lower cost than other options;
- Allows Fern Street to change to a local street;
- Gives direction to replacement of existing Keith Road Bridge; and,
- Improves connectivity through this area.

Staff advised that the intent is that transportation network changes in this area support Lower Lynn's OCP objectives for multi-modal transportation including walking, cycling, transit, and private vehicles.

Staff highlighted the results of a traffic study advising that under the currently approved zoning it is estimated that two hundred fifty vehicles would be added to afternoon peak hour volumes at Mountain Highway key intersections by 2016. Based on the same criteria and timeframe, the proposed development is estimated to add two hundred twenty vehicles.

Staff outlined parking details under the new proposal advising that a total of 938 spaces would serve the development.

Staff advised that a construction traffic management plan is currently under development and that need is recognized for both Seylynn Village and Keith Road construction to take place with the least possible disruption. Staff clarified that Fern Street is to remain in use until the Keith Road extension is open.

#### **4. PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT**

Presentation: Seylynn (North Shore) Properties Corporation

The applicants thanked staff for providing a detailed overview of the proposed development and drew attention to the following points:

- This development will include a fully constructed affordable rental building rather than just a spot for these units to be built later;
- Improvements will be made to the pedestrian and bicycle connections to the development;
- All of the roofs will be green roofs or roof terraces;
- Development offers several sustainable features such as on site storm water management, low water plumbing, use of local and recycled building materials and District Energy connectivity;
- Two levels of underground parking will be constructed; and,
- An at grade bicycle storage unit will be available for resident use.

To display skyline impact, the applicants referred to photos taken from several surrounding locations that displayed the proposed buildings super imposed into the photos.

The applicants detailed the result of a sunlight shadowing analysis.

In terms of landscaping, the applicants advised that the overall landscape concept is based on three North Shore themes: (1) Industrial history of the North Shore; (2) Making connections to nature; (3) Outdoor lifestyle. In keeping with these themes the development will feature:

- Heavy timber benches and other timber features;
- Natural outcrops;
- Green roof sites throughout; and,
- A landscaped berm.

The applicants referenced digital renderings displaying proposed landscape features and other form and character elements.

## **5. REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

### **5.1 Ms. Leslie Myers, 1174 Shavington Street**

**OPPOSED**

- Expressed concern over height of proposed towers;
- Commented that residents on Shavington Street have not been adequately consulted; and,
- Would like to see single-family homes or smaller multi-family developments on site.

### **5.2 Mr. Glenn Mason, 1174 Shavington Street**

**OPPOSED**

- Questioned whether the new units would be affordable for area residents; and,
- Urged council to represent citizens and use the site to put in something that is agreeable to area residents.

### **5.3 Ms. Nachiko Yokota, 1108 Strathaven Drive**

**OPPOSED**

- Questioned whether higher density developments will make the District more affordable to live in;
- Commented that the added traffic near the entrance of the Iron Workers Memorial Bridge is unacceptable and asked that more traffic planning be done; and,
- Urged council to make the site a low density family living development.

### **5.4 Ms. Liz Barnett, 3158 Mountain Highway**

**IN FAVOUR**

- Advised that she works with individuals who have a disability and commended the developers for the accessibility aspects of the proposed development; and,
- Supports the development of more affordable living units on the North Shore.

### **5.5 Mr. Garry Haensgen, 2270 Hyannis Drive**

**OPPOSED**

- Expressed concern over height of proposed towers; and,
- Requested that eighteen storeys be set as the absolute limit for building height in the District.

### **5.6 Mr. William Huva, 3970 Hixon Place**

**OPPOSED**

- Commented that proposed development is not in line with the spirit of the OCP even though it may be in line with language; and,
- Expressed concern about transportation issues in the Seymour River area, commenting that traffic congestion is already a major problem.

### **5.7 Jeffrey Anderson, 1586 Hunter Street**

**IN FAVOUR**

- Grew up in North Vancouver and works near the proposed development;
- Would love to live in the proposed development; and,
- Supports more developments that are affordable for young people.

### **5.8 Mr. Nick Hedley, 3355 Upton Road**

**OPPOSED**

- Expressed concerns that the development will exacerbate existing emergency response problems to the surrounding area;
- Concerned about the negative impact on views for residents in the area and the impact of shadows cast by the buildings; and,
- Unhappy with the way information was delivered in regards to the development.

- 5.9 Mr. Michael Antone, 476 Chief Jimmy Drive** **OPPOSED**
- Expressed concern that development will result in loss of character;
  - Concerned about impact on schools and safety with more residents and traffic in the area; and,
  - Does not see the benefit to the community and believes the development is too much and too big for North Vancouver.
- 5.10 Ms. Sandra Edelman, 4565 Prime Place** **COMMENTING**
- Commented that affordability and the availability of social housing are important; and,
  - Commented that healthy communities impact residents' well-being and applauded the work of the District in advancing health and well-being.
- 5.11 Mr. Zack Bhatia, 4186 Delbrook Avenue** **IN FAVOUR**
- Commented that the District needs to start building high rises, otherwise property taxes will not keep pace with rising costs; and,
  - Supports the fact that the Keith Road extension will provide improved connection to other side of the highway.
- 5.12 Mr. David Knee, 1225 Alderwood Drive** **OPPOSED**
- Concerned that the District of North Vancouver is too involved in this development;
  - Opposed to the purchase of the corner store site by the District; and,
  - Believes the FSR is miscalculated because the Keith Road extension parcel is included in the equation until the land is transferred to the District.
- 5.13 Mr. Declan Sacre, 2289 Whitman Avenue** **IN FAVOUR**
- Appreciates the bicycle friendly features included in the development proposal;
  - Feels grateful to own a home on the North Shore and believes this development will result in the opportunity for more people to own a residence here; and,
  - Commented that the development would be a good option for seniors wishing to downsize residences.
- 5.14 Ms. Colleen Lunde, 1211-1327 East Keith Road** **OPPOSED**
- Commented that the development is too much and too big for the North Shore;
  - Concerned about increased traffic congestion; and,
  - Commented that the development is not sustainable and not green.
- 5.15 Ms. Anne Marie Garcia, 3822 Hamber Place** **IN FAVOUR**
- Resided in area for almost twenty years and also works in the area;
  - Commented that development is a good option for residents wishing to downsize and young people looking to purchase their first home; and,
  - Commented that this development is in a good location as the obstruction of views will be minimal.
- 5.16 Mr. John Gilmour, 2916 Bushnell Place** **IN FAVOUR**
- Commented that the development is already approved for twenty five storeys and feels that the extra seven storeys in return for the Keith Road extension and affordable housing building is a good outcome for the District; and,
  - Commented that the area is in need of development and feels that the impact on traffic congestion will be minimal.

The hearing recessed at 8:50 p.m. and reconvened at 9:02 p.m.

- 5.17 Mr. Bob Lorimer, 3031 Duval Road** **OPPOSED**
- Stated that twenty-five to thirty-two storey high rises do not belong on the North Shore;
  - Expressed concern that there is no commitment from other levels of government; and,
  - Expressed concern in regard to increased traffic congestion.
- 5.18 Mr. Michael Ouchi, 895 Old Lillooet Road** **IN FAVOUR**
- Commented that low density housing equates to less tax revenue; and,
  - Noted that the OCP designates some areas as single-family and some areas for higher density and that

this area is designated for high density.

- 5.19 Mr. Joseph Bowes, 3639 Garibaldi Drive** **OPPOSED**
- Expressed belief that area should be used for commercial development only in order to add more jobs to the District;
  - Expressed opinion that high rises are being forced on the District by developers; and,
  - Concerned about increased traffic volume.
- 5.20 Ms. Vida Sieban, 1704-138 Esplanade Avenue** **IN FAVOUR**
- Expressed support and specifically identified recreational and child care facilities within the development as positive; and,
  - Wished to reach out to those who are opposed and ask them to consider the future and think about livability and affordability for the next generation.
- 5.21 Mr. Raffaele Panzetta, 420 Mountain Highway** **IN FAVOUR**
- Noted that higher density development in the area has been approved since 1994 so this development is nothing unexpected; and,
  - Would like to see the development approved so that construction can get going to make the area more livable.
- 5.22 Ms. Kelly Millin, 1123 Lillooet Road** **OPPOSED**
- Concerned about increased traffic and unconvinced that the Keith Road extension will solve the problem of traffic congestion in area; and,
  - Expressed concern that the development does not include sufficient parking.
- 5.23 Mr. Sean Balkwill, 1510 Crown Street** **IN FAVOUR**
- Expressed support for development and commented that the site is perfect for development and that the impact on traffic congestion would be minimal.
- 5.24 Mr. Barry Fenton, 2733 Byron Road** **IN FAVOUR**
- Stated that it is important to provide affordable housing options for young people and seniors; and,
  - Noted that the development is consistent with the OCP and that the commercial space provided with the development will create new jobs.
- 5.25 Mr. Shayne Bewiltus, 4586 Cove Cliff Road** **COMMENTING**
- Urged Council to provide more low income housing in the District.
- 5.26 Mr. Brian Wallace, 215 East Keith Road** **COMMENTING**
- Expressed concerns regarding the traffic plan.
- 5.27 Ms. Elizabeth Kristen, 1251 Cloverly Street** **COMMENTING**
- Expressed concern regarding traffic changes and highway access.
- 5.28 Mr. David Knee, 1225 Alderwood Drive** **SECOND TIME**
- Expressed concerns that the approval of this development will set a precedent and lead to more high rises; and,
  - Commented that the explanation of the amenity bonus system on the District's website is difficult to understand.
- 5.29 Mr. Ken Mason, 1560 Hunter Street** **COMMENTING**
- Commented that the development will be a good option for people who want to downsize.
- 5.30 Mr. Corrie Kost, 2851 Colwood Drive** **COMMENTING**
- Expressed concern that the phased development agreement is for ten years with an option for a ten year extension; and,
  - Commented that the North Shore has always been unaffordable for the average wage earner.
- 5.31 Mr. Corrie Kost, 2581 Colwood Drive** **SECOND TIME**

- Concerned that the affordable housing building would be completely shaded by the larger buildings; and,
- Queried Council in regard to the amount of money that will be accrued by the District as an 'uplift amount' as a result of this project.

**5.32 Ms. Kelly Millen, 1123 Lillooet Road**

**SECOND TIME**

- Stated that it seems as though all of the photos presented by the applicant to demonstrate the impact on residents view are taken from the street; and,
- Invited the applicant to take photos from her balcony.

**5.33 Mr. Michael Antone, 476 Chief Jimmy Drive**

**SECOND TIME**

- Commented that the development would mean a loss of mountain view from his residence; and,
- Expressed concerns in regard to increased traffic and safety issues.

The hearing recessed at 10:01 p.m. and reconvened at 10:08 p.m.

**6. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL**

In response to a Council query, staff advised that affordability is measured as thirty percent or less of household income which in the District of North Vancouver equates to an approximate average monthly rent or mortgage of \$1130 dollars or less.

In response to a Council query, staff advised that the smallest unit size in the development is approximately 550 square feet and the average size is approximately 860 square feet.

Council requested that staff clarify the situation if the proposed development is not approved. Staff advised that the site will remain zoned for up to 690 units including the construction of two twenty five storey buildings and a ten story building. Staff noted that the Keith Road extension will also be lost.

In a response to a Council query, staff clarified the total amenity contribution for the project drawing attention to \$2.5 million in neighbourhood improvements, several pieces of art, seventy below market rental units and a 2500 square foot child care facility.

In response to a Council query, staff displayed the Keith Road extension from an overhead view and demonstrated the flow of traffic. Staff advised that a wider Keith Road bridge over the highway is also in the conceptual planning stage.

Council requested supplemental information from the applicants in the form of more photos from different locations surrounding the site. Council queried the Clerk in regard to the admissibility of the supplementary material after the Public Hearing is closed.

The hearing recessed at 10:13 p.m. and reconvened at 10:23 p.m.

The Clerk advised Council that the additional information, as requested, may not be provided after the Public Hearing is closed. As such, if the applicants cannot fulfill Council's request for additional information, the Hearing will be recessed and scheduled to reconvene at a time and date to be determined.

Council asked the applicant to display photos from further up Keith Road and further up Shavington and to point out the location of the proposed development in said photos.

The hearing recessed at 10:42 p.m. and reconvened at 10:47 p.m.

The applicants displayed several photos and identified the location of the proposed development in each photo.

Council advised that their request for additional information had been adequately satisfied.

**7. COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

**MOVED by Councillor Nixon**  
**SECONDED by Councillor Little**

THAT the November 6, 2012 Public Hearing be closed;

AND THAT Bylaw 7955, "The District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1286," be returned to Council for further consideration;

AND THAT Bylaw 7957, "Phased Development Agreement (Seylynn Village) Bylaw, 2012" be returned to Council for further consideration.

**CARRIED**

**8. CLOSING**

Mayor Walton declared the Public Hearing in respect of Bylaws 7955 and 7957 CLOSED at 10:53 p.m.

**CERTIFIED CORRECT:**

---

Confidential Council Clerk