

# AGENDA ADDENDUM

## *REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL*

**Monday, November 7, 2016**

**7:00 p.m.**

**Council Chamber, 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



NORTH VANCOUVER  
DISTRICT

[www.dnv.org](http://www.dnv.org)

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

## **REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL**

**7:00 p.m.  
Monday, November 7, 2016  
Council Chamber, Municipal Hall  
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver**

### **AGENDA ADDENDUM**

#### **THE FOLLOWING LATE ITEMS ARE ADDED TO THE PUBLISHED AGENDA**

##### **9. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF**

###### **9.1. Development Variance Permit 54.16 – 740 East 10th Street File No. 08.3060.20/054.16**

*Recommendation:*

THAT the November 3, 2016 report of the Community Planner entitled Neighbourhood Response to Development Variance Permits Being Considered November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016 be received for information.

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

AGENDA INFORMATION	
<input type="checkbox"/> Regular Meeting	Date: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Workshop (open to public)	Date: _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addendum	Date: <u>NOV 7, 2016</u>



**The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver**  
**REPORT TO COUNCIL**

File: 3060.20/054.16  
 November 3, 2016

**AUTHOR:** Darren Veres, Community Planner

**SUBJECT:** NEIGHBOURHOOD RESPONSE TO DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS BEING  
 CONSIDERED NOVEMBER 7<sup>TH</sup>, 2016

**RECOMMENDATION:** That Council receive this report for information.

**REASON FOR REPORT:**

In accordance with Council's request to receive an indication as to the number of residents receiving notification, being in support or in opposition, the following information is submitted for the development variance permit being considered on November 7th, 2016.

**DISCUSSION:**

As of 10:00 a.m. on November 2, 2016:

Development Variance Permit 54.16 – 740 E 10<sup>th</sup> Street

19 notices were sent out to adjacent property owners/residents of the subject property and the Keith Lynn/Brooksbank Community Association. Three responses were received. One response was received in support. One response was received from a neighbour who does not support coach houses in the District. Their concerns with height and changes to the character of the lane were outlined in the report and in response the coach house was moved 10 feet from the rear property line. The neighbour was informed of this change during the application process. They also had concerns with the applicant's communications with neighbours prior to the application process. Staff have responded to answer questions the neighbour had. One response was received from a neighbour with construction-related activity concerns as discussed in the report. Staff have followed-up with the neighbour to explain the Highway Use Permit process and that their concern has been referred to the Engineering Department for further review. All responses are attached for the information of Council.

*Klausen fu*

Darren Veres  
 Community Planner

**Darren Veres**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 29, 2016 5:18 PM  
**To:** Darren Veres  
**Subject:** Fwd: Support for Coach House at 740 E 10th, N Van

Dear Members of Council

I am a resident and homeowner at [REDACTED]. We are situated [REDACTED] away from the proposed Coach House off the lane at 740 East 10th. The proposed coach house will fit in well with the scale and character of nearby homes. This lane infill is a great example of a means of achieving "gentle densification" in the District that will support affordability for families and vibrant communities. I urge your support.

thank-you  
[REDACTED]

## Darren Veres

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 28, 2016 12:32 PM  
**To:** Darren Veres  
**Subject:** Lane house

Hello Darren,  
We got a letter today about the lane house at 740 E 10th, and the meeting with counsel on November 7. We would have liked to be there, [REDACTED]. You can show our e-mail about our access concern instead, I hope?

Regards,

[REDACTED]

## Darren Veres

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 26, 2016 5:41 PM  
**To:** Darren Veres  
**Subject:** Re: Proposal for a Development Variance Permit at 740 East 10th Street  
**Attachments:** Lane-house1.jpg; Lane-house2.jpg

Mr. Darren Veres.

My wife and I are worried about the traffic in our lane during construction, trucks parking and using our garage area to park and turn around, but of bigger concern for us is being stuck in our garage when construction vehicles block the lane. That happened numerous times with ongoing construction of a workshop/garage and swimming pool at 732 East 10th Street.

[REDACTED] late for work and we missed a few appointments. It would be of great help for us and the neighbours east of the construction if the obstruction in our lane was cleaned up, then we could drive out that way and trucks could come and go much easier. So if the lane is blocked with cement trucks etc. we will have a way out. Hopefully somethings can be worked out.

See attached pictures for lane obstruction.

Regards  
[REDACTED]



## Darren Veres

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 30, 2016 9:57 AM  
**To:** Darren Veres  
**Subject:** Re: Proposal for variance at 740 East 10th Street

Hi Darren. My husband and I just received a copy of the report to council for the development variance at 740 East 10th Street. We reviewed the report and have a few comments.

On page 2 of the report, it states that the proposed lane house will be on the north-east corner of the lot, but the plans show it to be on the north -west corner. Can you clarify?

Of more concern, the report states in two places that signatures of support were obtained from all eight adjacent neighbours. This is inaccurate and misleading, as we only signed a document acknowledging receipt of the plan. We specifically clarified this point when providing our signatures, and were told it was not signing that we were in agreement with or supporting the plan in any way.

On page 7, the report states that the neighbours' concerns about building height and laneway character were addressed by increasing the setback. This again is incorrect. Our concerns were not addressed by this action. We remain concerned about the height, but more importantly, do not support the building of laneway homes in the District.

Due to our work schedules and evening commitments, I am not sure we can attend the council meeting to present these points. Is there another way to ensure our concerns are presented to council?

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY