

BOB HEASLIP

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING STRATEGIES

2932 CHESTERFIELD AVE. PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING

MEETING REPORT

Meeting Date: December 15, 2016

Time: 6:00 pm – 7:30 pm

Location: S. Andrew's & St. Stephen's Church,
Hollyburn Room, North Vancouver

Attendance: Approximately 11 community members

Meeting Purpose: As per District of North Vancouver Planning Policy

- To present proposed development details
- To provide an opportunity to ask questions, receive comments and suggestions about the proposed development

Notification: By newspaper advertisements in the North Shore News, December 11th and 14th, and direct delivery December 8th.

Project Team:

- Farzin Yadegari (FY), Farzin Yadegari Architects (FYA)
- Sahar Hamed, (FYA)
- Rick Artuso, Artuso Properties Ltd. (RA)

District of North Vancouver:

- Erik Wilhelm (EW), Community Planner

Facilitator:

- Bob Heaslip (BH), Development Planning Strategies (DPS)

Overview:

Participants were welcomed and requested to sign in, handed a comment sheet, and then directed to refreshments.

The presentation portion of the meeting began at 6:15 pm with introductions of the project team by Bob Heaslip, including FY & SH, as well as the District representative EW. BH outlined how the meeting would proceed, with a presentation by FY providing project information. BH requested participants save

8210 Elliott Street, Vancouver, BC V5S 2P2
CELL - 604-838-6588 OFFICE - 604-899-4474
EMAIL – planit54@telus.net

their questions until the presentation was completed. BH also requested that input be carried out respectfully keeping in mind allowing others to speak and express their opinions.

BH indicated questions/answers would be repeated as necessary for all to hear. He also noted that he would be writing down questions and comments on a flip chart. BH reminded participants to complete the Sign In and Comment Sheets and either leave them at the table by the entry, or email them to EW at the District.

This meeting session was intended to present the proposed development concept to community members at an early stage in the process and in conjunction with a Development Application submitted to the District of North Vancouver. It is also intended to provide an opportunity to ask clarifying questions and comment on the proposal.

FY, using a Power Point presentation, and 3 D computer modeling, provided an overview of the site location and characteristics, the project statistics, design and intent of the proposed redevelopment of the site.

During and after the presentation, the following questions and comments were provided.

Dialogue:

(Q = Question, A = Answer, C = Comment)

Q Can you better explain and describe the project height - What is the height of the project in relation to the house immediately behind and the townhouses to the north of the site?

A The project height is 36 ft. 4 in., which is less than the Zoning Bylaw equivalent requirement, which is a maximum of 41 ft. The proposed height would be approximately 10 ft. higher than the existing house and townhouses.

Q How does project parking work - are there tandem stalls?

A There are no tandem parking stalls and each of the 8 stalls is accessed by a central drive aisle.

Q Is there a security gate for parking?

A Yes there is an automatic gate at the driveway entry to the parkade.

Q How close is the stairwell on the east side of the property adjacent to the apartment building?

A The stairwell is 3 ft. 8 in's from the east property line.

Q As a neighbour I have sent letters to both the District and City Council concerning traffic safety and speed, and the need for street calming along 29th Avenue. Has the developer taken traffic into consideration in the design of the project?

8210 Elliott Street, Vancouver, BC V5S 2P2
CELL - 604-838-6588 OFFICE - 604-899-4474
EMAIL – planit54@telus.net

- A Yes the building design and number of units meets the Zoning Bylaw requirements and has satisfied the District Engineering Department requirements concerning parking and location of the driveway entry and distance to the intersection of 29th and Chesterfield.
- C There is a concern with seniors and their safety crossing 29th mid block on 29th near Churchill House Seniors, especially with the speed of traffic. There needs to be addition of stop signs for 29th at Chesterfield.
- A EW has noted these concerns for Engineering staff. It was also noted that a possible solution not related to this project could be introduction of a mid block crosswalk for seniors near Churchill House.
- Q Will there be parking on the street from the project? I have written to the District about the lack of street parking along 29th.
- A The proposed 8 parking stalls for the project meets the District Zoning Bylaw requirement of 2 spaces per unit, including visitor parking. No street parking will be allowed on Chesterfield for the frontage of the project along Chesterfield. It was suggested that the District be approached about neighbour Parking Permit restrictions and perhaps parking time limits.
- C The entry/exit for the project is quite close to the 29th and Chesterfield intersection.
- A As noted earlier the project design has satisfied the District Engineering Department requirements concerning the location of the driveway entry and distance to the intersection of 29th and Chesterfield. The project team explored entry from Chesterfield, but the Engineering Dept. requires that entry occur from 29th. It should also be noted that the proposed entry has been designed to be further east of the 29th St. intersection, than what is currently existing.
- Q During rush hour morning and evening vehicles are using 29th as a short cut to avoid traffic congestion on Queens and Chesterfield, which results in increased traffic and speed in the neighbourhood. The addition of this development will add to that traffic.
- A EW has noted these comments and will ask the Engineering Dept. about the need for a neighbour traffic review and potential calming measures.
- Q How will construction vehicle parking and traffic be handled?
- A The applicant will prepare a traffic management approach for trades and deliveries and discuss it with staff at the Building Permit stage of the process.
- Q I question the viability of the parkade layout, stall width, and in and out manoeuvring, and is there no provision for visitor parking?
- A The 2 stalls per unit includes visitor parking as per District requirements. In addition, the stall width and aisle design width meet Engineering requirements. The end stalls are provided with additional width to allow access and egress as per District requirements.

- C We understand that to get any changes to street parking or traffic changes on this street, we are required to have a petition signed by neighbours.
- A EW responded that this is correct. This policy is in place to ensure a healthy percentage of owners agree (2/3rds of those affected) to any proposed changes to parking and traffic flow or traffic calming measures and changes in the neighbourhood.
- Q I am concerned about the project design and the impact on my views and privacy on the house to the immediate east on the other side of Chesterfield. What will the impacts be?
- A FY has a view analysis of the project for this neighbouring home and will share it with the owner. He understands the concern and window placement has been carefully designed to minimize overlook.
- Q What will the length of time be for construction of the project?
- A Once approved, demolition of the existing home will take about a month and following preparation of the detailed Building Permit Plans and issuance of the Building Permit (about 4-5 months), construction will take about 16 months.
- Q Has this project been approved?
- A No. EW explained the approval process and that this Development Application has been made, review by District staff and Advisory Design Panel and project design changes made. Tonight's meeting allows for neighbour input, but the application is for rezoning from a single family designation to a CD (Comprehensive Development) designation. This requires Council consideration and 4 Readings and Adoption of a new Zoning Bylaw. Following 2nd Reading of the Bylaw Council holds a Public Hearing at a future date, which is advertized in the newspaper, local delivery notices to neighbours and posted on the District website. The Public Hearing allows interested people to voice their position to Council on the proposal. If Council supports the Rezoning, the Bylaw is given 3rd Reading with conditions that must be met by the developer before receiving 4th Reading and Adoption of the Bylaw.
- Q There seems to be a lot of development in the area. What will happen to all the surrounding single family homes, could the OCP be amended and they be rezoned too?
- A EW indicated that the Official Community Plan (OCP) specifies sites in the area that have potential for redevelopment and increased density, including the subject site. But such sites do require Rezoning within the process described a few minutes ago. The remaining area around these sites are mainly single family and the present OCP does not contemplate any changes to that designation. There is a provision that allows for application for an OCP amendment, but it has proven to be difficult to obtain such an approval without community and neighbour support.
- Q What is the rationale for two separate buildings instead of one? Was there a consideration of one building?

- A The design intent is to provide more of a neighbour friendly small scale and feel by reducing building mass, while allowing for immediate neighbour increased views and light penetration. The original design did consider one building but based on comments from District staff and Design Panel this design was altered to the design represented this evening.
- Q What are the number of bedrooms in each unit?
- A All 4 units have 3 bedrooms, 2 on the 2nd floor and 1 Master Bedroom on the 3rd floor.
- Q As the existing home is boarded up, is it the responsibility of the owner to maintain it? We are concerned about the illegal dumping on the site, landscape maintenance, cleaning of the sidewalks and vermin in the building. How is this being addressed?
- A EW yes it is the owner's responsibility. RA indicated that since acquiring the property from the previous owner, they try to ensure the landscaping is maintained, illegal dumping of materials removed when reported, and sidewalks cleared as required. He appreciates neighbour and staff notification of anything that needs their attention.
- Q Why can't the building be demolished now?
- A EW noted that District policy is to wait for the appropriate point in the development approval process, otherwise it could appear that early demolition is indicating the project approval is certain. This approach is felt to be a fairer process.
- Q What happens to all the materials resulting from the demolition process?
- A The materials are sorted and separated by the demolition contractor and recycled off site, reducing as much as possible waste going to the Landfill.
- Q What environmentally friendly features are proposed, for example are there solar panels? Is it a LEED project?
- A The project design meets the District's Green Building Policy with such energy efficient standards and features as reduced water flow, energy efficient appliances and lighting. We originally proposed solar panels, but those were opposed by the Design Panel and have been removed.
- Q Will all the sewer and water pipes have to be upgraded as part of the development causing disruption to traffic and neighbouring dwellings?
- A RA and EW indicated that this development will not generate any major infrastructure upgrades for water, sewer or roads. Any work will be connection to existing water and sewer related near the 29th St. intersection. As a result there should be any major disruptions.

Conclusion

BH thanked everyone for attending, for their time and comments, and for their patience during the meeting. He indicated he would be preparing a meeting summary report for

submission to the District of North Vancouver as part of the Development Application submission.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Meeting Summary

The meeting was attended by a few members of the neighbouring public living near the development. Besides a few questions and comments related to privacy, building height, design and view blockage, traffic and parking, and pedestrian safety in the area seemed to be the primary concerns. The residents generally seemed receptive to the proposal and welcomed possible traffic safety measures in the future within the area.

Note:

- 9 people filled out their contact information on the Sign In Sheets
- 1 person filled in a Comment Sheet and left it at the sign in table.

Attachments:

- Sign in Sheets (completed)
- Comment Sheet (completed)

*Prepared by Bob Heaslip, with input from Erik Wilhelm
December 19, 2016*

These notes are intended and assumed to be a fair, accurate reflection and record of the dialogue that occurred, unless the writer is informed otherwise in writing.

From: Heather Kralik
To: DNV Input
Subject: 2932 Chesterfield Ave - Four Unit Townhouse Project
Date: November 15, 2017 4:44:58 PM

Good Day,

First, I do support the need for affordable housing for families on the North Shore. I appreciate some of the changes the Developer has addressed.

I have the following concerns I would like addressed by the District before giving permission to build:

1. No Roof Top Decks -There should be no roof top deck space for any of the units. All townhouses have multi balconies included in the design. This will support privacy issues for both them and our building's residents on the West side.
2. No on Street Parking – There should be no on street parking in front of their buildings on 29th and Chesterfield. That corner is very busy. We need to ensure visibility when exiting our buildings' road access lanes. It is challenging enough today. The four way stops should assist but better safe than sorry.
3. Four Way Stop Signs – Mandatory for 29th and Chesterfield. Needed now to address volume of traffic turning onto 29th from Chesterfield both north & south. Needed to enter and exit our buildings safely.

Please contact me if you wish to discuss the above. I will be attending the meeting on November 28th.

Thank you for your time and support on this.

Heather & Tom Kralik

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Joanne Kennedy
To: [DNV Input](#)
Subject: Chesterfield and 29th St. 4 Unit Townhome Project
Date: November 21, 2017 2:02:47 PM

Hello,

I'd like to offer my concerns re the townhouse development at 2932 Chesterfield. The traffic around the intersection of Chesterfield and 29th has increased considerably over the past few years, and needs to be addressed. I feel a 4-way stop is needed at that intersection. Also, there should be no parking between the driveway of 188 W. Queens to the corner, that is, in front of the new development, as this will limit visibility from both driveways entering onto 29th.

The other problem area I'd like to bring up is the south side corner of Chesterfield and Queens. When turning left from Chesterfield to go west on Queens, the visibility is extremely poor looking to the left (west) for approaching traffic. This is caused by the street parking on Queens being allowed too close to the intersection, it's almost impossible to see traffic coming up the hill. This is a definite safety concern and I hope that the district will address this as well, as traffic at this corner will increase significantly with a new development on the corner of Chesterfield and 29th.

Thank you,
Joanne Kennedy

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Winnie Ng](#)
To: [DNV Input](#)
Subject: FW: Public hearing for Bylaw 8249 (2932 Chesterfield)
Date: November 22, 2017 2:01:31 PM
Attachments: [Letter to DNV re traffic and construction.docx](#)


From: Emel Nordin
Sent: November 22, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Shannon Dale <dales@dnv.org>; Winnie Ng <NgW@dnv.org>
Subject: FW: Public hearing for Bylaw 8249 (2932 Chesterfield)

Hi Shannon and Winnie,

I directly received this input for the 2932 Chesterfield Public Hearing on November 28th. I thought you may want to include this in the public input submission.

Thanks,

Emel Nordin
Planner
District of North Vancouver
604-990-2347
nordine@dnv.org

From: Diane Kozoris [<mailto:> 
Sent: November 21, 2017 3:35 PM
To: Emel Nordin <NordinE@dnv.org>
Subject: Public hearing for Bylaw 8249

Hello Emel,
I am attaching a letter addressing traffic volume on the 100 block West 29th St. in light of the new development on 29th and Chesterfield.
Thank you for giving it your attention.

Sincerely,

Diane Kozoris

Diane Kozoris

[REDACTED]

Emel Nordin
Development Planner
District of North Vancouver
355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver BC
V7N 4N5

Re: 2932 Chesterfield Ave. Public Hearing for Bylaw 8249

Dear Emel Nordin;

I attended an information meeting for this project in January 2017. Many neighbours expressed concerns about the already busy traffic along the 100 block West 29th St., notably:

- The need for traffic calming;
- Numerous existing driveways on both sides of the street;
- No crosswalk availability for pedestrians crossing mid-block;
- And many incidents of Starbucks patrons pulling out unsafely.

The current construction site with heavy duty machinery and large truck traffic is already adding to the density and speed along West 29th. Having 2 construction sites within one block puts another burden on this popular corridor as drivers already speed down from Queens and east on 29th in order to avoid the lights at Queens and Lonsdale.

One DNV representative at the meeting addressed these concerns and I am sorry that I did not record his name and position. I was pleased that he made the following suggestions:

- A 4-way stop at 29th and Chesterfield;
- Traffic calming speed bumps;
- And a crosswalk in this block.

I plan on attending the public hearing on 28 November, 2017 at 7pm and hope to hear concrete plans that will address the issues mentioned above.

Sincerely,

Diane Kozoris

21 November 2017

From: Andrew & Margot MacKay
To: [DNV Input](#)
Subject: FW: Rezoning 2932 Chesterfield Ave
Date: November 25, 2017 2:53:12 PM

Hello,

This is an excellent property to increase density from single family to a fourplex. The DNV has done a good job to date increasing density in this area from Queens to Londale, 29th and Chesterfield. Finish it off on the corner! Hopefully it will be done in good taste with similar finishing as the nearby townhouses or building on the north side of 29th.

Regards,

Andrew R. MacKay



From: Judy Downie
To: [DNV Input](#)
Subject: Nov 28 Public Hearing Submission
Date: November 28, 2017 7:42:41 AM

Dear Sirs/Madams,

I am writing regarding the proposed amendment to the Zoning Bylaw, to permit the development of a four unit townhouse project at 2932 Chesterfield Avenue.

My main concerns for this development are the increased strain this will put on West 29th street parking, and Chesterfield Avenue access to and from the laneway between West Queens and West 29th Street.

My home is on West 29th Street and, especially during District Municipal Hall hours, cars are parked in front of my house all day. It is very difficult for deliveries, and almost impossible to return to the front of my house if I have to leave for an appointment. In snowy conditions, when the laneway behind my house is too slippery for driving, and I've paid to have someone clear enough snow for my car to get in and out in the front, I return home to find that spot occupied, and nowhere safe for me to park. The increased density at 2932 Chesterfield will exacerbate these problems further. I would like on-site, underground parking to be included in the Townhouse Project.

The only entry/exit to and from the laneway behind my house is from Chesterfield Avenue. I am concerned that construction will block access for periods of time. Even a 1 minute delay can have a negative ripple effect for myself or one of my sons. I am also concerned that entering and exiting the laneway will be more hazardous for my sons and myself during construction.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mrs. Judy Downie

)

Nov. 28, 2017

RECEIVED

NOV 28 2017

Clerks
District of North Vancouver

District of North Vancouver

Dear Sirs / Madams

Re: Public Hearing - Nov 28/17
2932 Chestfield Av.
Four Unit Townhouse Project.

I am writing regarding the proposed amendment to the Zoning Bylaw, to permit the development of a four unit townhouse project at the above address.

My main concern for this development is the increased strain that this will put on the parking issue on West 29th St.

My home is on West 29th St., during Municipal Hall hours, cars are parked in front of my home all day. It is very difficult for deliveries and for my visitors to find a parking space. It is almost impossible to return to the front of my home if I have to leave for an appointment, shopping, etc. In snowy conditions, when my spot is all cleared out, when I return home, I find my spot occupied and nowhere else to park.

While I appreciate underground parking is included in the development of the Property, there will probably be more cars per family than available parking. In addition, people do not always use underground parking & there will be visitors, thus creating more cars on our street.

If the District could provide more parking for their employees, this would not be such an issue.

I thank you.

W Scott

