

From: [Linda Brick](#)
To: [Ashley Rempel](#)
Cc: [Linda Brick](#)
Subject: FW: 1591 Bowser Development
Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2015 12:45:06 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: IRENE DAVIDSON [<mailto:irene.davidson@shaw.ca>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2015 11:43 AM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV
Subject: 1591 Bowser Development

Dear Mayor and Council:

Re: Development Application for 1591 Bowser, currently zoned C9

This development is best suited as an "in-fill" project and not as the 'first build' in redevelopment of this block. (1600 Marine, South side)

If built as planned, it will have a negative effect on development of the adjoining properties on Marine Drive. It will be difficult to develop the Marine Drive properties as commercial/residential, because the lots will be very narrow to accommodate customer parking and resident access, especially if the south side of Marine Drive is to have a setback for extended bus lanes.

Development of this project will impact the flow of traffic on Marine Drive, basically a two-lane road. Subsequent small lots developed on this block will have their own underground parking, with access probably from Bowser, and using the East-West lane, southside. This section of Marine Drive has cul-de-sacs and not many intersections with traffic lights. Traffic will be increasingly backed up at Tatlow Avenue and Garden Avenue. The dedicated bus lane (east bound) ends at Bowser. Right turning traffic now turns into the bus lane and blocks the buses from pulling over to pick up passengers. There has been a suggestion to use articulated buses for rush hour. We cannot have them unless we plan space for them.

During a recent council meeting (December 2014), it was suggested that plans for 1591 Bowser had already taken a lot of time, and there did not seem to be a reason to delay it longer. That may be so, but it will be a precedent development for this area and we need to take time to examine the knock-on effects of the project. There is at least one more project for the north side of Tatlow and Marine which further complicates the traffic/transit picture.

Public focus is currently directed toward town centre type developments, but attention needs to be paid to East-West connector streets like Marine Drive. We have to ensure traffic/transit flow. Developing 1591 Bowser, without reference to a bigger plan will hurt businesses and traffic/transit on Marine Drive.

Regards,
Irene Davidson

From: [DNV Input](#)
To: [Ashley Rempel](#)
Cc: [Doug Allan](#)
Subject: FW: 1591 Bowser Avenue, North Vancouver, BC
Date: Thursday, January 22, 2015 2:56:07 PM

From: elap@shaw.ca [<mailto:elap@shaw.ca>]
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 2:40 PM
To: DNV Input
Subject: 1591 Bowser Avenue, North Vancouver, BC

I am a resident of 1523 Bowser Avenue, #303. My concern with the proposed apartment building has to do with parking. There is very little parking space on Bowser as it is, and with 16 more units on the same street, my visitors will not find space to park. I realize underground parking will be provided in the new building, but visitors park on the street, as well as residents for shorter periods of time. I am against a 16-unit apartment building.

Elaine Piovesan
604-971-4244

From: [James Gordon](#)
To: [Louise Simkin](#); [Ashley Rempel](#)
Cc: [James Gordon](#)
Subject: FW: 1591 Bowser Public hearing
Date: Thursday, January 22, 2015 4:46:11 PM

From: PairofKnees [mailto:pairofknees@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 4:33 PM
To: James Gordon; Doug Allan
Subject: 1591 Bowser Public hearing

Could you please add the comments below to the public input for the 1591 Bowser Public hearing

These comments(except additional comments) have already been sent to Council with no response and was not added to previous comments on this development

1591 Bowser

It would appear from the presentation by staff on this project to Council and the lack of questions from Council that you probably were not given the info on the first preliminary application.

In the first Preliminary development proposal for this site the developer was requesting to purchase the District lane West of their property so that their site met the size of site in the C9 Zoning to able build to the 1.75 FSR in a four storey building.

A majority of our Community Association directors that responded to this proposal (see e-mail responses to staff below) were opposed to selling the lane at this time.

The developer came up with a second proposal which you approved to go to public hearing which is on a site that only permits a two storey building with 1.0 FSR.

Staff made it sound as though the developer was doing everyone a favour by only asking for a three storey building with a 1.68 FSR. on this site when in fact they are asking for an additional storey and a 0.68 increase in FSR.

The numbers below are calculated not taking any FSR exemptions into account.

A four storey 1.75FSR building has a building site coverage of $1.75/4 = 0.4375$

A three storey 1.68 FSR building has a building site coverage of $1.68/3 = 0.56$

One of the criteria in the C9 zoning was to keep the footprint and bulk of the higher buildings as small as possible.

As you can see even if a higher FSR had been acceptable what was proposed was going in the wrong direction.

As this is the first smaller site to come up for redevelopment it would appear that the District is already abandoning its C9 zoning for the smaller sites.

There was a Committee of the Whole meeting earlier this year when staff admitted that the C9 zoning is not working as they had thought and it would appear staff is trying to change the C9 zoning for the smaller sites with this proposal without going back to the Community. Only one of the larger C9 projects built so far was approved with no Variances but the last

time I checked with staff no building permit has been requested for that project.

Additional comments

Since the public meeting one of the properties on Marine to the north of 1591 Bowser has been destroyed by fire and will need to be restored/rebuilt this maybe a opportunity and additional reason to revisit the owners of the properties to the north about consolidating their sites with 1591 Bowser property and doing a proper C9 Development and not approving this development at this time.

Thank You
David Knee

From: Eric Godot Andersen [<mailto:EricGAndersen@shaw.ca>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 3:55 PM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV
Subject: 1591 Bowser Avenue Public Hearing

Good evening, Mayor Walton and members of Council,

My name is Eric Andersen at 2589 Derbyshire Way, and this public input is not made on behalf of any committees or groups that I am belong to.

This is no doubt the first time that I address Council about a development in a vastly different part of the DNV. I do not live anywhere close to Bowser Avenue and I do not anticipate that the addition of 16 units will have a strong and direct impact on my life.

Additionally I do not even have enough information about this project to determine if it will have a positive or negative impact on the neighbouring community.

So you may wonder why I am writing in opposition to this project. As I had indicated in a previous e-mail to Council (dated December 19), as a principle I would urge Council to have the discussions about traffic, which is so closely connected to density, BEFORE you proceed with further developments.

I missed out on the 'Pace of Development' meeting on January 20, as I was out of town, but I had the opportunity to watch it since on the DNV's website. I felt that more questions than ever were raised and certainly staff did not have answers available, which cannot be a huge surprise in view of the complexity of the issue.

The pace of development in the CNV was not explored sufficiently and let us not forget the potential developments on First Nations lands in West Vancouver.

All in all many more questions need to be answered before Council continues with the rapid rate of approval of developments that we experienced over the last four years.

To claim as staff did that 'the OCP is a success story' is certainly up for debate. We do not have the full impact of all developments in the DNV and it will take a number of years before we can judge if the OCP were a success or not.

Certainly all I can say at this point is that the traffic conditions have worsened SUBSTANTIALLY overall in the DNV over the last four years. That is undeniable and I would hope and assume that you all will agree with this point of view. Council and staff's next steps are to find out WHY this has happened and what can be done to address same. The proof is in the pudding and we have not seen much of it so far. This is not meant as criticism, because I fully realize the magnitude of the task.

To give but a small example: earlier today I was asked to attend a meeting at the RCMP detachment next Monday and was asked for a convenient time in the afternoon. Without having to give it any further thought I quickly suggested a meeting in the early afternoon, as we all know how bad traffic is bound to be on the Cut practically every day after 3 PM. This would never have been an issue just three-four years ago.

Prior to sending this proposal to tonight's Public Hearing three members of Council suggested a PAUSE regarding developments. It was never suggested that a moratorium should apply for any length of time, or prohibition on developments. A simple pause to give everybody a chance to catch up and find out how the major traffic issues should be addressed and perhaps coordinated with the neighbouring municipalities.

I, therefore, respectfully urge Council to defer the 1591 Bowser Avenue proposal – not forever, but until such time that more and detailed info has been collected by staff about the traffic patterns. Let's

have more facts available before this Council continues 'business as usual', which means approving every proposal that comes to Council, as many of you did over the last four years.

It is hard for the affected citizens to understand the continuous rush for new developments. In a recent edition of the North Shore News there were no less than three different ads for 'Public Information Meetings' about development proposals in various locations of the DNV. I have no doubt at all that the previous Council would have rubber-stamped all these proposals (and more), but I have to have faith in the new Council that you will now look more objectively at these proposals. After all, you were all part of the recent election campaign (including the all-candidates meetings). How could you have missed that traffic and transportation was THE number ONE issue in the campaign? To blatantly ignore this just a few months after the election would be stunning and most disappointing to say the least.

As was pointed out during the Council meeting on December 15, which sent this proposal to tonight's Public Hearing, members of Council are supposed to have an open mind when attending such Public Hearings. I hope this will be the case at tonight's Public Hearing and that the old habit of consistently approving any development proposal, that comes to Council, will not prevail.

Council: Please defer this proposal till further facts about the persistent traffic woes in our municipality have been provided, analyzed and discussed by staff.

Thanks for listening.

Regards/Eric

Eric Gadot Andersen

2589 Derbyshire Way
North Vancouver, B.C.
V7H 1P9
Phone: 604 929 6849
Fax: 604 929 6803



Before printing this e-mail, please assess if it is really needed

From: [Paul Tubb](#)
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 7:14 PM
To: input@dnv.org
Subject: Public Hearing - 1591 Bowser Avenue

Mayor and Council,

Re: Public Hearing - 1591 Bowser Avenue, January 27, 2015

Below are my thoughts on the proposed development at 1591 Bowser Avenue for which I would urge Council to deny approval.

1. This development would inhibit proper development of the remainder of the block as envisioned by the Marine Drive Improvement Strategy and the existing C9 zoning. I would refer Council back to the illustrations done at the time for a view of what we hoped to achieve.
2. In the approximately 10 years it took to develop the C9 zoning for this area, it was recognized that it would take time for the redevelopment of Marine Drive. There are several other projects underway or already completed on Marine Drive that adhere to the vision and so there is no need to rush through a project like this.
3. This project comes very close to the maximum FSR of 1.75 which is only allowed on properties that meet the minimum size requirements in C9. The minimum size requirements in C9 for an FSR of 1.75 are already less than those originally recommended when the zoning was being developed (they were reduced prior to C9 being passed). To allow this project will further reduce the incentive for developers to assemble land.
4. The parking variance of 10 (22 vs 32) is excessive given that half the building is 2 or 3 bedroom units which could easily require 2 parking spaces each. Once again a parking variance is being proposed without the District having (to my knowledge) a policy in place for the area. I would suggest once again that work be undertaken to put such a policy in place rather than dealing with these developments (and there have now been several) as "one-offs".
5. The project utilizes the District's laneway from Marine Drive to the west of the project for access. The Marine Drive vision included eliminating all such laneways in order to improve efficiency and safety for motor vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians travelling along Marine Drive. This project will instead make it less likely that any such closure will occur in the foreseeable future.
6. If Council is concerned that C9 is not working then we should undertake a process to change C9 not drop in ad hoc developments like this that reduce the chances of success overall.
7. If the project does proceed, the community amenity contribution should be specifically dedicated to the immediate area – the area "pays" the cost of increased density so it should get the benefit.

Thank for your consideration.

Regards,

Paul Tubb

1070 West Keith Road

Member – Marine Drive Improvement Committee

Member – Pemberton Heights Community Association Executive