

**DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
PUBLIC HEARING**

REPORT of the Public Hearing held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, B.C. on Tuesday, November 22, 2016 commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Mayor R. Walton
Councillor R. Bassam
Councillor M. Bond
Councillor J. Hanson
Councillor R. Hicks
Councillor D. MacKay-Dunn
Councillor L. Muri (7:04 pm)

Staff: Mr. D. Desrochers, Manager – Engineering Projects & Development Services
Ms. J. Paton, Manager – Development Planning
Mr. A. Bell, Section Manager – Development Engineering
Ms. L. Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk
Ms. C. Archer, Confidential Council Clerk
Ms. N. Letchford, Planner

The District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan Bylaw 7900, 2011, Amendment Bylaw 8178, 2016 (Amendment 21)

Purpose of Bylaw:

Bylaw 8178 proposes to amend the OCP land use designation for 3105 Crescentview Drive from Residential Level 2: Detached Residential to Residential Level 5: Low Density Apartment and to designate this property as Development Permit Areas for Form and Character, Energy and Water Conservation and GHG Emission Reduction.

The District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1341 (Bylaw 8179)

Purpose of Bylaw:

Bylaw 8179 proposes to amend the District's Zoning Bylaw by creating a new Comprehensive Development Zone 95 (CD95) and rezone 3105 and 3115 Crescentview Drive from Single Family Residential Edgemont (RSE) to CD95 to allow the development of a twenty-two unit apartment and single family house.

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 bylaw will be afforded a reasonable opportunity to be heard and to present written submissions;

- Use of the established speakers list. At the end of the speakers list, the Chair may call on speakers from the audience;
- Each speaker will have five minutes to address Council for a first time and should begin remarks to Council by stating their 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 be respectful of one another as diverse opinions are expressed. 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 bylaw;
- 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,
- Everyone at the Hearing will be provided an opportunity to speak. If necessary, the Hearing will continue on a second night.

Ms. Linda Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk, stated that:

- The binder containing documents and submissions related to this bylaw is available on the side table to be viewed; and,
- The Public Hearing is being streamed live over the internet and recorded in accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

Councillor MURI arrived at this point in the proceedings.

2. INTRODUCTION OF BYLAWS BY THE CLERK

Ms. Linda Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk, introduced the proposed Bylaws, stating that Bylaw 8178 proposes to amend the OCP land use designation for 3105 Crescentview Drive from Residential Level 2: Detached Residential to Residential Level 5: Low Density Apartment and to designate this property as Development Permit Areas for Form and Character, Energy and Water Conservation and GHG Emission Reduction.

Bylaw 8179 proposes to amend the District's Zoning Bylaw by creating a new Comprehensive Development Zone 95 (CD95) and rezone 3105 and 3115 Crescentview Drive from Single Family Residential Edgemont (RSE) to CD95 to allow the development of a twenty-two unit apartment and single family house.

3. PRESENTATION BY STAFF

Ms. Natasha Letchford, Planner, provided an overview of the proposal elaborating on the introduction by the Deputy Municipal Clerk.

Ms. Letchford advised that:

- The proposal is for a 22-unit apartment building and a single family house over shared underground parking with access off Connaught Crescent;
- The application involves an amendment to the Official Community Plan to allow the shared parking area, as well as Rezoning and a Housing Agreement;
- The development site is comprised of three lots currently occupied by two houses;

- Two of the lots were identified in the 1999 Upper Capilano Local Plan as a suitable site for a low density apartment building with 25 units;
- This use was included in the OCP, adopted in 2011, and confirmed in the Edgemont Village Plan and Design Guidelines, endorsed by Council in 2014;
- The proposed single family house included in the proposal will provide a transition between the apartment building and the single family residential area adjacent to the site;
- The single family house would not have surface parking and would not be permitted a secondary suite;
- To address concerns raised at the Public Information Meeting regarding the adequacy of parking, the total number of proposed units was reduced by three to increase the parking ratio to two stalls per unit for a total of 46 parking stalls;
- The proposal includes twenty-six secure bicycle storage units;
- Time-limited parking may be considered for Connaught Crescent to address residents' street parking concerns;
- The access off Connaught Crescent was reviewed by District Staff and Bunt & Associates and found to be safe and appropriate;
- The proposal includes a diverse mix of unit types, with 86% of the units either two- or three-bedroom;
- The opportunity presented by this development for young families to return to the North Shore is generally supported by the community;
- Sixty-three trees would be removed for the proposed development and 75 replacement trees would be planted;
- The Community Amenity Contribution (CAC) for the proposed development would be \$337,095;
- Other benefits to the community would include a new public plaza, sanitary main, fibre optic cable, and road paving;
- New sidewalks would be constructed as part of the project to contribute to the Safe Routes to School initiative;
- The nearest bus stop is less than a five minute walk and is on a future Frequent Transit Network route;
- The applicant is mindful of the amount of construction in the Edgemont and Capilano Road area, including Metro Vancouver's water main work, and plans to reduce the impacts of construction;
- The project start date and construction access routes would be coordinated with other projects in the area;
- Other area projects are required to complete off-site works concurrently to reduce the number of road closures; and,
- A comprehensive construction management plan will be required for this project.

4. PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT

Ms. Alison Rakis, Applicant

- Noted she and her family have lived in Edgemont Village for over forty years and have strong ties to the local community;
- Commented on the family's business ties to the community, including owning small businesses and investment properties;
- Noted that the property was acquired in 2000;

- Reported that the original application made in 2012, following the adoption of the OCP, was withdrawn at the request of the District to allow for completion of the Edgemont Refresh process;
- Noted that other projects in the area were approved during this period; and,
- Commented on the revisions to the proposal which have made to address concerns such as parking.

Mr. Richard White, Richard White Planning Advisory Services Ltd.

- Commented on the changes which have been made to the proposal following feedback from the community and District staff, including reducing the number of, and increasing the size of, the units, proposing a single residence instead of a duplex, and improved tree and wildfire safety measures;
- Noted the main concern expressed by the community was the amount of construction activity in the Edgemont area and related traffic concerns;
- Advised that the proposed start date has been delayed until 2018 when construction will be completed on the Capilano Water Main project, the new Delbrook Community Centre, Edgemont Senior Living, and the Boffo project;
- Mentioned the proximity of Edgemont Village and its walkability;
- Commented on the maintenance of on-street parking during construction;
- Noted that the project meets existing density requirements;
- Reported that the project has the support of the Advisory Design Panel;
- Advised that phasing construction will take longer but will reduce construction impacts; and,
- Noted that all construction-related parking will use the development site through all phases of construction.

Ms. Jane Farquharson, P. Eng, Principal, Bunt & Associates

- Commented on the Transportation Impact Assessment Study, noting that the study used standard measures which do not take walkability into account;
- Reported that actual trips at similar developments in North Vancouver show lower vehicle use and that the Traffic Impact Study is very conservative in its traffic estimates;
- Advised that an estimated fifteen vehicle trips would be generated during the evening rush hour period;
- Suggested that the traffic impact of the development would be negligible; and,
- Noted that the parking included in the proposal is above the average vehicle ownership level for North Shore apartment residents.

5. REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

5.1. Ms. Janette Calder, 3100 Block Connaught Crescent: OPPOSED

- Suggested that the parking access driveway is too close to the adjacent building's driveway;
- Noted that rear lane access for nearby businesses on Edgemont Boulevard is via Connaught Crescent; and,
- Requested that construction start after other projects are completed in 2018 to minimize traffic impacts.

- 5.2. Mr. Geoff Pershick, 5500 Block Deerhorn Place: IN FAVOUR**
- Spoke in favour of the proposal;
 - Commented on the lack of available housing for downsizers who would like to stay in the area;
 - Noted that proposed project offers one-level living;
 - Suggested that the project fills a community need; and,
 - Noted he is not in favour of the single family house in the proposal due to a drop in single family sales.
- 5.3. Ms. Michaela Donnelly, 900 Block Clements Ave: OPPOSED**
- Suggested Council delay closing the Public Hearing until the OCP review is complete;
 - Expressed concern with traffic, safety and the amount and pace of development in the Edgemont area;
 - Commented on the cumulative impacts from multiple developments; and,
 - Suggested the quality of life for Edgemont residents has been affected by development.
- 5.4. Mr. Ryan King, 700 Block St. Georges Avenue: IN FAVOUR**
- Commented on his desire to relocate to the Edgemont area and the suitability of the project for his needs;
 - Remarked on the high cost of real estate;
 - Noted housing options and opportunities are needed for young families; and,
 - Commented on the site's proximity to transit.
- 5.5. Ms. Elizabeth McLenahan, 2600 Block Newmarket Drive: OPPOSED**
- Expressed concern with the amount of development in and around the Edgemont area;
 - Opined that the proposal does not adequately address construction management;
 - Commented on traffic and parking in the area;
 - Asserted that residents and merchants need a break from construction activities; and,
 - Commented on the OCP review.
- 5.6. Mr. Adrian Chaster, 3000 Block Crescentview Drive: IN FAVOUR**
- Noted that he lives near the proposed development;
 - Commented on the size of redeveloped single family homes in the area and the resulting loss of trees;
 - Commented on the site's designation for a multifamily development since 1999;
 - Expressed appreciation for the applicant's changes to the proposal to address parking concerns; and,
 - Commented on the timing of the proposed development to allow other projects to be completed.

- 5.7. Mr. Will Campbell, 1500 Block West 12th Avenue, Vancouver: IN FAVOUR**
- Noted that he works in Edgemont Village and would like to move to the area;
 - Commented on the high cost of housing and affordability for young people; and,
 - Suggested that the proposed development would provide housing options that are sustainable and affordable for young professionals.
- 5.8. Mr. Don Harrison, 100 Block West Keith Road: IN FAVOUR**
- Commented on the affordability of homes in the Edgemont area; and,
 - Advised that the proposed development would have fit his needs at the time he was looking for housing in North Vancouver.
- 5.9. Ms. Josie Harrison, 1700 Block Maple Street, Vancouver: IN FAVOUR**
- Commented that she would like to return to North Vancouver;
 - Noted that the proposed development would fit her needs and provide much-needed housing for the area;
 - Suggested that the development would be more affordable than other homes in the area; and,
 - Remarked on the applicant's local connections.
- 5.10. Mr. Kerry Dimmock, 200 Block Rockland Drive: IN FAVOUR**
- Noted he is a professional property appraiser and stated that his clients have expressed concern with a lack of available housing in the area for their children.
- 5.11. Mr. Phil Chapman, 1000 Block Handsworth Road: IN FAVOUR**
- Commented that the proposal is compliant with the OCP and the Edgemont Village Plan and Design Guidelines;
 - Acknowledged that residents are inconvenienced by construction impacts;
 - Commented on the proposed start date of the project;
 - Suggested that the Edgemont Village commercial area needs the support of an increased population; and,
 - Commented on the suitability of single level units close to services for older residents.
- 5.12. Mr. Jon Harbut, 2800 Block Crescentview Drive: OPPOSED**
- Expressed concern regarding the proposed increase in the number of residents on the street and the resulting increase in traffic;
 - Opined that the development will change the character of the street;
 - Expressed concern with the pace of development; and,
 - Proposed that Council wait until other Edgemont area projects are completed to make a decision on the application.
- 5.13. Mr. Stan van Woerkens, 4700 Block Maple Ridge Drive: IN FAVOUR**
- Remarked that he and other North Vancouver residents are fortunate to live in this community and expressed a desire for others to have the same opportunity;
 - Acknowledged that Edgemont business owners and residents would like to maintain a village quality;

- Stated that a variety of housing options are needed in the area;
- Expressed concern for where downsizers and millennials will find housing; and,
- Suggested that the proposed development, along with others in the area, will improve the character, create new public spaces, improve infrastructure, walkability, and attract business to the area.

5.14. Mr. Peter Thompson, 900 Block Clements Avenue: IN FAVOUR

- Commented on changes in the Edgemont area;
- Advised that a low-rise apartment building was included in the Local Area Plan nearly 20 years ago and confirmed as part of the Refresh Project;
- Remarked that the Local Area Plan identified a need for housing alternatives adjacent to Edgemont Village;
- Commented on the suitability of the proposed development for downsizers;
- Complimented the range of units and the project's design;
- Noted the proximity to transit and the provision of resident parking; and,
- Opined that the economic viability of Edgemont Village businesses would be improved by additional residents.

5.15. Ms. Helen Hall, 100 Block West 2nd Street: IN FAVOUR

- Noted she is a former Edgemont resident who was priced out of the area and would like to return;
- Commented that the proposed development would provide an opportunity for people to be part of the community; and,
- Opined that construction traffic is a short-lived inconvenience.

5.16. Mr. Brian Platts, 3100 Block Beverley Crescent: IN FAVOUR

- Remarked that a development application on this site was expected nearly 20 years ago as it has been part of the local plans and confirmed in the Edgemont Refresh Project and the OCP;
- Opined that delaying the application further would be a disservice to the planning processes to date and would prolong disruption to the community;
- Noted that much of the traffic in Edgemont Village has been due to the Capilano Water Main Project; and,
- Commented on pedestrian safety in Edgemont Village.

5.17. Ms. Erin Stevenson, 3600 Block Bluebonnet Road: OPPOSED

- Commented on parking, traffic and pedestrian safety in the Edgemont area;
- Expressed concern regarding the amount of development in the Edgemont area;
- Expressed concern regarding the possible loss of character of Edgemont Village; and,
- Opined that the units will not be affordable for many families.

5.18. Mr. Michael Sherman, 2900 Block Newmarket Drive: COMMENTING

- Commented that the site had been designated for a multifamily development for many years;
- Asserted the development would have been better without the single family house;

- Suggested that the project would have had more community support before the larger developments in the area were underway;
- Expressed concern with the pace and amount of development in the Edgemont area; and,
- Complimented the design of the proposal.

5.19. Mr. Grig Cameron, 1000 Clements Avenue: IN FAVOUR

- Commented on housing diversity and affordability;
- Noted that Edgemont is a Village Centre and a proposed future Frequent Transit Network;
- Suggested that the proposed development would help attract younger people to North Vancouver to help address concerns about the missing generation of 20-40 year olds on the North Shore; and,
- Observed that an increased population would provide a larger customer base for local businesses.

5.20. Ms. Erin MacNair, 3400 Block Emerald Drive: OPPOSED

- Acknowledged the delays the owners have experienced;
- Expressed concern with the amount of development in the Edgemont area;
- Expressed concern regarding increased traffic;
- Noted traffic impact studies are done in isolation and expressed concern regarding the cumulative effects of various developments; and,
- Commented on the projected cost of the units.

5.21. Mr. Gordon Savage, 3400 Block Edgemont Boulevard: OPPOSED

- Queried what could be built on the site without rezoning;
- Expressed concern regarding traffic congestion and transit capacity;
- Requested a study of the cumulative effect of traffic impacts from all local developments;
- Expressed concern regarding the loss of mature trees;
- Requested that the proposed development not be permitted to begin until other projects are completed, taking into account any construction delays; and,
- Opined that the project will not help address the need for affordable housing.

5.22. Mr. Shane Cable, 3100 Block Strathaven Lane: IN FAVOUR

- Commented that the proposed development would be a fit for his family.

The meeting recessed at 8:48 pm and reconvened at 8:56 pm.

5.23. Mr. Erik Jensen, 900 Block Clements Avenue: OPPOSED

- Urged Council to stop all multifamily development until transportation infrastructure has been improved;
- Queried what the consequences would be if the construction management plan is not followed;
- Commented on traffic and parking during the construction of Village projects;
- Queried why this development would be more affordable than other developments in the area;

- Commented on the disruption anticipated during the replacement of the Montroyal Bridge; and,
- Remarkd on the delayed completion date of the Capilano Water Main replacement.

5.24. Mr. Peter Duyker, 3700 Block Edgemont: IN FAVOUR

- Commented that the project will be suitable for downsizing in the future;
- Asserted that people who live in the area do not drive into Edgemont Village, noting that many vehicles in his complex stay parked throughout the day; and,
- Noted the site has been designated for multifamily use for nearly twenty years and the applicant has waited for several planning processes to be completed.

5.25. Mr. Shane Foulds, 1100 Block Ridgewood Drive: IN FAVOUR

- Commented that the single family home added to the site will allow for more parking and better transition between the single family area and multifamily;
- Advised that he would like families to have the opportunity to move into the proposed development;
- Remarkd that an increased pace of development would reduce the length of construction impacts;
- Commented on the appeal of one-level living; and,
- Remarkd that the project will beautify the community and add public space.

5.26. Mr. Darryl Foulds, 700 Block Westview Crescent: IN FAVOUR

- Commented on the suitability of the proposed development for his housing needs;
- Complimented the applicant on the building design and the quality of the application; and,
- Remarkd on the anticipated completion of other projects including the Grosvenor building and the new grocery store.

5.27. Mr. Gary Hawthorn, 2800 Block Thornecliffe Drive: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of densification of the commercial core and residential areas of Edgemont Village; and,
- Queried if more parking spaces could have been included in the proposal and why no surface parking for the single family house was planned.

5.28. Ms. Natasha Fonseca, 400 Block Genoa Crescent: IN FAVOUR

- Commented on the suitability of one-level living and the relative affordability of the proposed development;
- Remarkd on parking availability in Edgemont Village; and,
- Suggested additional residents would help local businesses.

5.29. Ms. Mel Montgomery, 3700 Block Bluebonnet: COMMENTING

- Expressed concern with the pace of development and construction traffic in the area; and,
- Proposed that Council wait until the OCP review is completed to decide on the application.

- 5.30. Mr. Corrie Kost, 2800 Block Colwood Drive: COMMENTING**
- Queried the CAC calculation;
 - Clarified EUCCA's comment regarding parking and support for the application to proceed to a Public Hearing;
 - Commented on the lack of surface visitor parking;
 - Expressed concern about the affordability of the units;
 - Opined that commercial rents could rise if the population of Edgemont Village increases; and,
 - Commended the applicant's plan for phasing of the development.
- 5.31. Mr. Jon Harbut: SPEAKING FOR A SECOND TIME**
- Suggested neighbours are opposed to the proposal;
 - Expressed concern regarding the capacity of local schools if more families move into the area; and,
 - Commented on pedestrian safety.
- 5.32. Mr. Phil Chapman: SPEAKING FOR A SECOND TIME**
- Noted the applicant has agreed to delay construction until other projects are completed to reduce construction impacts;
 - Suggested the proposed development will fill a community need for the aging population and the missing generation;
 - Commented on the need for diversity of housing and relative affordability; and,
 - Referred to planning processes already completed, including the OCP.
- 5.33. Ms. Anne Forsythe, 2900 Block Newmarket Drive: COMMENTING**
- Stated she is not opposed to the proposed development;
 - Remarked on traffic congestion; and,
 - Expressed concern regarding construction vehicles and pedestrian safety.
- 5.34. Mr. Gary Hawthorn: SPEAKING FOR A SECOND TIME**
- Suggested more parking could be added to the site; and,
 - Commented that some residents may use street parking.

6. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the transportation study for Edgemont Village included the proposed development and used a 2030 horizon for estimating future inbound and outbound vehicle trips.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the District could place a restrictive land use covenant on title to coordinate the start of construction with other major projects.

In response to a question from Council, staff provided an overview of proposed and approved developments in the Edgemont Village core and residential periphery.

7. COUNCIL RESOLUTION

**MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor HICKS**

THAT the November 22, 2016 Public Hearing is closed;

AND THAT "District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan Bylaw 7900, 2011, Amendment Bylaw 8178, 2016 (Amendment 21)" and "The District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1341 (Bylaw 8179)" be returned to Council for further consideration.

CARRIED
(9:50 p.m.)

CERTIFIED CORRECT:



Confidential Council Clerk