

To Municipal Clerk
North Vancouver District
For inclusion in public hearing 7:00 p.m. September 24, 2013

Re: 1075 Prospect Avenue
Proposed subdivision

This proposal is described as “creates two 10m (33 foot) lots generally consistent with the existing lot pattern along the 1000 Block of Prospect Road.”

While it can be argued that the 1909 era lot pattern of 33 foot divisions in this area prevails, a lot size born of land speculation in boom times, the creation of two 33 foot lots is NOT consistent with the past and present development of the block or neighbourhood.

The prevailing pattern of development on Prospect Ave is one of 66 foot lots, with single-family dwellings. The recent developments/new homes to the west of 1075 approaching Capilano Road include large, modern homes situated on large lots, as is also evidenced along both the north side of Prospect as well as to the east of 1075. Yes, an exception to the 66 foot patterning occurs immediately adjacent to both the west (1033 recently sold as two lots for development) and the east of 1075 Prospect (1073 Prospect), but these are anomalies, not the prevailing pattern.

Yes, the early 20th century pattern was drawn, but any push to develop Montroyal, Canyon, Clements, or Prospect *entirely* on a 33 foot model is not what residents of this neighbourhood wish to see in general. This is evidenced by the recent proposals that were rejected at both 962 Montroyal Blvd, and at 946 Clements Ave.

Developers have simply targeted our neighbourhoods in this area of North Vancouver as they see an opportunity to create the small lots that are now prevalent along the 1000 Clements block. This block is less congruent with the neighbourhood in general as a result of the development pattern of 33 foot lots. It suffers from a lack of parking space, congestion on both sides of the roadway, and a row-house appearance with a lack of plantings, and a focus on paving. This is not what the neighbours of this area signed on for and we hope our council can stem the development to maintain neighbourhoods, rather than simply bowing to the wishes of developers who view our neighbourhood as ripe for development.

Sincerely,
Jim Murdock
943 Clements Ave
North Vancouver, B.C.

From: Michaela Donnelly [<mailto:melisabethdonnelly@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:12 AM

To: Kathleen Larsen

Subject: subdivision of 1075 Prospect Avenue

Ms Larsen

Thank you for taking the time to discuss this matter with me. I am writing to voice my opposition to the abovementioned application for subdivision, and I would appreciate it if you would pass this email on to counsel. My family lives a few blocks away on Clements Avenue.

I understand that the current proposal for subdivision of 1075 would allow the imposition of various covenants on each of the potential new properties, including a ban on secondary suites. I understand that the current single property does not allow for such a covenant. Thus in theory, each plan would allow for the same increase in cars in that area. I nevertheless must voice my concern about that inevitable increase, given that two houses (very likely with suites) are likely being built on the two properties directly adjacent to 1075 where one house currently sits.

The park directly across from this proposed subdivision is the closest playground to our home, and we are there many times a week. It is a terrific playground, well used by those who live in the area, particularly now that it has been redone by the DNV. Almost all of the families who go to the playground or the adjacent park and tennis courts walk to the facilities, which results in a consistent flow of pedestrian traffic along that stretch of Prospect, often families with young children on foot or on their bikes.

In my view, adding more houses into that area will cause more congestion and will exacerbate an already difficult conflict between pedestrians and cars. Many people who live east of Capilano use Prospect as a thoroughfare by which to access their streets and, despite the proximity of the playground and the tennis courts to the street, many people speed in their cars through that area of Prospect far too fast. In my view, given the many children and young families who use this area, adding to the car traffic in the area is simply too dangerous.

It may be that both options in the case of 1075 will have the same negative result when it comes to the increase of cars, but I wanted to mention it because it leads me to what is the most pressing concern about the application for subdivision of 1075. When I moved into this area, I chose this area for several reasons. First, I chose this area because it is safe for my family - we have a young daughter who has just started kindergarten at our local school. It is my hope that in a few years, she will be able to walk to school on her own or with friends. As it stands right now, the density of the neighbourhood and the related car traffic allows me to feel that she would be safe in making that journey on her own. However the more subdivisions that the District allows, the more cars there will be, the more traffic there will be, and the less pedestrian friendly this neighbourhood will become. Children will have to fight with cars on their walk to school, elderly people who walk in the neighbourhood during the day (and there are many) will have to dodge more and more cars coming out of more and more driveways. That is not the kind of neighbourhood that I want.

Second, I chose this neighbourhood because of its character -- it has a variety of homes on properties of various sizes, the houses are not cheek by jowl, and there are many beautiful large trees in the area. One gets a sense that the neighbourhood has space to breathe and there are reminders all around that we live in the foothills of beautiful mountains in a rain forest. I do not like the character of other areas in the lower mainland that have houses which extend from property line to property line, with as many houses jammed into an area as possible, and with virtually no trees higher than six feet. I therefore chose NOT to live in those areas.

In my view, the more that counsel approves subdivisions in general, the more difficult it will be to deny any proposals down the line. It is not sufficient to look at each individual proposal on its own merits, tempting thought it is, particularly in this case where there may be particular benefits for those living directly adjacent to 1075. Counsel must also look at the community as a whole, and consider how they are changing its character by allowing subdivisions generally, and consider the precedent that they are setting for subdivision proposals in the future. Counsel has an obligation to those people who live in the neighbourhood to consider how it is now, and how it will be in the long term if they start down a road from which it may be difficult to turn back.

For those reasons, I would urge you to reject this subdivision proposal.

Michaela Donnelly
604 328 3087.