The District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1323 (Bylaw 8098)

Purpose of Bylaw:
Bylaw 8098 proposes to amend the Zoning Bylaw to reduce the minimum permitted lot width at this site from 15m (49.2 ft) to 10 m (33 ft) and will reduce the minimum permitted lot area from 550m² (5,920 sq. ft.) to 474.73m² (5,110 sq. ft.) to allow for the creation of two lots.

1. OPENING BY THE MAYOR

Mayor Walton welcomed everyone and advised that the purpose of the Public Hearing was to receive input from the community and staff on the proposed bylaw as outlined in the Notice of Public Hearing.

In Mayor Walton’s preamble he addressed the following:

- All persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by the proposed bylaws will be afforded a reasonable opportunity to be heard and to present written submissions;
- Use the established speakers list. At the end of the speakers list, the Chair may call on speakers from the audience;
- You will have 5 minutes to address Council for a first time. Begin your remarks to Council by stating your name and address;
- After everyone who wishes to speak has spoken once, speakers will then be allowed one additional five minute presentation;
- Any additional presentations will only be allowed at the discretion of the Chair;
- All members of the audience are asked to refrain from applause or other expressions of emotion. Council wishes to hear everyone’s views in an open and impartial forum;
- Council is here to listen to the public, not to debate the merits of the bylaws;
- The Clerk has a binder containing documents and submissions related to this bylaw which Council has received and which you are welcome to review;
- Everyone at the Hearing will be provided an opportunity to speak. If necessary, we will continue the
Hearing on a second night;

- At the conclusion of the public input Council may request further information from staff which may or may not require an extension of the hearing; or Council may close the hearing after which Council should not receive further new information from the public; and,
- Finally, please note that this Public Hearing is being streamed live over the internet and recorded in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

2. **INTRODUCTION OF BYLAWS BY CLERK**

Ms. Linda Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk, introduced the proposed bylaw stating that:

Bylaw 8098, Rezoning Bylaw 1323, proposes to amend the Zoning Bylaw to reduce the minimum permitted lot width at this site from 15m (49.2 ft) to 10 m (33 ft) and will reduce the minimum permitted lot area from 550m$^2$ (5,920 sq. ft.) to 474.73m$^2$ (5,110 sq. ft.) to allow for the creation of two lots.

**PRESENTATION BY STAFF**

Ms. Natasha Letchford, Planner, provided an overview of the proposal elaborating on the Clerk’s introduction.

Ms. Letchford advised that:

- The proposed application does not meet the minimum lot width or area requirements for the RS4 Zone;
- The application was identified as a potential Small Lot Infill Area (SLIA);
- Two of the lots on the north block face remain with potential to be developed into small lots;
- 85% of the lots on the larger block face are already classified as small lots (13.875m or less in width);
- Secondary suites are permitted, but require on-site parking and rear lane way access; and,
- Concerns by surrounding residents have been met and are reflected in the design of the house.

Ms. Letchford explained that the proposed subdivision would have the following covenants:

- Unique House Design;
- Compliance with the District’s Green Building Strategy;
- Stormwater Management; and,
- Maximum Garage Height.

3. **PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT**

Presentation: Joe Muego, Hearth Architectural Inc.

Mr. Joe Muego, Heath Architectural, provided background and context regarding the preliminary stages of the application.

Mr. Muego explained that the grade of the lot is on a steep slope and that the design of the house was designed to create less of an impact on neighbouring views.

Mr. Muego advised that he worked with District staff to ensure that the design of the house and lane access conforms with the District’s Official Community Plan.

4. **REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**
4.1. Mr. Ron Bain, 2600 Block Violet Street: COMMENTING
- Expressed concern regarding the volume of traffic on Violet Street; and,
- Commented on the lack of parking on Violet Street.

4.2. Ms. Shirley Cornthwaite, 2700 Block Violet Street: OPPOSED
- Concerned with the amount of vehicles parked on Violet Street;
- Expressed concern with the possibility of excess traffic in the laneway; and,
- Requested safety precautions be implemented for traffic calming on Violet Street.

4.3. Ms. Trish Taylor, 2700 Block Violet Street: COMMENTING
- Expressed concern regarding the safety of children and requested traffic calming measures for Violet Street; and,
- Expressed concern with excavation and potential slope failure at the proposed development site.

4.4. Mr. Eric Anderson, 2500 Block Derbyshire Way: IN FAVOUR
- Spoke as the co-chair of the Blueridge Community Association;
- Advised that the Blueridge Community Association has not been made aware of any opposition from residents regarding the proposed application; and,
- Thanked staff for notifying the Community Association of potential developments.

4.5. Ms. Jasmin Rajabali, 2600 Block Violet Street IN FAVOUR
- Spoke regarding the parking issues on Violet Street; and,
- Stated her support for the proposed application.

Council Discussion:

Council requested staff report back on where Violet Street ranks in the sidewalk priority index in the District’s 2009 Pedestrian Master Plan,

In response to a query it was advised that the District’s Bylaw Department follow’s up on any parking complaints made regarding Violet Street.

Discussion ensued regarding parking enforcement for secondary suites. Staff reported that the Bylaw Department has reviewed the parking situation on Violet Street and no parking concerns were noted. Staff advised that the Bylaw Department responds to issues on a complaint basis.

Discussion ensued regarding the possibility of restricting secondary suites on Violet Street.

Staff advised that prohibiting secondary suites by way of a covenant could be discussed when Council is considering second reading of the bylaw and feedback could be provided to the Approving Officer.

Staff advised that the property’s rear lane access meets the criteria for a secondary suite as outlined in the District’s Best Practices Guide.

Staff confirmed that the applicant has proposed sufficient parking to meet the requirements for a secondary suite.

Staff advised that they can report back regarding the resident concerns raised at the Public Hearing regarding parking and sidewalks.

4.6. Mr. Corrie Kost, 2800 Block Colwood Drive: COMMENTING
- Questioned if lane access reduced the cars on the street;
- Noted that residents are allowed to park on the street;
• Commented on the applications requirement for paving the rear lane; and,
• Proposed a coach house on the lot rather than a secondary suite.

4.7. **Joe Muego, 1700 West 2\textsuperscript{nd} Avenue:**

**APPLICANT**

• Commented regarding the proposed covenant that would limit a suite for the application; and,
• Concerned with the uncertainty of Council decisions regarding the allowance of secondary suites.

4.8. **Mr. Ron Bain:**

**SPEAKING A SECOND TIME**

• Commented regarding the secondary suite parking requirements.

4.9. **Ms. Jasmine Rajabali:**

**SPEAKING A SECOND TIME**

• Commented on the quality of the laneway; and,
• Commented regarding the parking.

4.10. **Larry Cornthwaite, 2700 Block Violet Street:**

**COMMENTING**

• Queried if parking restrictions could be implemented on Violet Street.

6. **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL**

7. **COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

**MOVED** by Councillor HANSON

**SECONDED** by Councillor MACKAY-DUNN

THAT the February 17, 2015 Public Hearing be closed;

AND THAT “The District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1323 (Bylaw 8098)” be returned to Council for further consideration.

**CARRIED**

(8:34 p.m.)

**CERTIFIED CORRECT:**

Confidential Council Clerk