# Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas

## Agenda and Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Public Hearing Agenda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. | December 4, 2017 – Regular Meeting of Council  
**Agenda** – Item 9.4. Bylaws 8265, 8266 and 8267: Upper Capilano Small Lot Infill Areas – Zoning Bylaw Amendments  
**Staff Report** – The report, dated November 27, 2017, introduces the three proposed bylaws to create three new Small Lot Infill Areas, and recommends First Reading and referral to Public Hearing. The report also provides an overview of the Small Lot Infill Areas proposed. |
| 3. | Bylaw 8265 – Amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to add a Small Lot Infill Area on Prospect Avenue (between Capilano Road and Cliffridge Avenue) |
| 4. | Bylaw 8266 – Amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to add a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard (between Belvedere Drive and Cliffridge Avenue) |
| 5. | Bylaw 8267 – Amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to add a Small Lot Infill Area on the north side of Montroyal Boulevard (between Cliffridge Avenue and Ranger Avenue) |
| 6. | Notice |
| 7. | September 18, 2017 – Regular Meeting of Council  
**Agenda** – Item 9.2. Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas  
**Staff Report** – The report, dated September 13, 2017, provides an overview of the results from the second public engagement held in fall 2016 and requests Council direction on proposed Small Lot Infill Areas. |

## Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Minutes</strong> – Item 9.2. Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **March 15, 2017 – Information Report to Council** – The report summarizes the results from the second public engagement held in fall 2016. Public input from the engagement is summarized in the report.

9. **September 20, 2016 – Information Report to Council** – The report provides Council with further information on public input from the first public engagement, and on lots in the study area.

10. **July 4, 2016 – Council Workshop**

    **Agenda** – Item 3.2. Upper Capilano Small Lots Study: Public Input and Next Steps

    **Staff Report** – The report, dated June 24, 2016, summarizes the results from the first public engagement held in spring 2016, and requests direction to proceed. Public input from the engagement is summarized in the report.

    **Minutes** – Item 3.2. Upper Capilano Small Lots Study: Public Input and Next Steps

**Public Input**

11. **Public Input** – Submissions from the public since First Reading given, including submissions at the September 18, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council.

12. **October 18, 2017 – Prospect Avenue residents meeting** – Summary of public input received (Attachment 4 from the staff report dated November 27, 2017).

13. **October 5, 2016 – Second open house** - Summary of public input received from the open house and questionnaire (Attachment 2 from the staff report dated March 15, 2017).

    **Full input** – Record of the public input received from the October 5, 2016 open house and questionnaire.

14. **May 2016 – First open house** – Summary of public input received from the open house and questionnaire (Attachment 2 from the staff report dated June 24, 2016).
AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

Monday, December 4, 2017
7:00 p.m.
Council Chamber, Municipal Hall
355 West Queens Road,
North Vancouver, BC
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Mayor Richard Walton
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Councillor Mathew Bond
Councillor Jim Hanson
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Councillor Doug MacKay-Dunn
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THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

7:00 p.m.
Monday, December 4, 2017
Council Chamber, Municipal Hall,
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver

AGENDA

BROADCAST OF MEETING

- Online at www.dnv.org

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS NOT AVAILABLE FOR DISCUSSION

- Bylaw 8142 – Rezoning Employment Zone – Lynn Creek Light Industrial
- Bylaw 8230 – OCP Amendment 1886-1956 Belle Isle Place & 2046 Curling Road
- Bylaw 8231 – Rezoning 1886-1956 Belle Isle Place & 2046 Curling Road
- Bylaw 8236 – Rezoning 905-959 Premier Street
- Bylaw 8240 – OCP Amendment 1502-1546 Oxford Street
- Bylaw 8241 – Rezoning 1502-1546 Oxford Street
- Bylaw 8225 – Rezoning 756-778 Forsman Avenue
- Bylaw 8244 – OCP Amendment 1801-1865 Glenaire Drive & 2064-2082 Curling Road
- Bylaw 8245 – Rezoning 1801-1865 Glenaire Drive & 2064-2082 Curling Road
- Bylaw 8215 – Rezoning 1401-1479 Hunter Street & 481-497 Mountain Highway
- Bylaw 8233 – Phased Development Agreement 1401-1479 Hunter Street & 481-497 Mountain Highway
- Bylaw 8262 – OCP Amendment 1923 Purcell Way
- Bylaw 8239 Rezoning 3030 Sunnyhurst Road
- Bylaw 8249 Rezoning 2932 Chesterfield Avenue

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. December 4, 2017 Regular Meeting Agenda

Recommendation:
THAT the agenda for the December 4, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adopted as circulated, including the addition of any items listed in the agenda addendum.
2. PUBLIC INPUT

(limit of three minutes per speaker to a maximum of thirty minutes total)

3. PROCLAMATIONS

4. RECOGNITIONS

5. DELEGATIONS

5.1. Mike Little and Linda Munro, North Vancouver District Public Library
Re: North Vancouver District Public Library: Year in Review

6. ADOPTION OF MINUTES


Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the October 23, 2017 Regular Council meeting are adopted.

6.2. November 20, 2017 Regular Council Meeting p. 31-37

Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the November 20, 2017 Regular Council meeting are adopted.


Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the November 21, 2017 Public Hearing are received.


Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the November 21, 2017 Public Hearing are received.

6.5. November 27, 2017 Regular Council Meeting p. 53-57

Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the November 27, 2017 Regular Council meeting are adopted.

7. RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING DECISIONS

8. COUNCIL WORKSHOP REPORT
9. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

With the consent of Council, any member may request an item be added to the Consent Agenda to be approved without debate.

If a member of the public signs up to speak to an item, it shall be excluded from the Consent Agenda.

Recommendation:
THAT items are included in the Consent Agenda and are approved without debate.

982 Belvedere Drive
File No. 08.3060.20/029.17

At the request of Mayor Walton, the following resolution from the November 6, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council is put before Council for reconsideration pursuant to s. 131 of the Community Charter.

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor HICKS
THAT Development Variance Permit 29.17, to allow for a two car garage addition to a single-family house at 982 Belvedere Drive, is ISSUED.

9.2. Bylaw 8253: 2017-2021 Consolidated Financial Plan Amendment #2 p. 75-83
File No. 05.1780/Financial Plan 2017

Recommendation:

9.3. Bylaw 8281: Development Cost Charges (DCC) Bylaw Amendment p. 85-141
File No. 11.5240.02/004.000

Recommendation:
THAT “Development Cost Charges Bylaw 7135, 2000, Amendment Bylaw 8281, 2017 (Amendment 7)” is given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings.
9.4. Bylaws 8265, 8266 and 8267: Upper Capilano Small Lot Infill Areas – Zoning Bylaw Amendments
File No. 13.6480.30/003.003.000

Recommendation:
THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1362 (Bylaw 8265) is given FIRST Reading;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1362 (Bylaw 8265) is referred to a PUBLIC HEARING.

THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1363 (Bylaw 8266) is given FIRST Reading;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1363 (Bylaw 8266) is referred to a PUBLIC HEARING.

THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1364 (Bylaw 8267) is given FIRST Reading;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1364 (Bylaw 8267) is referred to a PUBLIC HEARING.

File No. 09.3900.01/000.000

Recommendation:
THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1365 (Bylaw 8273)” is given SECOND and THIRD Readings.

File No. 09.3900.01

Recommendation:
1. THAT THIRD Reading of “Radio Amplification Bylaw 8272, 2017” is rescinded.

2. THAT “Radio Amplification Bylaw 8272, 2017” is amended by:
   a. deleting the words “this section 1.5” in section 1.6 and replacing them with the words “section 1.7”;
   b. deleting section 2.6 in its entirely, renumbering the remainder of section 2 accordingly and consequentially amending any section number references as necessary; and,
   c. deleting the following line from the table in section 7.4:

| Failure to install amplification system that meets guidelines | 2.6 | 200 |

3. THAT “Radio Amplification Bylaw 8272, 2017” is given THIRD Reading as amended.
9.7. **Bylaw 8269: Waterworks Regulation Bylaw 2279, 1958**
*Bylaw 8270: Sewer Bylaw 6656, 1994*
*Bylaw 8280: Solid Waste Removal Bylaw 7631, 2007*
File No. 09.3900.20/000.000

**Recommendation:**
THAT “Waterworks Regulation Bylaw 2279, 1958, Amendment Bylaw 8194, 2016 (Amendment 62)” is ADOPTED.

THAT “Sewer Bylaw 6656, 1994, Amendment Bylaw 8195, 2016 (Amendment 28)” is ADOPTED.

THAT “Solid Waste Removal Bylaw 7631, 2007, Amendment Bylaw 8199, 2016 (Amendment 13)” is ADOPTED.

9.8. **Bylaw 8268: Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992,**
*Amendment Bylaw 8268, 2017*
File No. 09.3900.20/000.000

**Recommendation:**
THAT “District of North Vancouver Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992, Amendment Bylaw 8268, 2017 (Amendment 54)” is ADOPTED.

9.9. **Bylaw 8258 – Zoning Bylaw Text Amendment**
*for Industrial Buildings and Structures*
File No. 08.3060.20/044.15

**Recommendation:**
THAT the November 22, 2017 report of the Development Planner entitled Bylaw 8258 – Zoning Bylaw Text Amendments for Industrial Buildings and Structures is received for information.

9.10. **Public Information Meeting Signs**
File No. 08.3060.20/007.17

**Recommendation:**
THAT the Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications Corporate Policy is amended to include new Public Information Meeting Sign templates.

10. **REPORTS**

10.1. Mayor

10.2. Chief Administrative Officer

10.3. Councillors
10.4. Metro Vancouver Committee Appointees

10.4.1. Aboriginal Relations Committee – Councillor Hanson
10.4.2. Housing Committee – Councillor MacKay-Dunn
10.4.3. Regional Parks Committee – Councillor Muri
10.4.4. Utilities Committee – Councillor Hicks
10.4.5. Zero Waste Committee – Councillor Bassam
10.4.6. Mayors Council – TransLink – Mayor Walton

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12. ADJOURNMENT

Recommendation:
THAT the December 4, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adjourned.
The District of North Vancouver

REPORT TO COUNCIL

November 27, 2017
File: 13.6480.30/003.003.000

AUTHOR: Nicole Foth, Community Planner

SUBJECT: Upper Capilano Small Lot Infill Areas - Zoning Bylaw Amendments

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT Bylaw 8265, which amends the District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965, to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Prospect Avenue, is given FIRST reading and is referred to Public Hearing;

AND THAT Bylaw 8266, which amends the District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965, to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard, is given FIRST reading and is referred to Public Hearing;

AND THAT Bylaw 8267, which amends the District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965, to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Montroyal Boulevard, is given FIRST reading and is referred to Public Hearing.

REASON FOR REPORT:
At the September 18, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council, Council directed staff to prepare Zoning Bylaw amendments for three new Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIAs) in the Upper Capilano area. Council passed the following four motions.

THAT staff are directed to prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard as described in the September 13, 2017 report of the Community Planner entitled Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;

AND THAT staff are directed to prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Montroyal Boulevard as described in the September 13, 2017 report of the Community Planner entitled Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas.

THAT staff be directed to include the five lots on Clements Avenue in the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area that are adjacent to the potential Small Lot Infill
Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard, in the Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard.

THAT staff be directed to propose a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on the 1000 block on Prospect Avenue.

**SUMMARY:**
At Council’s direction, staff prepared three Zoning Bylaw amendments for three new SLIAs for Council’s consideration at First Reading. The amending bylaws are available in Attachment 1, Attachment 2, and Attachment 3. The locations of the three proposed SLIAs are shown in Figure 1 below.

The amending bylaws are summarized as follows:

- Designate a SLIA on **Prospect Avenue** from Capilano Road to Cliffridge Avenue (Bylaw 8265);
- Designate a SLIA on **Clements Avenue**, including the five lots in the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area, and **Canyon Boulevard** from Belvedere Drive/lane to Cliffridge Avenue (Bylaw 8266); and a clarifying text amendment to add a section heading; and
- Designate a SLIA on **Montroyal Boulevard** from Cliffridge Avenue to Ranger Avenue (Bylaw 8267).

![Figure 1: Three new Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIAs)](image)

**BACKGROUND:**
At Council’s direction, staff initiated a public engagement process in spring 2016 to assess the extent of community interest in small lot subdivisions in the Upper Capilano area, and to identify related issues. The public engagement process was initiated to respond to enquiries regarding subdivision potential, and to work with community members to develop a long-term vision for neighbourhood character. Most of the houses in the neighbourhood were built in the 1950s and 1960s and there is continuing interest from homeowners to renovate or redevelop their homes.
Public Process
The following timeline summarizes the public process and Council direction throughout this initiative.

May 3, 2016  Staff invited homeowners in the area to the first open house to express their views on the potential for small lots within the study area (between Capilano Rd, Montroyal Blvd, Ranger Ave, and Prospect Ave). Staff invited public input through a questionnaire.

July 4, 2016  At a Workshop, Council received the results of the public input from the first open house and questionnaire. Staff identified two potential SLIAs in the study area that were identified based on the public feedback received and an analysis of the block features. At that workshop, Council directed staff to hold further public engagement on the two potential SLIAs, and for staff to explore other housing options with the public.

Oct. 5, 2016  Staff held a second open house to gather public feedback on the two potential SLIAs on Clements/Canyon, and Montroyal, and staff invited public input through a questionnaire. The results were reported to Council in an Information Report dated March 15, 2017.

Sept. 18, 2017  At the Regular Meeting of Council, staff presented the results of the second public engagement that focused on the two potential SLIAs on Clements/Canyon and Montroyal. The results showed public support for two potential SLIAs from the respondent households in the study area and nearby neighbours, as well as within each potential SLIA.

Council directed staff to draft Zoning Bylaw amendments for these two potential SLIAs, and included five lots on Clements Ave. to the Clements/Canyon SLIA. Council also directed staff to draft a Zoning Bylaw amendment for one block of Prospect Ave.

Oct. 18, 2017  Since a SLIA on Prospect Ave. was added for consideration at the September 18th, 2017 Regular Council Meeting, staff met with residents of this block to share information on what a SLIA might mean for their block, and collected feedback. At the meeting, staff informed that there would be a public input opportunity at a Public Hearing, should Council refer one or more bylaws to Public Hearing. For reference, meeting details and feedback are available in Attachment 4.

EXISTING POLICY:
Official Community Plan (OCP)
The OCP recognizes there may be opportunities to sensitively introduce more housing choices in established single-family neighbourhoods, while respecting the importance of maintaining single-family uses and neighbourhood character. Examples include small lot subdivisions, designating additional SLIAs, duplexes, and coach houses (Policy 2.3.5, 7.1.2).
**SUBJECT: Upper Capilano Small Lot Infill Areas - Zoning Bylaw Amendments**  
November 27, 2017

**Subdivision Best Practices**  
At the November 5, 2013 Workshop, the Approving Officer subdivision best practices were confirmed by Council as the preferred method of managing subdivisions. The best practices pertain primarily to small lot subdivisions and enhance the review of subdivision applications in the District. The best practices include prohibiting secondary suites on small lots without lane access, no mirror house designs with subdivision, non-tandem parking for suites, and generally 50% or more small lots on a block face for subdivision. The best practices resulted from concerns related to small lot subdivision and are also applied to locations outside of designated SLIAs.

**ANALYSIS:**  
**Subdivision Potential**  
In the three potential SLIAs, there are currently 138 lots. Fifty-eight of these lots have the potential to subdivide into small lots. This represents a potential net increase of up to 59 lots for a total of 197 lots within the two potential SLIAs as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential SLIA</th>
<th>Existing Small Lots</th>
<th>Other Lots</th>
<th>Total Lots</th>
<th>Build out scenario with SLIAs designation Small Lots</th>
<th>Other Lots</th>
<th>Net-new Lots subtotal</th>
<th>Total Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clements/ Canyon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montroyal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>193</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Subdivision potential in the two potential SLIAs*

On average three to four small lots are created by subdivision each year. If Council approves these two potential SLIAs and the rate of small lot subdivision remains generally the same, it could take an estimated 14 to 19 years for the 58 existing large lots within the three proposed SLIAs to be subdivided.

Council may continue to receive applications to subdivide in areas outside of designated SLIAs in the form of rezoning and/or subdivision applications, each of which will be assessed by staff using the Approving Officer Subdivision Best Practices and reported to Council where rezoning is required.

**Transportation**  
At build-out, estimates indicate net increase of trips made would add about 1 vehicle per minute during PM peak hour with these trips distributed across the streets (ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, land use code 210). During most of the day, it would be lower.

**Text Amendment**  
A clarifying text amendment is included in one of bylaws; it adds the title “Schedule A” at the beginning of the SLIA maps in the Zoning Bylaw Section 312. This amendment is included in Bylaw 8266.
Timing/Approval Process:
Should Council refer one or more of the bylaws to Public Hearing, a Public Hearing will be scheduled. Following the Public Hearing, the bylaws considered would be brought to Council for second reading.

Concurrence:
The bylaws have been reviewed by the Legal department.

Financial Impacts:
Infill housing, such as SLIAs, is a more efficient way to deliver linear services (e.g. water, sanitary, storm sewer, sidewalks, street lighting and roads) when compared to conventional subdivision development. Specifically, infill provides more rate/tax payers for the same distance of linear infrastructure. This means infill housing is an overall financial benefit to the District, especially when the existing service levels can be maintained (e.g. no up-sizing of pipes or construction of new public infrastructure) as is the case with the SLIAs proposed in this report.

Liability/Risk:
The proposed SLIAs are not expected to expose the District to additional risk. Specifically, the Slope Hazard Development Permit Areas (DPA) guidelines will continue to apply whether or not lots are included in the proposed SLIAs, including the requirement for a report from a qualified professional indicating the properties may be “safely used for the use intended”. In the proposed SLIAs, there are five lots on Clements Ave. and 7 lots on Prospect Ave. in the Slope Hazard DPA.

Social Policy Implications:
The proposed SLIAs in this report are intended to expand housing choices through sensitive infill in existing single-family neighbourhoods, as per policy in the OCP. Given there are few remaining places in the District for additional single-family home creation, the benefit of adding these additional SLIAs is to create housing choices for a wider range of household incomes, types, and sizes, and to allow older residents to age in place.

Environmental Impact:
Subdivision and single-family construction are expected to follow applicable environmental Development Permit Areas (DPAs), the Tree Protection Bylaw, and the Environmental Protection and Preservation Bylaw.

Conclusion:
Designating SLIAs is an opportunity identified in the OCP to expand housing choices through sensitive infill in existing single-family neighbourhoods by enabling a variety of house sizes.

Many houses in this Upper Capilano neighbourhood were built in the 1950s and 1960s, making these homes nearing the end of their functional lifespan and poised to be renovated or rebuilt. As these potential changes are imminent, exploring and identifying new SLIAs has been an opportunity to engage the community in developing a long-term vision both for housing diversity needs and changing neighbourhood character as homes rebuild.
Through the public input processes, staff has identified potential SLIAs to strike a balance between opportunities to sensibly introduce more housing choices in established single-family neighbourhoods where public input has been supportive, and maintaining the existing status quo neighbourhood lot pattern in other parts of the study area.

Based on the analysis and public input, staff supports proceeding with the designation of the three new SLIAs in the report, Clements/Canyon, Montroyal, and Prospect. Subdivision of these areas has the potential to add up to 59 new houses to the area over time, and when homeowners choose to pursue subdivision at their discretion.

Options:

THAT Bylaw 8265, which amends the District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965, to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Prospect Avenue, is given FIRST reading and is referred to Public Hearing;

AND THAT Bylaw 8266, which amends the District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965, to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard, is given FIRST reading and is referred to Public Hearing;

AND THAT Bylaw 8267, which amends the District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965, to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Montroyal Boulevard, is given FIRST reading and is referred to Public Hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Foth
Community Planner

Attachment 1: Bylaw 8265 (Prospect Avenue)
Attachment 2: Bylaw 8266 (Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard)
Attachment 3: Bylaw 8267 (Montroyal Boulevard)
Attachment 4: Prospect Ave. meeting
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8265

A bylaw to amend District of North Vancouver Bylaw 3210, 1965

The Council for The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver enacts as follows:

1. Citation

This bylaw may be cited as "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1362 (Bylaw 8265)."

2. Amendments

2.1 District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965 is amended as follows:

   a) Section 312, the table “Small Lot Infill Area # / Geographical Description” is amended by adding a row, in numerical order, as follows:

| 4b | Prospect Avenue (between Capilano Road and Cliffridge Avenue) |

   b) Section 312 is amended by adding the map, which is attached to this bylaw as Schedule A, in numerical order.

READ a first time
PUBLIC HEARING held
READ a second time
READ a third time
ADOPTED

Mayor
Municipal Clerk
Certified a true copy

______________________________
Municipal Clerk
Schedule A to Bylaw 8265

Small Lot Infill Area 4b
Bylaw 8265

Community Planning Department, District of North Vancouver

SMALL LOT INFILL AREA
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8266

A bylaw to amend District of North Vancouver Bylaw 3210, 1965

The Council for The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver enacts as follows:

1. Citation

This bylaw may be cited as “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1363 (Bylaw 8266)

2. Amendments

2.1 District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965 is amended as follows:

a) Section 312, the table “Small Lot Infill Area # / Geographical Description” is amended by adding a row, in numerical order, as follows:

| 4c | Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard (between Belvedere Drive and Cliffridge Avenue) as delineated in the corresponding map in Schedule A |

b) Section 312 is amended by adding the map, which is attached to this bylaw as Schedule A, in numerical order.

c) Section 312 is amended by adding the title “SCHEDULE A to Section 312” to the top of the page with the map entitled “Small Lot Infill Plan Area #1”.

READ a first time

PUBLIC HEARING held

READ a second time

READ a third time

ADOPTED

Mayor

Municipal Clerk
Certified a true copy

Municipal Clerk
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8267

A bylaw to amend District of North Vancouver Bylaw 3210, 1965

The Council for The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver enacts as follows:

1. Citation

This bylaw may be cited as “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1364 (Bylaw 8267)”.

2. Amendments

2.1 District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965 is amended as follows:

a) Section 312, the table “Small Lot Infill Area # / Geographical Description” is amended by adding a row, in numerical order, as follows:

| "4d" | North side of Montroyal Boulevard (between Cliffridge Avenue and Ranger Avenue) |

b) Section 312 is amended by adding the map, which is attached to this bylaw as Schedule A, in numerical order.

READ a first time

PUBLIC HEARING held

READ a second time

READ a third time

ADOPTED

Mayor

Municipal Clerk
Certified a true copy

Municipal Clerk
Schedule A to Bylaw 8267
Prospect Ave. meeting

The potential SLIA on Prospect Ave. between Capilano Rd. and Cliffridge Dr. was added for consideration by Council in September 2017. Staff held a meeting with residents of this block on October 18, 2017 to share information on what a SLIA might mean for their block, collect feedback, and answer questions. The meeting was at Canyon Heights Church, and 16 residents attended. Residents were able to provide feedback online until November 1, 2017.

Staff received 16 completed questionnaires from 12 households located on Prospect Ave. between Capilano Rd. and Cliffridge Dr. Responses are reported by household in an effort to ensure equitable representation as some households had multiple responses.

Of 38 total households in this block, nine respondent households indicated they support or strongly support a SLIA on Prospect Ave., while three respondent households indicated they do not support or strongly do not support a SLIA. All 12 respondent households indicated that they felt they fairly well or very well understand what a SLIA might mean for their street.

Respondent households that support a SLIA commented that small lots are relatively more affordable than large lots, small lots may attract families, and suggested to open more lane access. Respondent households that do not support a SLIA expressed concern about impacts to on-street parking, increased traffic, loss of greenery and trees, more developer interest, and concern about change of street character.

At the meeting, staff informed that there would be a public input opportunity at a Public Hearing, should Council refer one or more bylaws to Public Hearing.
DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Council for the District of North Vancouver held at 7:02 pm on Monday, December 4, 2017 in the Council Chambers of the District Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, British Columbia.

Present: Mayor R. Walton
         Councillor R. Bassam
         Councillor M. Bond
         Councillor J. Hanson
         Councillor R. Hicks

Absent: Councillor D. MacKay-Dunn
         Councillor L. Muri

Staff: Mr. D. Stuart, Chief Administrative Officer
      Ms. C. Grant, General Manager – Corporate Services
      Mr. D. Milburn, General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits
      Mr. A. Wardell, Acting General Manager – Finance & Technology
      Mr. S. Ono, Deputy General Manager – Engineering, Parks & Facilities
      Mr. J. Gordon, Manager – Administrative Services
      Mr. T. Lancaster, Manager – Community Planning
      Ms. J. Paton, Manager – Development Planning
      Ms. C. Archer, Confidential Council Clerk
      Ms. N. Foth, Planner

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

   1.1. December 4, 2017 Regular Meeting Agenda

   MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
   SECONDED by Councillor BOND
   THAT the agenda for the December 4, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adopted as circulated, including the addition of any items listed in the agenda addendum.

   CARRIED

2. PUBLIC INPUT

   2.1. Ms. Claudia Cornwall, 1000 Block Canyon Boulevard:
       • Spoke in support of item 9.4 regarding Upper Capilano Small Lot Infill Areas;
       • Noted the age of homes in the neighbourhood;
       • Commented regarding the availability of lane parking;
       • Commented regarding the subdivision process for individual lots; and,
       • Spoke regarding provisions for increased density in the Official Community Plan (OCP).
2.2. **Mr. Brian Harrington, 900 Block Belvedere Drive:**
- Spoke in support of item 9.1 regarding the reconsideration of the Development Variance Permit for 982 Belvedere Drive;
- Commented regarding the availability of parking in the neighbourhood; and,
- Noted that development of the site is restricted due to the adjacent creek.

2.3. **Mr. John Voiles, 900 Block Belvedere Drive:**
- Spoke in favour of item 9.1 regarding the reconsideration of the Development Variance Permit for 982 Belvedere Drive;
- Commended the applicant regarding consultation with neighbours and the design of the proposed garage; and,
- Commented regarding the site’s building restrictions due to the adjacent creek.

2.4. **Mr. Gary Olszewski, 800 Block Premier Street:**
- Spoke regarding field options for Inter River Park;
- Urged Council to move ahead with a one-field option and retain the forested area for community use;
- Noted the forest is well used; and,
- Commented regarding the potential impacts of the proposed fields.

2.5. **Ms. Susan Hingson, 3200 Block Highland Boulevard:**
- Commented regarding duplex zoning and floorspace ratio (FSR) allowed in the Edgemont area, noting that the permitted FSR for duplexes is the same as for single-family homes;
- Commented regarding property values and construction costs; and,
- Recommended increasing the permitted FSR for duplexes in the Edgemont area.

2.6. **Mr. Andrew Westwell-Roper, 1000 Block Canyon Boulevard:**
- Spoke in support of item 9.4 regarding Upper Capilano Small Lot Infill Areas;
- Commented that the proposed bylaws are in alignment with the OCP; and,
- Spoke regarding the availability of parking in the area and the size of new homes built on larger lots.

2.7. **Mr. Warren McKay, 1000 Block Prospect Avenue:**
- Spoke in support of item 9.4 regarding Upper Capilano Small Lot Infill Areas; and,
- Commended District staff on consultation with area residents.

2.8. **Ms. Rosa Mattia, 700 Block Orwell Street:**
- Spoke in opposition to installing artificial turf (ATF) fields at Inter River Park;
- Commented regarding the health risks posed by ATF fields;
- Indicated she is opposed to the removal of the forest to accommodate a second field;
- Commented regarding active community use of the surrounding area; and,
- Urged Council to require a new community impact study before making a decision.

2.9. **Ms. Golnaz Rakhshan, 4900 Block Cliffridge Avenue:**
- Spoke in support of item 9.4 regarding Upper Capilano Small Lot Infill Areas;
- Commented regarding housing affordability; and,
- Spoke regarding the age of the existing houses in the neighbourhood.
3. **PROCLAMATIONS**

Nil

4. **RECOGNITIONS**

Nil

5. **DELEGATIONS**

5.1. **Mike Little and Linda Munro, North Vancouver District Public Library**  
Re: North Vancouver District Public Library: Year in Review

Mr. Mike Little, Chair, and Ms. Linda Munro, Vice-Chair, North Vancouver District Public Library Board, provided a review of the library’s achievements in 2017, highlighting a partnership with Metro Conversation to provide space for a session on affordable housing, a visit by a delegation from South Korea and successful youth outreach efforts. Future plans were presented and it was noted that the library had been recognized with two PR Xchange awards from the Library Leadership and Management Association.

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM  
SECONDED by Councillor HICKS  
THAT the delegation of the North Vancouver Public Library is received.  

CARRIED

6. **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

6.1. **October 23, 2017 Regular Council Meeting**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

6.2. **November 20, 2017 Regular Council Meeting**

MOVED by Councillor BOND  
SECONDED by Councillor BASSAM  
THAT the minutes of the November 20, 2017 Regular Council meeting are adopted.  

CARRIED

6.3. **November 21, 2017 Public Hearing (Zoning Bylaw)**

MOVED by Councillor BOND  
SECONDED by Councillor BASSAM  
THAT the minutes of the November 21, 2017 Public Hearing are received.  

CARRIED
6.4. November 21, 2017 Public Hearing
(1923, 1935, 1947 and 1959 Purcell Way)

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor BASSAM
THAT the minutes of the November 21, 2017 Public Hearing are received.
CARRIED

6.5. November 27, 2017 Regular Council Meeting

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor BASSAM
THAT the minutes of the November 27, 2017 Regular Council meeting are adopted.
CARRIED

7. RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING DECISIONS
Nil

8. COUNCIL WORKSHOP REPORT
Nil

9. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT items 9.2, 9.3, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, 9.8 are included in the Consent Agenda and are approved without debate.
CARRIED

9.1. Reconsideration of Development Variance Permit 29.17 – 982 Belvedere Drive
File No. 08.3060.20/029.17

Public Input:
Mr. Greg Smallenberg, 900 Block Belvedere Drive:
• Noted he is the applicant;
• Commented regarding the Streamside Development Permit Area;
• Noted that restrictions were placed on the property after it was purchased, creating a hardship;
• Commented that they worked closely with District staff to select the safest site for the garage;
• Indicated that other options were explored, all of which would require a variance; and,
• Noted the adjacent neighbours are in support of the application.
MOVED by Mayor WALTON
SECONDED by Councillor BOND
THAT Development Variance Permit 29.17, to allow for a two car garage addition to a single-family house at 982 Belvedere Drive, is ISSUED.

CARRIED

9.2. Bylaw 8253: 2017-2021 Consolidated Financial Plan Amendment #2
File No. 05.1780/Financial Plan 2017

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON

CARRIED

9.3. Bylaw 8281: Development Cost Charges (DCC) Bylaw Amendment
File No. 11.5240.02/004.000

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT “Development Cost Charges Bylaw 7135, 2000, Amendment Bylaw 8281, 2017 (Amendment 7)” is given FIRST Reading.

CARRIED

9.4. Bylaws 8265, 8266 and 8267: Upper Capilano Small Lot Infill Areas – Zoning Bylaw Amendments
File No. 13.6480.30/003.003.000

Public Input:
Mr. Grig Cameron, 1000 Block Clements Avenue:
• Spoke in favour of moving forward with the bylaws;
• Commented regarding the provision for Small Lot Infill Areas in the OCP; and,
• Commented regarding the size of new homes built on large lots and the age of homes in the area.

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor BOND
THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1362 (Bylaw 8265)” is given FIRST Reading;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1362 (Bylaw 8265)” is referred to a PUBLIC HEARING.

THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1363 (Bylaw 8266)” is given FIRST Reading;
AND THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1363 (Bylaw 8266)" is referred to a PUBLIC HEARING.

THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1364 (Bylaw 8267)" is given FIRST Reading;

AND THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1364 (Bylaw 8267)" is referred to a PUBLIC HEARING.

CARRIED

File No. 09.3900.01/000.000

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1365 (Bylaw 8273)" is given SECOND and THIRD Readings.

CARRIED

9.6. **Bylaw 8272: Amendment to Radio Amplification Bylaw 8272, 2017**
File No. 09.3900.01

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
1. THAT THIRD Reading of "Radio Amplification Bylaw 8272, 2017" is rescinded.

2. THAT "Radio Amplification Bylaw 8272, 2017" is amended by:
   a. deleting the words "this section 1.5" in section 1.6 and replacing them with the words "section 1.7";
   b. deleting section 2.6 in its entirely, renumbering the remainder of section 2 accordingly and consequentially amending any section number references as necessary; and,
   c. deleting the following line from the table in section 7.4:

| Failure to install amplification system that meets guidelines | 2.6 | 200 |

3. THAT "Radio Amplification Bylaw 8272, 2017" is given THIRD Reading as amended.

CARRIED

9.7. **Bylaw 8269: Waterworks Regulation Bylaw 2279, 1958**
**Bylaw 8270: Sewer Bylaw 6656, 1994**
**Bylaw 8280: Solid Waste Removal Bylaw 7631, 2007**
File No. 09.3900.20/000.000

Regular Council – December 4, 2017
MOVED by Councillor BASSAM  
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON  
THAT “Waterworks Regulation Bylaw 2279, 1958, Amendment Bylaw 8194, 2016 (Amendment 62)” is ADOPTED.

THAT “Sewer Bylaw 6656, 1994, Amendment Bylaw 8195, 2016 (Amendment 28)” is ADOPTED.

THAT “Solid Waste Removal Bylaw 7631, 2007, Amendment Bylaw 8199, 2016 (Amendment 13)” is ADOPTED.

CARRIED

File No. 09.3900.20/000.000

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM  
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON  
THAT “District of North Vancouver Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992, Amendment Bylaw 8268, 2017 (Amendment 54)” is ADOPTED.

CARRIED

File No. 08.3060.20/044.15

Public Input:  
Mr. Glen Dempster, 1200 Block McKeen Avenue:  
• Spoke in opposition to the Zoning Bylaw amendments on behalf of Fibreco and other waterfront industrial businesses;  
• Noted that many existing buildings and proposed improvements would become non-conforming;  
• Noted waterfront industrial lands are finite;  
• Stated that tall, compact buildings reduce the footprint and increase efficiency; and,  
• Commented regarding industrial employment.

MOVED by Councillor HANSON  
SECONDED by Councillor BASSAM  
THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1338 (Bylaw 8158)” is given FIRST Reading;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1338 (Bylaw 8158)” is referred to a Public Hearing.

CARRIED
9.10. Public Information Meeting Signs
File No. 08.3060.20/007.17

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor HICKS
THAT this item be laid on the table;

AND THAT no further action be taken.

CARRIED
Opposed: Mayor WALTON and Councillor HANSON

10. REPORTS

10.1. Mayor

Mayor Walton reported on his attendance at:
- The Molly Nye House Bright Christmas event; and,
- The official lighting ceremony for the Parade of Trees at Lynn Valley Village.

10.2. Chief Administrative Officer

Nil

10.3. Councillors

10.3.1. Councillor Hicks reported on his attendance at the official lighting ceremony for the Parade of Trees at Lynn Valley Village.

10.4. Metro Vancouver Committee Appointees

10.4.1. Utilities Committee – Councillor Hicks

Nil

10.4.2. Aboriginal Relations Committee – Councillor Hanson

Nil

10.4.3. Housing Committee – Councillor MacKay-Dunn

Nil

10.4.4. Regional Parks Committee – Councillor Muri

Nil

10.4.5. Zero Waste Committee – Councillor Bassam

Nil
10.4.6. Mayors Council – TransLink – Mayor Walton

Nil

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Nil

12. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT the December 4, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adjourned.

CARRIED

(8:43 pm)

Mayor

Municipal Clerk

Regular Council – December 4, 2017
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8265

A bylaw to amend District of North Vancouver Bylaw 3210, 1965

The Council for The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver enacts as follows:

1. Citation

This bylaw may be cited as “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1362 (Bylaw 8265)”.

2. Amendments

2.1 District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965 is amended as follows:

   a) Section 312, the table “Small Lot Infill Area # / Geographical Description” is amended by adding a row, in numerical order, as follows:

   | “4b”               | Prospect Avenue (between Capilano Road and Cliffridge Avenue) |

   b) Section 312 is amended by adding the map, which is attached to this bylaw as Schedule A, in numerical order.

READ a first time December 4\textsuperscript{th}, 2017

PUBLIC HEARING held

READ a second time

READ a third time

ADOPTED

Mayor

Municipal Clerk
Certified a true copy

__________________________
Municipal Clerk
Schedule A to Bylaw 8265

Small Lot Infill Area 4b
Bylaw 8265

Community Planning Department, District of North Vancouver

SMALL LOT INFILL AREA
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8266

A bylaw to amend District of North Vancouver Bylaw 3210, 1965

The Council for The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver enacts as follows:

1. Citation

This bylaw may be cited as “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1363 (Bylaw 8266)”. 

2. Amendments

2.1 District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965 is amended as follows:

a) Section 312, the table “Small Lot Infill Area # / Geographical Description” is amended by adding a row, in numerical order, as follows:

| "4c" | Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard (between Belvedere Drive and Cliffridge Avenue) as delineated in the corresponding map in Schedule A |

b) Section 312 is amended by adding the map, which is attached to this bylaw as Schedule A, in numerical order.

c) Section 312 is amended by adding the title “SCHEDULE A to Section 312” to the top of the page with the map entitled “Small Lot Infill Plan Area #1”.

READ a first time December 4th, 2017

PUBLIC HEARING held

READ a second time

READ a third time

ADOPTED

Mayor ______________________________ Municipal Clerk ______________________________
Certified a true copy

________________________________________
Municipal Clerk
Small Lot Infill Area 4c
Bylaw 8266

Community Planning Department, District of North Vancouver

Map Created October 2017
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8267

A bylaw to amend District of North Vancouver Bylaw 3210, 1965

The Council for The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver enacts as follows:

1. Citation

This bylaw may be cited as “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1364 (Bylaw 8267)”.

2. Amendments

2.1 District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965 is amended as follows:

a) Section 312, the table “Small Lot Infill Area # / Geographical Description” is amended by adding a row, in numerical order, as follows:

| "4d" | North side of Montroyal Boulevard (between Cliffridge Avenue and Ranger Avenue) |

b) Section 312 is amended by adding the map, which is attached to this bylaw as Schedule A, in numerical order.

READ a first time December 4th, 2017

PUBLIC HEARING held

READ a second time

READ a third time

ADOPTED

Mayor ________________________________ Municipal Clerk ________________________________
Certified a true copy

Municipal Clerk
PUBLIC HEARING

Upper Capilano Small Lot Infill Areas – Zoning Bylaw Amendments

What: A Public Hearing for Bylaws 8265, 8266 and 8267, proposed amendments to the Zoning Bylaw to create three new Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIAs) in the Upper Capilano area.

When: 7 pm, Tuesday, January 16, 2018

Where: Council Chambers, District of North Vancouver Municipal Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC

What changes?
Bylaws 8265, 8266 and 8267 propose to amend the Zoning Bylaw by:
• Designating a SLIA on Prospect Avenue from Capilano Road to Cliffridge Avenue (Bylaw 8265);
• Designating a SLIA on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard from Belvedere Drive/Lane to Cliffridge Avenue (Bylaw 8266); and,
• Designating a SLIA on the north side of Montroyal Boulevard from Cliffridge Avenue to Ranger Avenue (Bylaw 8267).

When can I speak?
We welcome your input Tuesday, January 16, 2018, at 7 pm. You can speak in person by signing up at the hearing, or you can provide a written submission to the Municipal Clerk at input@dnv.org or by mail to Municipal Clerk, District of North Vancouver, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC, V7N 4N5, before the conclusion of the hearing.

Please note that Council may not receive further submissions from the public concerning these bylaw amendments after the conclusion of the public hearing.

Need more info?
Relevant background material and copies of the bylaws are available for review at the Municipal Clerk’s Office or online at dnv.org/public_hearing from December 5, 2017 to January 18, 2018. Office hours are Monday to Friday 8 am to 4:30 pm, except statutory holidays.

Who can I speak to?
If you have questions on the proposed SLIAs, please contact Nicole Foth, Community Planner, at 604-990-2354 or fothn@dnv.org
AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

Monday, September 18, 2017
7:00 p.m.
Council Chamber, Municipal Hall
355 West Queens Road,
North Vancouver, BC

Council Members:
Mayor Richard Walton
Councillor Roger Bassam
Councillor Mathew Bond
Councillor Jim Hanson
Councillor Robin Hicks
Councillor Doug MacKay-Dunn
Councillor Lisa Muri

www.dnv.org
THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

7:00 p.m.
Monday, September 18, 2017
Council Chamber, Municipal Hall,
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver

AGENDA

BROADCAST OF MEETING

- Online at www.dnv.org

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS NOT AVAILABLE FOR DISCUSSION

- Bylaw 8142 – Rezoning Employment Zone – Lynn Creek Light Industrial
- Bylaw 8230 – OCP Amendment 1886-1956 Belle Isle Place & 2046 Curling Road
- Bylaw 8231 – Rezoning 1886-1956 Belle Isle Place & 2046 Curling Road
- Bylaw 8236 – Rezoning 905-959 Premier Street
- Bylaw 8240 – OCP Amendment 1502-1546 Oxford Street
- Bylaw 8241 – Rezoning 1502-1546 Oxford Street
- Bylaw 8225 – Rezoning 756-778 Forsman Avenue

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. September 18, 2017 Regular Meeting Agenda

Recommendation:
THAT the agenda for the September 18, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adopted as circulated, including the addition of any items listed in the agenda addendum.

2. PUBLIC INPUT

(limit of three minutes per speaker to a maximum of thirty minutes total)

3. PROCLAMATIONS

3.1. United Way Day – September 21, 2017

4. RECOGNITIONS

5. DELEGATIONS
6. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

6.1. September 11, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council

Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the September 11, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council are adopted.

7. RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING DECISIONS

7.1. September 11, 2017 Closed Special Meeting of Council
File No. 01.0360.20/076.000

7.1.1. Advisory Oversight Committee Recommendations and Appointments

THAT Adrian Chaster, Amelia Hill, Antje Wahl, Betsy Agar, Betty Forbes, Cynthia Luo, Guy Trotter, Jason Mah, Jenn Ohlhauser, Katie Wilson, Maureen Bragg, Mel Montgomery, Vivian Osiek and Vincent Santacroce be appointed to the OCP Implementation Committee for a term ending October 31, 2018;

AND THAT this resolution be released to the public.

8. COUNCIL WORKSHOP REPORT

9. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

With the consent of Council, any member may request an item be added to the Consent Agenda to be approved without debate.

If a member of the public signs up to speak to an item, it shall be excluded from the Consent Agenda.

Recommendation:
THAT items ________________ are included in the Consent Agenda and are approved without debate.


Recommendation:
THAT the District of North Vancouver Solid Waste Collection services resume the collection of all yard waste that is appropriately presented for collection. Appropriate presentation includes yard waste that is presented in the District provided wheeled carts, large Kraft paper bags and/or bundled sticks not greater than 3 feet in length and tied with natural fibre rope or twine;

AND THAT the District of North Vancouver policy of limiting the amount of yard waste set out for collection be rescinded so that there is no limit in effect for the collection of organic waste.
9.2. Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas

Recommendation:
THAT staff are directed to prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard as described in the September 13, 2017 report of the Community Planner entitled Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;

AND THAT staff are directed to prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Montroyal Boulevard as described in the September 13, 2017 report of the Community Planner entitled Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas.

10. REPORTS

10.1. Mayor

10.2. Chief Administrative Officer

10.3. Councillors

10.4. Metro Vancouver Committee Appointees

10.4.1. Aboriginal Relations Committee – Councillor Hanson

10.4.2. Housing Committee – Councillor MacKay-Dunn

10.4.3. Regional Parks Committee – Councillor Muri

10.4.4. Utilities Committee – Councillor Hicks

10.4.5. Zero Waste Committee – Councillor Bassam

10.4.6. Mayors Council – TransLink – Mayor Walton

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12. ADJOURNMENT

Recommendation:
THAT the September 18, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adjourned.
The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COUNCIL

September 13, 2017
File: 13.6480.30/003.003.000

AUTHOR: Nicole Foth, Community Planner

SUBJECT: Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas

RECOMMENDATIONS
THAT staff be directed to prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard as described in the September 13, 2017 report “Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas”.

AND THAT staff be directed to prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Montroyal Boulevard as described in the September 13, 2017 report “Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas”.

REASON FOR REPORT
To seek Council’s direction to proceed with preparing Zoning Bylaw amendments to include two new Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIAs) in Upper Capilano. As requested by Council at the July 4, 2016 Council Workshop, staff held a second public engagement about the two potential SLIAs within the Upper Capilano Study Area (Figure 1). The majority of respondent households within the two target areas support inclusion in a SLIA.

SUMMARY
The outcome of the second round of public engagement is support for the two potential SLIAs from the respondent households in the Study Area and nearby neighbours, as well as...
within each potential SLIA. Staff recommend designating two new SLIAs in Upper Capilano described as follows, and as illustrated in Figure 1.

1. Two blocks of Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard between Cliffridge Avenue and Belvedere Drive/lane. Of 45 total lots, 24 lots have potential to subdivide into small lots.

2. Three blocks on the north side of Montroyal Boulevard between Ranger Avenue and Cliffridge Avenue. Of 50 total lots, 8 lots have potential to subdivide into small lots.

Designating these two new SLIAs would require a Zoning Bylaw amendment, which Council would consider and refer to Public Hearing.

BACKGROUND
At Council's direction, staff initiated a public engagement process in spring 2016 to assess the extent of community interest in small lot subdivisions in the Upper Capilano area, and to identify related issues. The public engagement process was initiated to respond to enquiries regarding subdivision potential, and to work with community members to develop a long-term vision for neighbourhood character. Most of the houses in the area were built in the 1950s and 1960s and there is continuing interest from homeowners to renovate or redevelop their homes.

Public Process
An initial open house was held in May 2016 where questionnaires were distributed. Staff reported the results of public input at the July 4, 2016 Council Workshop and identified two potential SLIAs in the Upper Capilano Study Area. At that workshop, Council requested further public engagement on the two potential SLIAs, and for staff to explore other housing options with the public. Staff completed a second public engagement for the two potential SLIAs in October 2016. The results were reported to Council in an Information Report dated March 15, 2017 (Attachment 1). The report and the verbatim comments are available on the webpage, www.dnv.org/small-lots.

EXISTING POLICY
Official Community Plan (OCP)
The OCP recognizes there may be opportunities to sensitively introduce more housing choices in established single-family neighbourhoods, while respecting the importance of maintaining single-family uses and neighbourhood character. Examples include small lot subdivisions, designating additional SLIAs, duplexes, and coach houses (Policy 2.3.5, 7.1.2).

Subdivision Best Practices
At the November 5, 2013 Workshop, the Approving Officer subdivision best practices were confirmed by Council as the preferred method of managing subdivisions. The best practices pertain primarily to small lot subdivisions and enhance the review of subdivision applications in the District. The best practices include prohibiting secondary suites on small lots without lane access, no mirror house designs with subdivision, non-tandem parking for suites, and 50% or more small lots on a block face for subdivision. The best practices resulted from concerns related to small lot subdivision and are also applied to locations outside of designated SLIAs.
PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY
The full public input results from the October 2016 public engagement were reported in the Information Report dated March 15, 2017 (Attachment 1). A summary of the results follows.

The purpose of the open house and questionnaire was to determine residents’ level of interest in the two potential SLIAs and other housing options. Staff received 132 completed questionnaires from 104 households in or near the study area. Responses are reported by household in an effort to ensure equitable representation as some households had multiple responses. All responses are available on the webpage, www.dnv.org/small-lots.

There is majority support from the respondent households in or near the study area for the two potential SLIAs compared to those who disagree/strongly disagree (Fig. 2).

Within each of the respective potential SLIAs, the majority of respondent households in each potential SLIA agree/strongly agree with designating their area as a SLIAs compared to those who disagree/strongly disagree (Figure 3 and Figure 4).
The Edgemont and Upper Capilano Community Association (EUCCA) supports the designation of the two potential SLIAs because it aligns with OCP objectives of increasing housing diversity, and there is a majority of public support from the second public engagement (see Attachment 2).

Other public comments on the potential SLIAs were gathered through the public engagement. The top four themes include transportation, neighbourhood character and density, SLIA boundaries, and environment. See Attachment 1 for more details.

*Other Housing Options (duplex, triplex, fourplex)*

As part of the public engagement, respondents were asked about their preference for exploring other housing options (duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes) in the potential SLIAs. There was not strong overall public support for exploring other housing options in the potential SLIAs. See Attachment 1 for more information.

**ANALYSIS**

Given the support from the respondent households for both the Clements/Canyon and Montroyal potential SLIAs, staff recommend designating these areas as new SLIAs. Through the process of public input, staff have identified potential SLIAs to strike a balance between finding opportunities to sensitively introduce more housing choices in established single-family neighbourhoods where public input has been supportive, and maintaining the existing status quo neighbourhood lot pattern in other parts of the Study Area.

**Subdivision Potential**

In the two potential SLIAs, there are currently 95 lots. Thirty-two of these lots have the potential to subdivide into small lots. This represents a potential net increase of up to 33 lots for a total of 128 lots within the two potential SLIAs as shown in Table 1 (one lot in the Montroyal potential SLIA has sufficient width to potentially accommodate three small lots; the number of lots would be subject to subdivision review and approval process). In the whole study area, there are 356 households and 365 privately-owned lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential SLIA</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Build out scenario with SLIAs designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Lots</td>
<td>Other Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements/Canyon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montroyal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Subdivision potential in the two potential SLIAs

On average three to four small lots are created by subdivision across the District each year. In total, subdivision creates an average of eight new single-family lots each year. If Council approves these two potential SLIAs, and the rate of subdivision remains generally the same as in past years, it could take an estimated 8 to 15 years or more for the 32 existing lots within the two proposed SLIAs to be subdivided.
Clements/Canyon potential SLIA
There are several attributes that make the Clements/Canyon potential SLIA amenable to small lots. The location would continue the lot pattern and character from the adjacent existing SLIA to the west. In addition, the potential SLIA also has an existing opened lane between Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard, which would reduce the number of front yard driveways as houses rebuild over time. This would provide public, on-street parking spaces on one side of each block. This is different from the existing SLIA next to this area where driveways are located on both sides of the street, which reduces the supply of on-street parking.

Montroyal potential SLIA
In the Montroyal potential SLIA, there is an established pattern of small lots with few remaining lots to subdivide. Of the 50 total lots, eight have the potential to subdivide into small lots, and 42 are existing small lots. This represents a potential net increase of up to nine houses over time should homeowners choose to pursue subdivision.

Other public input comments
The questionnaire distributed at the second round of public engagement also asked the public for other comments about the potential SLIAs. The top four themes include transportation, neighbourhood character and density, SLIA boundaries, and environment. See Attachment 3 for responses to address these comments.

Options
Some respondents asked for the 1000 block of Prospect Avenue and the five parcels in the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area (DPA) on Clements Avenue to be considered as SLIAs (Figure 5). However, at this time, staff only recommend proceeding with the two potential SLIAs as indicated in this report. Information on these other areas is presented here for Council’s consideration.

Lots in the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area
Five lots on Clements Avenue were excluded for the potential Clements/Canyon SLIA as these lots are in the Slope Hazard DPA. All five large lots (20 metres wide or greater) have...
the potential width to subdivide into small lots. In this area, three of four respondent households expressed desire to be included in the potential SLIA; no response was received from the fifth household.

Staff recommend excluding these properties from the potential SLIA. If the Clements/Canyon potential SLIA is adopted, staff recommend consideration be given to these five lots through the individual rezoning process although the block face may have less than 50% existing small lots, as per the Approving Officer Subdivision Best Practices. If these homeowners wish to pursue subdivision, the sites would be assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine if subdivision would be appropriate, considering the sloped terrain and the Slope Hazard DPA requirements.

An optional recommendation is presented at the end of this report if Council chooses to direct staff to add these five lots to the proposed SLIA. However, if these lots are added to the SLIA, Council would not have the opportunity to review applications on a case-by-case basis through rezoning in order to consider the impacts to the sloped terrain, and hear public input. Subdivision approval is delegated to the Approving Officer for subdivision applications not requiring rezoning or variances.

1000 block of Prospect Avenue
There has been ongoing interest indicated from some households in the 1000 block of Prospect Avenue, from Capilano Road to Cliffridge Avenue, to be included in a SLIA. In this block, eight out of 10 respondent households indicated their desire to be part of a SLIA. There are 37 households in this block on 38 lots. There are 21 large lots (20 metres wide or greater) with the potential width for subdivision into small lots. This block was excluded from a potential SLIA after the initial public engagement because slightly less than half of the respondent households indicated interest in small lots.

At this time, staff recommend limiting the focus to the potential SLIAs discussed in this report, while the 1000 block of Prospect Avenue could be considered as a potential SLIA in the future. However, an optional recommendation is presented at the end of this report if Council chooses to direct staff to review the 1000 block of Prospect Avenue as an additional potential SLIA.

Timing/Approval Process
Should Council approve the recommendations, staff would proceed with drafting Zoning Bylaw amendments for Council’s first reading. The Zoning Bylaw amendment process allows for a public input opportunity at a Public Hearing.

Concurrence
The recommendations of the report have been reviewed with the Building department.

Conclusion
Designating SLIAs is an opportunity identified in the OCP to expand housing choices through sensitive infill in existing single-family neighbourhoods by enabling a variety of house sizes.
SUBJECT: Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas
September 13, 2017

Given the public input and staff analysis of the two potential SLIAs, staff recommend proceeding with the designation of the Clements/Canyon SLIA and the Montroyal SLIA in Upper Capilano. Subdivision of these areas may have the potential to add up to 33 new houses to the area over the long term. Given that there are few remaining places in the District for additional single-family homes, the benefit of adding these additional SLIAs is create housing choices for a wider range of households types and sizes, and allow residents to age in place.

Council may continue to receive applications to subdivide in the form of rezoning and/or subdivision applications outside of designated SLIAs, each of which will be assessed by staff using the Approving Officer Subdivision Best Practices and reported to Council where rezoning is required.

Options
Recommendations:

THAT staff be directed to prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard as described in the September 13, 2017 report “Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas”.

AND THAT staff be directed to prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate Small Lot Infill Area on Montroyal Boulevard as described in the September 13, 2017 report “Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas”.

Additional options:

THAT staff be directed to include the five lots on Clements Avenue in the slope Hazard Development Permit Area that are adjacent to the potential Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard, in the Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard.

THAT staff be directed to review the 1000 block of Prospect Avenue as a potential Small Lot Infill Area.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Foth
Community Planner


Attachment 2: Commentary and background by the Edgemont and Upper Capilano Community Association emailed to Council on August 29, 2017.

Attachment 3: Responses to public comments on the potential SLIAs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th></th>
<th>External Agencies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Sustainable Community Dev.</td>
<td>☐ Clerk’s Office</td>
<td>☐ Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Development Services</td>
<td>☑ Communications</td>
<td>☐ NS Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Utilities</td>
<td>☑ Finance</td>
<td>☐ RCMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Engineering Operations</td>
<td>☑ Fire Services</td>
<td>☐ NVRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Parks</td>
<td>☑ ITS</td>
<td>☐ Museum &amp; Arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Environment</td>
<td>☑ Solicitor</td>
<td>☐ Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Facilities</td>
<td>☑ GIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Human Resources</td>
<td>☑ Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AUTHOR:  Nicole Foth, Community Planner

SUBJECT:  Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas - Public Engagement Results

REASON FOR REPORT:
At the Council Workshop on July 4, 2016, staff presented an overview of public engagement results regarding the potential for small lots in the Upper Capilano Study Area, identified in Figure 1. Council requested that staff complete a second round of public engagement for the two Potential Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIAs) within the Upper Capilano Study Area (Figure 1). Council also expressed interest in further consultation with the same residents about other housing options (e.g. duplex, triplexes and fourplexes). This report summarizes the results of this second round of public engagement which occurred in the fall of 2016.

This information is being provided to Council in advance of a Council Workshop on this subject, which is anticipated to be in early fall 2017. This Workshop is being scheduled after Council’s consideration of the OCP Implementation Review.

Figure 1: Upper Capilano Study Area
SUMMARY:
Residents were asked for input on the two potential SLIAs (Figure 1) and other housing options. Staff received 132 completed questionnaires from 104* households in or near the Study Area.

The results, which are detailed in the Public Engagement Results section and Attachment 2 of this report, are summarized here as follows.

Clements/Canyon potential SLIA:
- There are 45 existing households on 45 lots in this potential SLIA.
- There are 24 existing lots within this potential SLIA that have the potential to be subdivided into small lots. If all 24 lots were subdivided, 24 new lots would be created, bringing the total number of lots in this potential SLIA to 69 (i.e. 45 existing lots plus 24 new lots).
- 18 of 26 respondent households in this potential SLIA indicated they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA.
- In total, 51 of 101* respondent households in the Upper Capilano area indicated they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA.

Montroyal potential SLIA:
- There are 46 existing households and 50 lots in this potential SLIA.
- There are 8 existing lots within this potential SLIA that have the potential to be subdivided into small lots. If all 8 lots were subdivided, 9 new lots would be created bringing the total number of lots in this area to 59 (i.e. 50 existing lots plus 9 new lots)
- 10 of 16 respondent households in this potential SLIA indicated they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA.
- In total, 50 of 98* respondent households in the Upper Capilano area indicated they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA.

* The questionnaire response totals are not the same because some questionnaires were only partially completed.

There was not strong overall public support for exploring alternative housing options (e.g. duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes) in the potential SLIAs. More detail on the residents’ responses to alternative housing options may be found in Attachment 2 of this report.

A number of land owners continue to contact the District about small lot infill subdivision in the Study Area. Consistent with current practice, these requests will be processed on a site-by-site basis.

BACKGROUND:
At Council’s direction, staff initiated a public engagement process in spring 2016 to assess the level of community interest, as well as identify issues and ideas relating to small lot subdivisions in the Upper Capilano area. The majority of houses in the area were built in the 1950s and 1960s and there is growing interest by homeowners to renovate or redevelop their homes. The public engagement process was initiated to respond to enquiries regarding
subdivision potential, and to work with community members to develop a long-term vision for neighbourhood character.

An initial open house and questionnaire was held in May 2016. Staff reported the results of the public input at the July 4, 2016, Council Workshop. At that workshop Council requested further public engagement on the two potential SLIAs in the Upper Capilano Study Area, and to explore other housing options with the public.

The two potential SLIAs are:

- Two blocks of Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard between Clifford Avenue and Belvedere Drive/lane (identified in this report as the “Clements/Canyon potential SLIA”), and
- Three blocks on the north side of Montroyal Boulevard between Ranger Avenue and Clifford Avenue (identified in this report as the “Montroyal potential SLIA”).

See Attachment 1 for further background on existing SLIAs, the Upper Capilano Study Area, and small lot subdivision.

EXISTING POLICY:
Official Community Plan 2011 (OCP)
Respecting the importance of maintaining single-family uses and neighbourhood character, the OCP recognizes there may be opportunities to sensitively introduce more housing choices in established single-family neighbourhoods. Examples include small lot subdivisions, designating additional SLIAs, duplexes, and coach houses (Policy 2.3.5, 7.1.2).

Subdivision Best Practices
At the November 5, 2013 Committee of the Whole meeting, Council considered the Approving Officer’s subdivision best practices. The best practices pertain primarily to small lot subdivisions and enhance the review of subdivision applications in the District. The best practices include prohibitions for: secondary suites on small lots without lane access, mirror image or identical house designs, and tandem parking for suites. In addition, outside of SLIAs generally more than 50% of the block faces needs to already be developed as small lots.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROCESS (Fall 2016):
Residents in the Upper Capilano Study Area (Figure 1) and nearby neighbours were invited to attend an open house on October 5, 2016, from 6:00 to 8:00 pm at Canyon Heights Church. Approximately 100 people attended this open house, and many completed a questionnaire. The purpose of the open house and questionnaire was to determine residents’ level of interest in the two potential SLIAs and other housing options. An online version of the same questionnaire was available on the District website, as well as the open house display material.
Following the open house, staff went door-to-door to households in the two potential SLIAs that had not yet responded to the questionnaire. Staff spoke with these residents or left a postcard encouraging residents to share their views via the online questionnaire.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT RESULTS (Fall 2016):
The public engagement results are presented here, as well as in Attachment 2. In addition, verbatim comments from the open house and questionnaire will be available on the project website, www.dnv.org/small-lots.

Two Potential SLIAs in the Upper Capilano Study Area
Staff received 132 completed questionnaires from 104 households in or near the study area. The results have been presented here at the household level. The total number of household responses to each question varies as some questionnaires were only partially completed. Of the 104 households represented in the questionnaire results, 87 households are located in the Study Area and 17 households are from near the Study Area (i.e. within a 75-metre radius of the study area).

In summary, more respondent households agreed with the two potential SLIAs than disagreed (Figure 2).

For the Clements/Canyon potential SLIA, 51 of 101 respondent households indicated that they agree or strongly agree to the Clements/Canyon potential SLIA, whereas 39 of 101 respondent households indicated they disagree or strongly disagree. Eleven households responded unsure or had a mixed response, while 3 were blank (i.e. not completed).

For the Montroyal potential SLIA, 50 of 98 respondent households indicated that they agree or strongly agree to the Montroyal potential SLIA, whereas 41 of 98 respondent households indicated they disagree or strongly disagree. Seven households responded unsure or had a mixed response, while 6 were blank (i.e. not completed).
In the two potential SLIAs, there are currently 95 lots. Thirty two of these lots have the potential to subdivide into small lots. This represents a potential net increase of up to 33\(^{1}\) lots for a total of 128 lots within the two potential SLIAs as shown in Table 1. In the whole study area, there are 356 households and a total of 365 privately-owned lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential SLIA</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Potential with Designated SLIAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Lots</td>
<td>Other Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements/Canyon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montroyal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Subdivision potential in the two potential SLIAs

On average 3 to 4 small lots are created by subdivision across the entire District each year. If Council approves these two potential SLIAs, and the rate of subdivision remains generally the same as in past years, it could take an estimated 8 to 15 years or more for the 32 existing lots within the two proposed SLIAs to be subdivided.

**Clements/Canyon Potential SLIA**

In this area, 26 households responded of a total 45 households in this potential SLIA (Figure 3). Overall, more respondent households agreed with the SLIA than disagreed. Eighteen of 26 respondent households indicated that they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA, whereas 8 of 26 respondent households indicated they disagree or strongly disagree (Figure 3).

Of the total 45 lots, 24 lots have the potential to subdivide into small lots. This represents a potential net increase of up to 24 houses over time should homeowners choose to pursue subdivision. Five lots on Clements Avenue in the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area are excluded.

---

\(^{1}\) One parcel in the Montroyal potential SLIA has been identified with sufficient width to potentially accommodate two new small lots; the number of lots would be subject to subdivision review and approval process.
Montroyal Potential SLIA
In this area, 16 households responded of a total 46 households in this potential SLIA (Figure 6). Overall, more respondent households agreed with the SLIA than disagreed. Ten of 16 respondent households, indicated that they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA, whereas 4 of 16 respondent households indicated they disagree or strongly disagree (Figure 5). Two households indicated they were unsure or had a mixed response.

Of the total 50 lots, 8 lots have the potential to subdivide into small lots. This represents a potential net increase of up to 9 houses\(^2\) over time, should homeowners choose to pursue subdivision.

\[\text{Figure 5: Montroyal potential SLIA respondent households}\]

\[\text{Figure 6: Montroyal Potential SLIA}\]

\(^2\) One parcel in the Montroyal potential SLIA has been identified with sufficient width to potentially accommodate two new small lots; the number of lots would be subject to subdivision review and approval process.
**Other public comments on the potential SLIAs**

The questionnaire also gathered other comments, concerns, and ideas about the potential SLIAs. Key themes are summarized in Figure 7, and Attachment 2 provides further details. Each themes noted in Figure 7 was mentioned five or more times by respondents.

**Figure 7: Response themes of comments or ideas on the two potential SLIAs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern about traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about Montroyal Blvd traffic, parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Character and Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern about cumulative development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like small lots character, more affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern negative impacts on character, density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLIA Boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include whole study area in SLIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include 1000 block Prospect Ave in SLIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern SLIAs pursued despite lack of support from study area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern about vegetation loss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of times theme mentioned by respondents
While having adequate width for small lot subdivision, 5 lots on Clements Avenue were excluded from the potential Clements/Canyon SLIA as these lots are in the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area (Figure 8). Three of 4 respondent households in this area expressed a desire to include these 5 lots in the potential SLIA. Any subdivision applications in this area would continue to be assessed according to the Approving Officer subdivision best practices, and applicable development permit guidelines.

In the 1000 block of Prospect Avenue, as indicated within the dashed line in Figure 9, from Capilano Road to Cliffridge Avenue, 8 of 10 respondent households indicated their desire to be part of a SLIA. There are 37 households in this block on 38 lots. There are 21 large lots (20 metres wide or greater) with adequate width for small lot subdivision. This block was not suggested as a potential SLIA because slightly less than half of the respondent households indicated interest in small lots during the initial round of public engagement. Although not recommended at this time, this area could be considered a candidate for future SLIA designation.

**Other housing options (duplex, triplex, fourplex)**

Respondents indicated their level of interest in other housing options in the two potential SLIAs (See Attachment 2 for further details). Duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes were discussed as moderately denser residential development forms compared to single-family houses.

In general, more respondent households indicated they were not interested in duplexes, triplexes or fourplexes than households that indicated they were interested these housing options. The Montroyal potential SLIA was an exception where more respondent households were interested in duplexes compared to respondent households not interested.
The public input shows that there is not strong overall support for exploring other housing options (duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes) in the potential SLIAs at this time. Some respondents identified areas that may be more appropriate, such as near centres, density, and transit (10 respondents). The public input results for other housing options and the potential SLIAs are anticipated to be discussed during a future Council Workshop.

**Timing/Approval Process:**
This information is being provided to Council in advance of a Council Workshop on this subject, which is anticipated to be in early fall 2017, after the OCP Implementation Review.

In the meantime, Council may see applications from individual property owners seeking small lot subdivision in this area through the currently available process of site-by-site rezoning applications.

**Conclusion:**
The OCP identifies small lot infill as an opportunity to expand housing choices through sensitive infill in existing single-family neighbourhoods by enabling a variety of lot and house sizes. Staff will present the public engagement results, and options for small lot infill development, at a future Council Workshop.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Foth
Community Planner

Attachment 1: Background
Attachment 2: Public Input Summary
ATTACHMENT 1: BACKGROUND
The following is excerpted from the “Upper Capilano Small Lots Study: Public input and next steps” Report to Council, June 24, 2016.

SLIAs were first adopted by the District in the 1980s. There are currently 23 SLIAs across the District, including one in the Upper Capilano area. In 2004, residents proposed a SLIA for the 1000 block of Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard. At the time, Council deferred the proposal until the Upper Capilano Official Community Plan\(^3\) was reviewed. Since then, the current 2011 District-wide Official Community Plan (OCP) was adopted with policies that support exploration of infill housing (see Existing Policy section).

In April 2014, Council asked staff to look at issues related to small lot subdivisions in the Upper Capilano area in response to reoccurring issues that typically arise with individual subdivision and rezoning applications, such as parking and traffic. As a result of Council’s direction, staff embarked on a public engagement process to assess the level of interest, as well as issues and ideas relating to small lot subdivisions in the Upper Capilano area.

The process seeks to develop a long-term vision for housing needs and neighbourhood character now and in the future as homes rebuild in this area. The existing SLIA in Upper Capilano is nearly exhausted of subdivision potential (two eligible lots remain). Staff receive frequent enquires at the planning counter about the subdivision potential of lots in the Upper Capilano area outside the existing SLIA.

Study area
The selected study area for exploring the public’s interest in small lots is located in Upper Capilano approximately between Montroyal Boulevard, Ranger Avenue, Prospect Avenue, and Capilano Road. It is adjacent to the existing Small Lot Infill Area 4A. A majority of houses in the study area were built in the 1950s and 1960s with many of these homes currently changing or likely to be renovated or rebuilt. Consultation at this juncture presents a timely opportunity to ask residents about their ideas for the future of the neighbourhood.

Small lot subdivision
The study area is zoned RS3, which permits a minimum lot width of 18 metres. Small lots are considered to be less than 13.875 metres (45 feet) wide and a minimum of 10 metres (33 feet) wide. To create a small lot outside of a SLIA, a property owner must apply for rezoning in addition to subdivision. The rezoning requires a text amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to add the lot to the Zoning Bylaw Section 310 “Special Minimum Lot Sizes”.

A SLIA establishes a long-term vision for lot sizes in an area and provides greater clarity to residents regarding what type of lot sizes they may expect in the future. If approved by Council, new SLIAs would be added to the Zoning Bylaw. Zoning Bylaw Section 312 “Small Lot Infill Areas” permits parcels in SLIAs to have a minimum lot width of 10 metres, and specifies the locations of approved SLIAs. Within an approved SLIA, an applicant seeking a small lot subdivision would apply for subdivision, but no rezoning would be required.

\(^3\) Repealed with the adoption of the current Official Community Plan, but remains a policy reference document.
ATTACHMENT 2: PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY

This attachment provides a summary of the responses and key themes from the questionnaire at and following the October 5, 2016 open house.

Invitation letters were mailed to property owners in the Upper Capilano Study Area and nearby neighbours within a 75-metre radius of the study area, which is the same distribution area as the initial open house in May 2016. The questionnaire was provided in hardcopy at the open house, and digitally online after the open house for a total period of about four weeks.

Summary statistics
132 individual questionnaire responses were received from addresses within the study area and within a 75-metre radius (the notification area) of the study area, representing 104 households (lots with addresses).

It is noted that 16 individual questionnaire responses were received that did not have an address or were from addresses beyond a 75-metre radius of the study area. Because the public input is summarized by household and with a focus on the study area and households nearby, these responses are not included in the following summary of questionnaire responses. The input will be available in the verbatim comments on the project website, www.dnv.org/small-lots.

Questionnaire Responses
The questionnaire responses are shown by household (addresses) within the study area and a 75-metre radius. If households submitted more than one questionnaire, the responses to questions are grouped by affirmative or negative, for example strongly agree and agree. If a household submitted more than one questionnaire with both affirmative and negative responses, these answers are reported as 'mixed response'.

For the open text questions, response themes that were mentioned five or more times by respondents are highlighted in this summary.
Question 1: Please indicate whether or not you agree with the potential Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard?

Number of Respondent Households

- Strongly Agree or Agree
- Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree)
- Strongly Disagree or Disagree

Total (study area and nearby neighbours): 101
Households in Clements/Canyon potential SLIA: 26

Total: 98
Blank: 6

Question 2: Please indicate whether or not you agree with the potential Small Lot Infill Area on Montroyal Boulevard?

Number of Respondent Households

- Strongly Agree or Agree
- Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree)
- Strongly Disagree or Disagree

Total (study area and nearby neighbours): 98
Households in Montroyal potential SLIA: 16

Total: 158
Blank: 1
Question 3: Do you have other comments or ideas about either (or both) of the potential SLIAs in Upper Capilano?

Response themes

**Transportation**
- Concern about traffic
- Concern about parking
- Concern about Montroyal Blvd traffic, parking

**Neighbourhood Character and Density**
- Concern about cumulative development
- Like small lots character, more affordable
- Concern negative impacts on character, density

**SLIA Boundaries**
- Include whole study area in SLIA
- Include 1000 block Prospect Ave in SLIA
- Concern SLIAs pursued despite lack of support from study area

**Environment**
- Concern about vegetation loss

Further details about the key response themes

**Transportation**
- Traffic concerns include: increase with development, congestion, poor transit.
- Parking concerns include: on-street, sufficient off-street parking, should park on property, garages used for storage.
- Montroyal Boulevard concerns include: traffic volume, lack of on-street parking, safety, driveways, no sidewalk on one side.

**Neighbourhood character and density**
- Cumulative development concerns include: impact of overall Upper Capilano/North Shore development, lack of infrastructure to support additional density, Capilano Heights Chinese Restaurant redevelopment with SLIAs.
- Small lot support includes: fits with existing small lots, more affordable single-family housing compared to houses on large lots.
- Negative impact concerns include: changing character and increasing density.
SLIA boundaries
- Support for the whole study area to be considered for a SLIA.
- Support for 1000 block Prospect Ave (Capilano Road to Cliffridge Ave) to be considered for a SLIA.
- Concern that SLIAs are being pursued and considered despite lack of support from overall study area as a whole during the initial public input.

Environment
- Vegetation concerns include loss of trees, greenery, natural resources

Question 4 to 6: Please indicate your level of interest in other housing forms in the potential Small Lot Infill Areas.

Question 4: I am interested in the potential for duplexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondent Households</th>
<th>Very or Somewhat interested</th>
<th>Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree)</th>
<th>Not very or Not at all interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (study area and nearby neighbours)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in Clements/Canyon potential SLIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in Monroyal potential SLIA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Blank 96 8
Question 5: I am interested in the potential for triplexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondent Households</th>
<th>Total (study area and nearby neighbours)</th>
<th>Households in Clements/Canyon potential SLIA</th>
<th>Households in Montroyal potential SLIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very or Somewhat interested
Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree)
Not very or Not at all interested

Question 6: I am interested in the potential for fourplexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondent Households</th>
<th>Total (study area and nearby neighbours)</th>
<th>Households in Clements/Canyon potential SLIA</th>
<th>Households in Montroyal potential SLIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very or Somewhat interested
Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree)
Not very or Not at all interested
Question 7: Should we consider other locations for other housing options in the Upper Capilano neighbourhood, besides the potential Small Lot Infill Areas? If so, please describe.

Locations suggested in Upper Capilano outside the study area include: Capilano Road, south of Montroyal Blvd, Edgemont, Highlands, near Montroyal school.

Locations suggested within study area include: 1000 block Prospect Ave, Clements Ave, Prospect Ave, Montroyal Blvd.

Some responses identified concerns about other housing options: lack of amenities and transit, affordability, negative impact on property values, negative impact on character, increase in traffic, lack of parking.

Question 8: Do you have other comments or ideas about other housing options?

Comments about housing affordability include: large houses expensive, small houses more affordable, small houses not affordable, more affordable housing for families, need to provide housing options.
UPPER CAPILANO POTENTIAL SMALL LOT INFILL AREAS
MARCH 15, 2017 STAFF INFORMATION REPORT TO COUNCIL
EUCCA COMMENTARY

BACKGROUND

The 2011 OCP contains policy and objectives to increase diversity of housing choice in the single family neighbourhoods by introducing Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIA’s) to provide more options to suit different residents’ ages, needs and incomes.

Upper Capilano has been identified by Staff as an appropriate area to introduce SLIA’s due to an extensive history of Small Lot development, including an existing SLIA established in 1982.

In May 2016, Staff commenced public engagement with residents by holding an open house to obtain input on this initiative. The area selected for consideration was extensive being bounded by Capilano Rd., Ranger Ave., Montroyal Blvd. and Prospect Ave.

The results of the public input were presented to Council at a Workshop on July 4, 2016 and included a recommendation to establish 2 Small Lot Areas, subsequently titled Clements/Canyon SLIA and Montroyal SLIA.

Following discussion, Council requested that Staff complete a second round of public engagement for these 2 potential SLIA’s within the greater Upper Capilano Study Area defined above.

During the Workshop it also appeared that Council could benefit from additional background information to provide context to this Staff proposal as it passes through the approval process. Accordingly, the Executive of EUCCA prepared a report entitled “Backgrounder – Upper Capilano SLIA Proposal” which was submitted to Council on August 3, 2016. A copy of the “Backgrounder” is appended to this Commentary as a refresher.

The second round of public engagement on the 2 proposed SLIA’s was carried out by means of an open house held on October 5, 2016. The results of the input received were submitted on March 15, 2017 by means of an Information Report to Council entitled “Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas – Public Engagement Results”.

The Information Report is the subject of this EUCCA Commentary.
COMMENTARY

Summary of Results

- Within the Clements/Canyon potential SLIA: 18 respondents support, while 8 oppose the SLIA
- Within the Montroyal SLIA: 10 respondents support, while 4 oppose the SLIA
- Within the larger original Study Area: 51 respondents support, while 39 oppose the Clements/Canyon SLIA
- Within the larger original Study Area: 50 respondents support, while 41 oppose the Montroyal SLIA

These results show that a significant majority (70%) of respondents living within the proposed SLIA’s are in favour of the rezoning.

There is also positive support (55%) within the much larger original Study Area for establishing these 2 small proposed SLIA’s.

On the basis of this positive outcome, establishment of the 2 SLIA’s should proceed.

Excluded Lots on Clements Ave.

5 lots on Clements have been excluded from the SLIA because they are in the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area. 3 of the 4 respondent households object to this and we agree that exclusion is premature at this time. These lots will eventually be subject to replacement as the houses age and the remedial work to stabilize the slope and mitigate any hazard should be determined at that time by geotechnical investigation as required by the DPA. This work would be required whether the objective is to build 1 or 2 houses on the lot and enable development decisions to be based on good geotechnical information.

Excluded Lots on 1000 Block Prospect Ave.

This block was excluded from the proposed Clements/Canyon SLIA by a very slim margin following the first round of public engagement. In this second round of public engagement, 8 out of 10 respondents asked to be part of a SLIA. We submit that this is a substantial level of support and recommend that this area also be designated a SLIA at this time before the opportunity is lost due to redevelopment of the 66’ lots with large, expensive houses.
RECOMMENDATIONS

We support adoption of the Clements/Canyon and Montroyal SLIA’s at the earliest opportunity. They comply with the policies and objectives in the 2011 OCP to increase housing diversity in the residential neighbourhoods and have broad local and community support.

Due to the age of the current housing stock in Upper Capilano, more and more older houses on large lots are being replaced with large, expensive monster houses. Time is, therefore, of the essence to subdivide 66’ lots to 33’ while the opportunity still exists to provide a more affordable housing option.

We recommend inclusion of the 5 homes in the Slope Hazard DPA in the Clement/Canyon SLIA at this time. Re-development options to be determined by geotechnical investigations at the time of application.

We recommend inclusion of the 1000 Block Prospect Ave. in a SLIA at this time while the opportunity for subdivision of the remaining 66’ lots still exists.

Observing the trends in neighbourhood housing redevelopment confirms that opposing a SLIA will not contribute to “preserving neighbourhood character”. In fact, it means ongoing support for construction of large, overbuilt homes unaffordable to most. This has far more impact on neighbourhood character in terms of the built environment and the vibrancy of community life.

Executive
Edgemont & Upper Capilano Community Association (EUCCA)
BACKGROUNDER – UPPER CAPILANO SLIA PROPOSAL

INTRODUCTION

The issue of an extended SLIA previously came before Council in January 2005. Almost 12 years have elapsed since then and only 2 members remain from that Council. There has also been significant turnover of senior Planning staff in the interim with very few members remaining who are familiar with the history of this initiative. This subject is now returning to Council commencing with the COW workshop held on July 4, 2016 which several Executive Committee members of the Edgemont and Upper Capilano Community Association (EUCCA) attended. During this discussion, it appeared that Council could benefit from additional background information to provide context to this latest Staff proposal. This document has, therefore, been prepared by EUCCA Executive members to provide this information to Council.

The notes refer specifically to the proposed extension of the existing SLIA on Canyon Blvd. and Clements Ave. from Belvedere Ave./Lane east to Cliffridge Ave. However, many of the points are applicable to the other proposed SLIA on Montroyal Blvd.

SUMMARY

The proposed SLIA provides an opportunity to:
- Enable less costly housing to be available in character with the neighbourhood
- Provide additional housing with little or no DNV infrastructure costs
- Provide additional housing in an area already served by existing public transit, cycling and pedestrian alternatives to key centres (Vancouver, Edgemont Village, Lonsdale Quay, etc)
- Provide housing adjacent to, or easily accessible to, excellent schools, existing local parks, activity playing fields, regional parks
- Avoid arbitrary dislocation of residents – any change will be by owner’s choice

HISTORY

The area was originally surveyed as 33’ lots in the 1940’s. Since land was relatively inexpensive in these days, purchasers bought a mix of single or double lots on which to build houses. Initially, the double lots were not consolidated and were registered as 2 separate 33’ lots with a single family home straddling the pair. In the 1960’s, the local ratepayers association, finding land still relatively cheap, petitioned the District to discontinue sale of 33’ lots and sell only 66’ lots made up of consolidated pairs of 33’ lots. There were also some property tax advantages at the time to lot consolidation. As a result, there is now a mixed pattern of 33’ and 66’ lots in the area.

In the early 80’s land values began to increase substantially over building costs which led owners of un-consolidated 66’ lots to apply for building permits to develop their properties as 2 separate 33’ lots as they were still registered as such. This led, in turn, to owners of consolidated 66’ lots, which were co-mingled in the same area, to request subdivision so they could build on 33’ lots. The District’s response to these requests to re-subdivide previously consolidated properties was to establish the Small Lot Infill Area (SLIA) which exists today.
The eastern boundary of the existing SLIA has always been contentious. There is no north-south street at that location so that the area has the character of one continuous block running from Capilano to Cliffridge. The logic of having half this long block as 33’ lots and the other half as 66’ lots has long been questioned by the residents.

In 2004, the owners to the east of the existing SLIA boundary became alarmed when the first “monster” house was built on a consolidated 66’ lot on Clements Ave. This alerted everyone to the fact that the high land values encouraged the development of overbuilt, expensive houses on the 66’ lots which are out of character for the area. In due course, this concern led to an application from the residents of this area to extend the existing SLIA boundary eastward to Cliffridge. The application was supported by 83% of the residents and cited community benefits and considerations still relevant today. The outcome of Council’s deliberations on the application was to support the Staff recommendation by a 4-3 vote that the proposal be deferred until the next update of the OCP, anticipated by 2009.

The official update to the OCP was finally issued in 2011 and specifically addresses the SLIA opportunity. The Plan Policy states that, although 75% - 90% of future housing development is to take place in the town centres, the balance of 10% - 25% is to be achieved by introducing appropriate housing choices such as Small Lot Infill in the neighbourhoods. The stated objective of the District in invoking this policy is to provide more options to suit different residents’ ages, needs and incomes.

It is in response to this OCP policy directive that Staff has undertaken the present Upper Capilano SLIA study.

CONSIDERATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THIS SLIA

Integrity of the DNV Planning Process

The proposed rezoning responds to the Policies and Objectives in the 2011 OCP.

Community Support

In 2004, 83% of residents participated in an application to extend the existing SLIA. Some 12 years later, the recent informal survey by Staff shows a similar level of resident support.

Neighbourhood Character

The area is adjacent to an existing SLIA which ends mid-block, so the predominant character is essentially small lot. The SLIA designation would help arrest the inroads of large overbuilt houses on 66’ lots which are not sensitive to the area both in scale and style.

Relative Affordability

Additional subdivision would permit new smaller more affordable houses which promotes a more balanced demographic mix. Although houses in this area cannot be described as inexpensive, it is a fact that houses built on 33’ lots are less expensive than those built on 66’ lots.
Specifically, a review of actual real estate sales and listing date in the area during the spring of 2016 reveals the following for houses of the same vintage:

- for a first generation-aged house, the price on a 66’ lot is 50% higher than an old house on a 33’ lot
- for a newer home, the price on a 66’ lot is 78% higher than a comparable-aged house on a 33’ lot
- for a brand new home, the price on a 66’ lot is 82% higher than a new house on a 33’ lot
- an older home on a 66’ lot is compatible in price than a new home on a 33’ lot

In all cases, the most affordable home is on a 33’ lot.

Recent sales activity in the area reveals that the 33’ lot homes are primarily being bought by people with young children which will improve neighbourhood vitality and help support Montroyal Primary School, which, it is understood, is having difficulty achieving full kindergarten enrollment. Regrettably, the often largely unoccupied new houses on 66’ lots do not offer the same contribution to community life!

**Transportation**

The area is well served by Coast Mountain bus. It is within 5 minutes walk of 4 routes – numbers 232, 236, 246 and 247. In fact, the #247 bus bisects the area. These routes provide ready access to Downtown Vancouver, Edgemont Village, Lonsdale Quay, etc. Many residents use these services to commute daily by bus to their employment downtown. The area is also convenient to the major bicycle route being expanded on Capilano Rd.

**Schools**

The area is within walking distance of Montroyal Primary and Handsworth Secondary Schools. There is no need for parents to chauffeur children to school.

**Recreation/Amenities**

The area is well served with amenities such as Cleveland Dam Metro Vancouver Park, Cleveland baseball and soccer fields, Prospect playground and tennis courts, not to mention easy access to the Grouse Grind from your front door! In addition, a restaurant, strip mall and corner store also conveniently service the area.

**Tax Contribution**

The infill housing would capitalize on existing infrastructure and services without impacting raw land. It would contribute additional revenue to the Municipal tax base as well as other Metro levies.
Opportunity

The average age of a house on a 66’ lot in the area is 55-60 years. Consequently, the current high land value means that homes in this area are ready for redevelopment. Subdivision would permit existing owners to downsize to new affordable houses and remain in the area while releasing 33’ lots to give others an opportunity to locate here. Importantly, any changes would not forcibly dislocate existing residents as any changes will only come about through the choice of existing owners. Unfortunately, rejecting the SLIA would not result in preserving the status quo in the neighbourhood. The existing 66’ lots will continue to be redeveloped at the current rapid pace resulting in wholesale tree removal to accommodate massive houses with secondary suites and built to the maximum FSR and building coverage. In time, these will come to define the “character” of the neighbourhood!

EUCCA Support

As indicated in the attached letter of May 13, 2016, EUCCA’s Executive Committee fully supports the Staff initiative to identify and designate additional Small Lot Infill Areas in Upper Capilano in accordance with the policies and objectives in the 2011 OCP. Based on the foregoing history and planning considerations, the Executive supports the establishment of the 2 SLIA’s recommended in the Staff Report. These areas demonstrably offer a suitable opportunity to provide a greater diversity of housing choice and enhance relative affordability.
Attn.: Nicole Foth

Re: Upper Capilano - Small Lot Infill Area Project

Dear Nicole,

The Executive of the Edgemont & Upper Capilano Community Association is fully supportive of the Planning Department project now underway to identify the potential for and designate additional Small Lot Infill Areas in Upper Capilano.

The 2011 OCP calls for growth in future housing development to be in the range of between 10 to 25% in the residential areas and identifies Small Lot Infill as an appropriate option to provide greater diversity of housing choice and enhance affordability. The present project is now addressing this opportunity.

The study area in question has a long history of 33’ small lot development commencing as far back as the 1940’s. Most of the lots were originally surveyed as 33’ and it is difficult to identify an area in the District more suitable for extending this lot pattern.

We would be pleased to provide input and advice from a community perspective as the project progresses and look forward to a positive outcome.

Regards,

Brian Platts, Secretary

CC. Dan Milburn
Sarah Dal Santo
EUCCA Executive
ATTACHMENT 3: Responses to public comments on the potential SLIAs

Key themes from the public input received from the second public engagement’s questionnaire are summarized below. Each of the following themes were mentioned five or more times by respondents. See the Information Report dated March 15, 2017 (Attachment 1) for more information.

Transportation
Several public responses commented about transportation, including concerns about traffic and parking in general, and on Montroyal Boulevard. If all homeowners of large lots in the potential SLIAs decided to subdivide, at full built out of 33 new small lots, estimates indicate a net increase of traffic volume would add 0.55 vehicles per minute during PM peak hour with these trips distributed across the streets (ITE Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition, land use code 210). During most of the day, the trip numbers would be lower. As small lot subdivisions are anticipated to be spread out over time, this increase is anticipated to be gradual. The two potential SLIAs are close to transit (routes 232, 236, 247, and 246), and dedicated cycling facilities on Capilano Road.

In the Clements/Canyon potential SLIA, the existing open lane on one side of each block would allow for on-street parking as redeveloped lots would take access from the rear lane. To reduce the impact of driveways on the streetscape, narrower driveway entrances can be explored while ensuring access and parking requirements. It is recognized that on-street parking along Montroyal Boulevard is more constrained with the presence of driveways, however on-site parking is required for all single-family houses (Zoning Bylaw): two on-site parking spaces, or three with a secondary suite and in non-tandem configuration are sought with subdivision.

Access from a lower classification street by Montroyal Boulevard is preferable. However if it is not feasible and the driveway is required to be located on Montroyal Boulevard, the impact of up to nine driveways of the 50 lots in this section is likely minimal. The driveway would need to ensure that sight distance is adequate and any other technical criteria met through the subdivision review and approval process, as with any subdivision application.

Neighbourhood character/density
Some public responses commented about neighbourhood character and density, including concerns about cumulative development, those who like the small lot character and comparative affordability, concerns about negative impacts on character and density.

Staff acknowledge that it is increasingly crucial to coordinate the timing of major development projects as the OCP is implemented in order to reduce impacts on residents. Single-family neighbourhoods including Upper Capilano are undergoing renewal as houses age, the Capilano area recently experienced road detours and construction inconvenience for Metro Vancouver’s Capilano Water Main project, and development in Edgemont Village.

The District’s Construction Traffic Management group, the Project Delivery group, and the Development Planning and Engineering department are actively working to better coordinate and reduce impacts on residents where possible as many parts of the District are being renewed.
In terms of utilities, the Utilities Department has no immediate concerns for the proposed SLIAs for water or sewer, and in general capital renewal will be added to the capital plan as needed. A benefit of subdivision, for example, is that renewed sewer connections reduce water infiltration into the sewer which helps manage capacity.

Other comments about neighbourhood character show a mix of views. Some respondents like the character of small lots and their comparable affordability in contrast to large lots, while others expressed concern about how small lots would change to the existing character. Given that there are few remaining places in the District for additional single-family homes, the OCP provides direction to consider opportunities to introduce sensitive infill housing in existing neighbourhoods where appropriate with the community. Infill housing can create housing choices for a wider range of households types and sizes, and allow residents to age in place.

**SLIA boundaries**

Some respondents commented on the location of SLIA boundaries. Some expressed they would like the whole Study Area designated as a SLIA, while others do not want SLIAs pursued at all. There is ongoing interest in the 1000 block of Prospect Avenue for a SLIA from eight of 10 respondents, as well as some interest from the lots in the Slope Hazard DPA beside the potential Clements/Canyon SLIA (three of four respondent households).

Respondents’ comments illustrate a diversity of views about SLIA boundaries, and through the public process staff are seeking to strike a balance between finding opportunities to sensitively introduce more housing choices in established single-family neighbourhoods where public input has been supportive, and maintaining the existing status quo neighbourhood lot pattern in other parts of the Study Area.

**Environment**

Some respondents expressed concern about tree and vegetation loss. This concern is heard from areas where renewal of older single-family houses happens regardless of lot size. The District seeks to balance homeowners’ ability to rebuild older houses and the impact on the environment with policies to lessen the impact of redevelopment, such as the Tree Protection Bylaw and the Good Neighbour program.
DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Council for the District of North Vancouver held at 7:03 pm on Monday, September 18, 2017 in the Council Chambers of the District Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, British Columbia.

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

Staff: Mr. D. Stuart, Chief Administrative Officer
       Ms. C. Grant, General Manager – Corporate Services
       Mr. G. Joyce, General Manager – Engineering, Parks & Facilities
       Mr. D. Milburn, General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits
       Mr. L. Jensen – Manager – Engineering Operations
       Mr. T. Lancaster, Manager – Community Planning
       Ms. L. Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk
       Ms. C. Archer, Confidential Council Clerk
       Ms. N. Foth, Community Planner

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. September 18, 2017 Regular Meeting Agenda

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor BASSAM
THAT the agenda for the September 18, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

With the consent of Council, Mayor Walton varied the agenda as follows:

3. PROCLAMATIONS

3.1. United Way Day – September 21, 2017

2. PUBLIC INPUT

2.1. Ms. Yolande Westwell-Roper, 1000 Block Canyon Boulevard:
    • Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;
    • Commented on the need for housing and green space;
    • Remarked on the size of new homes built on redeveloped sixty-six foot lots;
• Commented on the suitability of the identified streets for a small lot infill area; and,
• Noted the concerns raised by area residents have been addressed by District staff.

2.2. **Mr. Andrew Westwell-Roper, 1000 Block Canyon Boulevard:**
- Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;
- Commented on the process and urged Council to move ahead with approving Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIA’s);
- Noted parking and transportation concerns identified in the 2016 resident survey have been addressed by District staff;
- Commented on parking and transportation in current SLIA’s; and,
- Commented on the size of new homes built on redeveloped sixty-six foot lots.

2.3. **Mr. Gordon Cornwall, 1000 Block Canyon Boulevard:**
- Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;
- Commented on the age of existing homes in the area and the associated repair costs; and,
- Remarked that subdivision of properties in the proposed area could allow existing residents to stay in place.

2.4. **Ms. Claudia Cornwall, 1000 Block Canyon Boulevard:**
- Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;
- Commented on the need for more affordable housing options; and,
- Commented on the environmental impact of larger houses.

2.5. **Mr. Zeljko Stojsavijevic, 1000 Block Canyon Boulevard:**
- Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas; and,
- Commented on the age and state of repair of current homes in the proposed area.

Councillor MURI left the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

2.6. **Ms. Jane Nicol, 1000 Block Canyon Boulevard:**
- Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;
- Commented on housing affordability for families and the impact on local schools;
- Noted parking has not been a problem in the existing SLIA area; and,
- Commented on the length of the process to date.

2.7. **Ms. Ilona Kuligowska, 1000 Block Canyon Boulevard:**
- Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;
- Commented on the state of repair of older homes and the need for replacement; and,
• Commented on the need for affordable homes for families and the impact of changing demographics on local schools.

Councillor MURI returned to the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

2.8. Ms. Darya Ostadsavaie, 1000 Block Clements Avenue:
• Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;
• Commented on the need for affordable homes for young families;
• Commented on population growth; and,
• Noted subdivision of larger lots would reduce the need to remove trees to clear more land for homes.

2.9. Mr. Warren McKay, 1000 Block Prospect Avenue:
• Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas; and,
• Presented a copy of a petition of residents in favour of designating a portion of Prospect Avenue as a Small Lot Infill Area.

2.10. Mr. Adrian Chaster, 3000 Block Crescentview Drive:
• Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;
• Commented on the size of newly constructed homes and housing affordability;
• Noted the area has access to transit, schools and parks;
• Opined that existing local amenities are sufficient to serve an area with increased density; and,
• Urged Council to direct staff to draft the proposed bylaws.

4. RECOGNITIONS

Nil

5. DELEGATIONS

Nil

6. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

6.1. September 11, 2017 Regular Council Meeting

MOVED by Councillor MACKAY-DUNN
SECONDED by Councillor HICKS
THAT the minutes of the September 11, 2017 Regular Council meeting are adopted as amended.

CARRIED

7. RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING DECISIONS

7.1. September 11, 2017 Closed Special Meeting of Council
7.1.1. **Advisory Oversight Committee Recommendations and Appointments**

File No. 01.0360.20/076.000

THAT Adrian Chaster, Amelia Hill, Antje Wahl, Betsy Agar, Betty Forbes, Cynthia Luo, Guy Trotter, Jason Mah, Jenn Ohlhauser, Katie Wilson, Maureen Bragg, Mel Montgomery, Vivian Osiek and Vincent Santacroce be appointed to the OCP Implementation Committee for a term ending October 31, 2018,

AND THAT this resolution be released to the public.

8. **COUNCIL WORKSHOP REPORT**

Nil

9. **REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF**

9.2. **Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas**

File No. 13.6480.30/003.003.000

Public Input:

Mr. Grig Cameron, 1000 Clements Avenue:

- Spoke in favour of item 9.2 regarding Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;
- Noted the proposal is consistent with the Official Community Plan and has the support of the Edgemont and Upper Capilano Community Association;
- Opined that allowing subdivision of large lots will help retain the existing character of the neighbourhood;
- Commented on the size of new homes on redeveloped sixty-six foot lots;
- Commented on the age of existing houses in the neighbourhood and rising property values; and,
- Commented on the public engagement process.
The motion was bifurcated at the request of Council.

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor HICKS
THAT staff are directed to prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard as described in the September 13, 2017 report of the Community Planner entitled Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas;

AND THAT staff are directed to prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Montroyal Boulevard as described in the September 13, 2017 report of the Community Planner entitled Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas.

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor HICKS
THAT staff be directed to include the five lots on Clements Avenue in the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area that are adjacent to the potential Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard, in the Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard;

CARRIED
Opposed: Councillors HANSON, MACKAY-DUNN and MURI

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor HICKS
THAT staff be directed to propose a Zoning Bylaw amendment to designate a Small Lot Infill Area on the 1000 block on Prospect Avenue;

CARRIED
Opposed: Mayor WALTON, Councillors HANSON and MURI

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor HICKS
THAT staff be directed to prepare a bylaw amendment to allow duplex form on the Small Lot Infill Areas.

DEFEATED
Opposed: Mayor WALTON, Councillors HANSON, MACKAY-DUNN and MURI

The meeting recessed at 8:21 p.m. and resumed at 8:23 p.m.

Regular Council – September 18, 2017

File No.

MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON

THAT the District of North Vancouver Solid Waste Collection services resume the collection of all yard waste that is appropriately presented for collection. Appropriate presentation includes yard waste that is presented in the District provided wheeled carts, large Kraft paper bags and/or bundled sticks not greater than 3 feet in length and tied with natural fibre rope or twine;

AND THAT the District of North Vancouver policy of limiting the amount of yard waste set out for collection be rescinded so that there is no limit in effect for the collection of organic waste.

DEFEATED

Opposed: Mayor WALTON, Councillors BOND, HICKS, MACKAY-DUNN and MURI

10. REPORTS

10.1. Mayor

Mayor Walton reported on his attendance at:
• The opening of the Lynn Valley Link trail with Councillor Hanson and Hicks; and,
• The 2017 Terry Fox Run in North Vancouver.

10.2. Chief Administrative Officer

Nil

10.3. Councillors

10.3.1. Councillor Bassam reported on his attendance at the 30th anniversary of the North Shore Diners Club Congregate Meals Program

10.3.2. Councillor Hicks reported on his attendance at the North Vancouver Community Arts Council Annual General Meeting.

10.3.3. Councillor Hanson reported on his attendance, as Acting Mayor, at the Sunrise Care Facility concert series sponsored by the BC Care Providers Association.

10.4. Metro Vancouver Committee Appointees

10.4.1. Aboriginal Relations Committee – Councillor Hanson

Nil
10.4.2. Housing Committee – Councillor MacKay-Dunn
Nil

10.4.3. Regional Parks Committee – Councillor Muri
Nil

10.4.4. Utilities Committee – Councillor Hicks
Nil

10.4.5. Zero Waste Committee – Councillor Bassam
Nil

10.4.6. Mayors Council – TransLink – Mayor Walton
Nil

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
Nil

12. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor HICKS
THAT the September 18, 2017 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adjourned.

CARRIED
(8:54pm)

_________________________
Mayor

_________________________
Municipal Clerk
The District of North Vancouver
INFORMATION REPORT TO COUNCIL

March 15, 2017
File: 13.6480.30/003.003.000

AUTHOR: Nicole Foth, Community Planner

SUBJECT: Upper Capilano Potential Small Lot Infill Areas - Public Engagement Results

REASON FOR REPORT:
At the Council Workshop on July 4, 2016, staff presented an overview of public engagement results regarding the potential for small lots in the Upper Capilano Study Area, identified in Figure 1. Council requested that staff complete a second round of public engagement for the two Potential Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIAs) within the Upper Capilano Study Area (Figure 1). Council also expressed interest in further consultation with the same residents about other housing options (e.g. duplex, triplexes and fourplexes). This report summarizes the results of this second round of public engagement which occurred in the fall of 2016.

This information is being provided to Council in advance of a Council Workshop on this subject, which is anticipated to be in early fall 2017. This Workshop is being scheduled after Council's consideration of the OCP Implementation Review.

Figure 1: Upper Capilano Study Area
SUMMARY:
Residents were asked for input on the two potential SLIAs (Figure 1) and other housing options. Staff received 132 completed questionnaires from 104* households in or near the Study Area.

The results, which are detailed in the Public Engagement Results section and Attachment 2 of this report, are summarized here as follows.

Clements/Canyon potential SLIA:
- There are 45 existing households on 45 lots in this potential SLIA.
- There are 24 existing lots within this potential SLIA that have the potential to be subdivided into small lots. If all 24 lots were subdivided, 24 new lots would be created, bringing the total number of lots in this potential SLIA to 69 (i.e. 45 existing lots plus 24 new lots).
- 18 of 26 respondent households in this potential SLIA indicated they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA.
- In total, 51 of 101* respondent households in the Upper Capilano area indicated they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA.

Montroyal potential SLIA:
- There are 46 existing households and 50 lots in this potential SLIA.
- There are 8 existing lots within this potential SLIA that have the potential to be subdivided into small lots. If all 8 lots were subdivided, 9 new lots would be created bringing the total number of lots in this area to 59 (i.e. 50 existing lots plus 9 new lots).
- 10 of 16 respondent households in this potential SLIA indicated they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA.
- In total, 50 of 98* respondent households in the Upper Capilano area indicated they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA.

* The questionnaire response totals are not the same because some questionnaires were only partially completed.

There was not strong overall public support for exploring alternative housing options (e.g. duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes) in the potential SLIAs. More detail on the residents' responses to alternative housing options may be found in Attachment 2 of this report.

A number of land owners continue to contact the District about small lot infill subdivision in the Study Area. Consistent with current practice, these requests will be processed on a site-by-site basis.

BACKGROUND:
At Council's direction, staff initiated a public engagement process in spring 2016 to assess the level of community interest, as well as identify issues and ideas relating to small lot subdivisions in the Upper Capilano area. The majority of houses in the area were built in the 1950s and 1960s and there is growing interest by homeowners to renovate or redevelop their homes. The public engagement process was initiated to respond to enquiries regarding
subdivision potential, and to work with community members to develop a long-term vision for
neighbourhood character.

An initial open house and questionnaire was held in May 2016. Staff reported the results of
the public input at the July 4, 2016, Council Workshop. At that workshop Council requested
further public engagement on the two potential SLIAs in the Upper Capilano Study Area, and
to explore other housing options with the public.

The two potential SLIAs are:

- Two blocks of Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard between Cliffridge Avenue
  and Belvedere Drive/lane (identified in this report as the "Clements/Canyon potential
  SLIA"), and
- Three blocks on the north side of Montroyal Boulevard between Ranger Avenue and
  Cliffridge Avenue (identified in this report as the "Montroyal potential SLIA").

See Attachment 1 for further background on existing SLIAs, the Upper Capilano Study Area,
and small lot subdivision.

EXISTING POLICY:
Official Community Plan 2011 (OCP)
Respecting the importance of maintaining single-family uses and neighbourhood character,
the OCP recognizes there may be opportunities to sensitively introduce more housing
choices in established single-family neighbourhoods. Examples include small lot
subdivisions, designating additional SLIAs, duplexes, and coach houses (Policy 2.3.5, 7.1.2).

Subdivision Best Practices
At the November 5, 2013 Committee of the Whole meeting, Council considered the
Approving Officer’s subdivision best practices. The best practices pertain primarily to small
lot subdivisions and enhance the review of subdivision applications in the District. The best
practices include prohibitions for: secondary suites on small lots without lane access, mirror
image or identical house designs, and tandem parking for suites. In addition, outside of
SLIAs generally more than 50% of the block faces needs to already be developed as small
lots.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROCESS (Fall 2016):
Residents in the Upper Capilano Study Area (Figure 1) and nearby neighbours were invited
to attend an open house on October 5, 2016, from 6:00 to 8:00 pm at Canyon Heights
Church. Approximately 100 people attended this open house, and many completed a
questionnaire. The purpose of the open house and questionnaire was to determine residents’
level of interest in the two potential SLIAs and other housing options. An online version of the
same questionnaire was available on the District website, as well as the open house display
material.
Following the open house, staff went door-to-door to households in the two potential SLIAs that had not yet responded to the questionnaire. Staff spoke with these residents or left a postcard encouraging residents to share their views via the online questionnaire.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT RESULTS (Fall 2016):
The public engagement results are presented here, as well as in Attachment 2. In addition, verbatim comments from the open house and questionnaire will be available on the project website, www.dnv.org/small-lots.

Two Potential SLIAs in the Upper Capilano Study Area
Staff received 132 completed questionnaires from 104 households in or near the study area. The results have been presented here at the household level. The total number of household responses to each question varies as some questionnaires were only partially completed. Of the 104 households represented in the questionnaire results, 87 households are located in the Study Area and 17 households are from near the Study Area (i.e. within a 75-metre radius of the study area).

In summary, more respondent households agreed with the two potential SLIAs than disagreed (Figure 2).

For the Clements/Canyon potential SLIA, 51 of 101 respondent households indicated that they agree or strongly agree to the Clements/Canyon potential SLIA, whereas 39 of 101 respondent households indicated they disagree or strongly disagree. Eleven households responded unsure or had a mixed response, while 3 were blank (i.e. not completed).

For the Montroyal potential SLIA, 50 of 98 respondent households indicated that they agree or strongly agree to the Montroyal potential SLIA, whereas 41 of 98 respondent households indicated they disagree or strongly disagree. Seven households responded unsure or had a mixed response, while 6 were blank (i.e. not completed).
In the two potential SLIAs, there are currently 95 lots. Thirty-two of these lots have the potential to subdivide into small lots. This represents a potential net increase of up to 33\(^1\) lots for a total of 128 lots within the two potential SLIAs as shown in Table 1. In the whole study area, there are 356 households and a total of 365 privately-owned lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential SLIA</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Potential with Designated SLIAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Lots</td>
<td>Other Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements/Canyon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montroyal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Subdivision potential in the two potential SLIAs

On average 3 to 4 small lots are created by subdivision across the entire District each year. If Council approves these two potential SLIAs, and the rate of subdivision remains generally the same as in past years, it could take an estimated 8 to 15 years or more for the 32 existing lots within the two proposed SLIAs to be subdivided.

**Clements/Canyon Potential SLIA**

In this area, 26 households responded of a total 45 households in this potential SLIA (Figure 3). Overall, more respondent households agreed with the SLIA than disagreed. Eighteen of 26 respondent households indicated that they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA, whereas 8 of 26 respondent households indicated they disagree or strongly disagree (Figure 3).

Of the total 45 lots, 24 lots have the potential to subdivide into small lots. This represents a potential net increase of up to 24 houses over time should homeowners choose to pursue subdivision. Five lots on Clements Avenue in the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area are excluded.

---

\(^1\) One parcel in the Montroyal potential SLIA has been identified with sufficient width to potentially accommodate two new small lots; the number of lots would be subject to subdivision review and approval process.
Montroyal Potential SLIA
In this area, 16 households responded of a total 46 households in this potential SLIA (Figure 6). Overall, more respondent households agreed with the SLIA than disagreed. Ten of 16 respondent households, indicated that they agree or strongly agree to this area becoming a designated SLIA, whereas 4 of 16 respondent households indicated they disagree or strongly disagree (Figure 5). Two households indicated they were unsure or had a mixed response.

Of the total 50 lots, 8 lots have the potential to subdivide into small lots. This represents a potential net increase of up to 9 houses\(^2\) over time, should homeowners choose to pursue subdivision.

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c}
& \text{Strongly Agree or Agree} & \text{Unsure or mixed responses agree/disagree} \\
\hline
\text{Number of Respondent Households} & 20 & 10 \\
\text{Total} & 16 & \\
\text{Blank} & 1 & \\
\end{array}\]

Figure 5: Montroyal potential SLIA respondent households

---

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{CLIFFRIDGE AVE} \\
\text{MONTROYAL BLVD} \\
\text{RANGER AVE} \\
\text{Potential Small Lot Infill Area}
\end{array}\]

Figure 6: Montroyal Potential SLIA

\(^2\) One parcel in the Montroyal potential SLIA has been identified with sufficient width to potentially accommodate two new small lots; the number of lots would be subject to subdivision review and approval process.
Other public comments on the potential SLIAs

The questionnaire also gathered other comments, concerns, and ideas about the potential SLIAs. Key themes are summarized in Figure 7, and Attachment 2 provides further details. Each theme noted in Figure 7 was mentioned five or more times by respondents.

Figure 7: Response themes of comments or ideas on the two potential SLIAs

- **Transportation**
  - Concern about traffic
  - Concern about parking
  - Concern about Montroyal Blvd traffic, parking

- **Neighbourhood Character and Density**
  - Concern about cumulative development
  - Like small lots character, more affordable
  - Concern negative impacts on character, density

- **SLIA Boundaries**
  - Include whole study area in SLIA
  - Include 1000 block Prospect Ave in SLIA
  - Concern SLIAs pursued despite lack of support from study area

- **Environment**
  - Concern about vegetation loss

Number of times theme mentioned by respondents
While having adequate width for small lot subdivision, 5 lots on Clements Avenue were excluded from the potential Clements/Canyon SLIA as these lots are in the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area (Figure 8). Three of 4 respondent households in this area expressed a desire to include these 5 lots in the potential SLIA. Any subdivision applications in this area would continue to be assessed according to the Approving Officer subdivision best practices, and applicable development permit guidelines.

In the 1000 block of Prospect Avenue, as indicated within the dashed line in Figure 9, from Capilano Road to Cliffridge Avenue, 8 of 10 respondent households indicated their desire to be part of a SLIA. There are 37 households in this block on 38 lots. There are 21 large lots (20 metres wide or greater) with adequate width for small lot subdivision. This block was not suggested as a potential SLIA because slightly less than half of the respondent households indicated interest in small lots during the initial round of public engagement. Although not recommended at this time, this area could be considered a candidate for future SLIA designation.

**Other housing options (duplex, triplex, fourplex)**

Respondents indicated their level of interest in other housing options in the two potential SLIAs (See Attachment 2 for further details). Duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes were discussed as moderately denser residential development forms compared to single-family houses.

In general, more respondent households indicated they were not interested in duplexes, triplexes or fourplexes than households that indicated they were interested these housing options. The Montroyal potential SLIA was an exception where more respondent households were interested in duplexes compared to respondent households not interested.
The public input shows that there is not strong overall support for exploring other housing options (duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes) in the potential SLIAs at this time. Some respondents identified areas that may be more appropriate, such as near centres, density, and transit (10 respondents). The public input results for other housing options and the potential SLIAs are anticipated to be discussed during a future Council Workshop.

Timing/Approval Process:
This information is being provided to Council in advance of a Council Workshop on this subject, which is anticipated to be in early fall 2017, after the OCP Implementation Review.

In the meantime, Council may see applications from individual property owners seeking small lot subdivision in this area through the currently available process of site-by-site rezoning applications.

Conclusion:
The OCP identifies small lot infill as an opportunity to expand housing choices through sensitive infill in existing single-family neighbourhoods by enabling a variety of lot and house sizes. Staff will present the public engagement results, and options for small lot infill development, at a future Council Workshop.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Foth
Community Planner

Attachment 1: Background
Attachment 2: Public Input Summary
ATTACHMENT 1: BACKGROUND

The following is excerpted from the “Upper Capilano Small Lots Study: Public input and next steps” Report to Council, June 24, 2016.

SLIAs were first adopted by the District in the 1980s. There are currently 23 SLIAs across the District, including one in the Upper Capilano area. In 2004, residents proposed a SLIA for the 1000 block of Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard. At the time, Council deferred the proposal until the Upper Capilano Official Community Plan3 was reviewed. Since then, the current 2011 District-wide Official Community Plan (OCP) was adopted with policies that support exploration of infill housing (see Existing Policy section).

In April 2014, Council asked staff to look at issues related to small lot subdivisions in the Upper Capilano area in response to reoccurring issues that typically arise with individual subdivision and rezoning applications, such as parking and traffic. As a result of Council’s direction, staff embarked on a public engagement process to assess the level of interest, as well as issues and ideas relating to small lot subdivisions in the Upper Capilano area.

The process seeks to develop a long-term vision for housing needs and neighbourhood character now and in the future as homes rebuild in this area. The existing SLIA in Upper Capilano is nearly exhausted of subdivision potential (two eligible lots remain). Staff receive frequent enquiries at the planning counter about the subdivision potential of lots in the Upper Capilano area outside the existing SLIA.

Study area
The selected study area for exploring the public’s interest in small lots is located in Upper Capilano approximately between Montroyal Boulevard, Ranger Avenue, Prospect Avenue, and Capilano Road. It is adjacent to the existing Small Lot Infill Area 4A. A majority of houses in the study area were built in the 1950s and 1960s with many of these homes currently changing or likely to be renovated or rebuilt. Consultation at this juncture presents a timely opportunity to ask residents about their ideas for the future of the neighbourhood.

Small lot subdivision
The study area is zoned RS3, which permits a minimum lot width of 18 metres. Small lots are considered to be less than 13.875 metres (45 feet) wide and a minimum of 10 metres (33 feet) wide. To create a small lot outside of a SLIA, a property owner must apply for rezoning in addition to subdivision. The rezoning requires a text amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to add the lot to the Zoning Bylaw Section 310 “Special Minimum Lot Sizes”.

A SLIA establishes a long-term vision for lot sizes in an area and provides greater clarity to residents regarding what type of lot sizes they may expect in the future. If approved by Council, new SLIAs would be added to the Zoning Bylaw. Zoning Bylaw Section 312 “Small Lot Infill Areas” permits parcels in SLIAs to have a minimum lot width of 10 metres, and specifies the locations of approved SLIAs. Within an approved SLIA, an applicant seeking a small lot subdivision would apply for subdivision, but no rezoning would be required.

3 Repealed with the adoption of the current Official Community Plan, but remains a policy reference document.
ATTACHMENT 2: PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY

This attachment provides a summary of the responses and key themes from the questionnaire at and following the October 5, 2016 open house.

Invitation letters were mailed to property owners in the Upper Capilano Study Area and nearby neighbours within a 75-metre radius of the study area, which is the same distribution area as the initial open house in May 2016. The questionnaire was provided in hardcopy at the open house, and digitally online after the open house for a total period of about four weeks.

Summary statistics
132 individual questionnaire responses were received from addresses within the study area and within a 75-metre radius (the notification area) of the study area, representing 104 households (lots with addresses).

It is noted that 16 individual questionnaire responses were received that did not have an address or were from addresses beyond a 75-metre radius of the study area. Because the public input is summarized by household and with a focus on the study area and households nearby, these responses are not included in the following summary of questionnaire responses. The input will be available in the verbatim comments on the project website, www.dnv.org/small-lots.

Questionnaire Responses
The questionnaire responses are shown by household (addresses) within the study area and a 75-metre radius. If households submitted more than one questionnaire, the responses to questions are grouped by affirmative or negative, for example strongly agree and agree. If a household submitted more than one questionnaire with both affirmative and negative responses, these answers are reported as ‘mixed response’.

For the open text questions, response themes that were mentioned five or more times by respondents are highlighted in this summary.
Question 1: Please indicate whether or not you agree with the potential Small Lot Infill Area on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondent Households</th>
<th>Strongly Agree or Agree</th>
<th>Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree or Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (study area and nearby neighbours)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in Clements/Canyon potential SLIA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: Please indicate whether or not you agree with the potential Small Lot Infill Area on Montroyal Boulevard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondent Households</th>
<th>Strongly Agree or Agree</th>
<th>Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree or Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (study area and nearby neighbours)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in Montroyal potential SLIA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: 3122032
Question 3: Do you have other comments or ideas about either (or both) of the potential SLIAs in Upper Capilano?

Response themes

Transportation
- Concern about traffic
- Concern about parking
- Concern about Montroyal Blvd traffic, parking

Neighbourhood Character and Density
- Concern about cumulative development
- Like small lots character, more affordable
- Concern negative impacts on character, density

SLIA Boundaries
- Include whole study area in SLIA
- Include 1000 block Prospect Ave in SLIA
- Concern SLIAs pursued despite lack of support from study area

Environment
- Concern about vegetation loss

Number of times theme mentioned by respondents

Further details about the key response themes

Transportation
- Traffic concerns include: increase with development, congestion, poor transit.
- Parking concerns include: on-street, sufficient off-street parking, should park on property, garages used for storage.
- Montroyal Boulevard concerns include: traffic volume, lack of on-street parking, safety, driveways, no sidewalk on one side.

Neighbourhood character and density
- Cumulative development concerns include: impact of overall Upper Capilano/North Shore development, lack of infrastructure to support additional density, Capilano Heights Chinese Restaurant redevelopment with SLIAs.
- Small lot support includes: fits with existing small lots, more affordable single-family housing compared to houses on large lots.
- Negative impact concerns include: changing character and increasing density.
SLIA boundaries
- Support for the whole study area to be considered for a SLIA.
- Support for 1000 block Prospect Ave (Capilano Road to Cliffridge Ave) to be considered for a SLIA.
- Concern that SLIAs are being pursued and considered despite lack of support from overall study area as a whole during the initial public input.

Environment
- Vegetation concerns include loss of trees, greenery, natural resources

Question 4 to 6: Please indicate your level of interest in other housing forms in the potential Small Lot Infill Areas.

Question 4: I am interested in the potential for duplexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondent Households</th>
<th>Very or Somewhat interested</th>
<th>Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree)</th>
<th>Not very or Not at all interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (study area and nearby neighbours)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in Clements/Canyon potential SLIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in Montroyal potential SLIA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 96
Blank: 8

Households in Clements/Canyon potential SLIA:
- Total: 25
- Blank: 1

Households in Montroyal potential SLIA:
- Total: 16
- Blank: 1
Question 5: I am interested in the potential for triplexes.

Total (study area and nearby neighbours):
- Very or Somewhat interested: 26
- Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree): 11
- Not very or Not at all interested: 55

Households in Clements/Canyon potential SLIA:
- Very or Somewhat interested: 7
- Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree): 14
- Not very or Not at all interested: 3

Households in Montroyal potential SLIA:
- Very or Somewhat interested: 7
- Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree): 7
- Not very or Not at all interested: 1

Total Households: 92
Blank: 12

Question 6: I am interested in the potential for fourplexes.

Total (study area and nearby neighbours):
- Very or Somewhat interested: 24
- Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree): 7
- Not very or Not at all interested: 61

Households in Clements/Canyon potential SLIA:
- Very or Somewhat interested: 9
- Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree): 15
- Not very or Not at all interested: 1

Households in Montroyal potential SLIA:
- Very or Somewhat interested: 5
- Unsure or mixed responses (agree/disagree): 9
- Not very or Not at all interested: 1

Total Households: 92
Blank: 12
Question 7: Should we consider other locations for other housing options in the Upper Capilano neighbourhood, besides the potential Small Lot Infill Areas? If so, please describe.

Suggested locations

- Near centres, density and transit
- Original study area
- Locations in Upper Capilano outside study area
- Locations within the original study area

Locations suggested in Upper Capilano outside the study area include: Capilano Road, south of Montroyal Blvd, Edgemont, Highlands, near Montroyal school.

Locations suggested within study area include: 1000 block Prospect Ave, Clements Ave, Prospect Ave, Montroyal Blvd.

Some responses identified concerns about other housing options: lack of amenities and transit, affordability, negative impact on property values, negative impact on character, increase in traffic, lack of parking.

Question 8: Do you have other comments or ideas about other housing options?

Response themes

- Do not want SLIAs, other housing forms, density
- Comments about housing affordability
- Interest in coach houses
- Concern about increasing traffic and congestion

Comments about housing affordability include: large houses expensive, small houses more affordable, small houses not affordable, more affordable housing for families, need to provide housing options.
The District of North Vancouver

INFORMATION REPORT TO COUNCIL

September 20, 2016
File: 13.6480.30/003.003.000

AUTHOR: Nicole Foth, Community Planner

SUBJECT: Upper Capilano Small Lots Study: Public input and next steps

REASON FOR REPORT:
1. To provide Council with a revised summary of the public feedback and lot information.
2. To summarize the next steps in the public engagement process for the Upper Capilano Small Lots Study.

SUMMARY: On July 4, 2016, Council directed staff to proceed with a public engagement process for two potential Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIAs) within the original study area identified in the map below. In addition, Council directed staff to engage the public in a discussion on other forms of infill housing in the two potential SLIAs. Finally, Council requested more detailed information on the public feedback and study area in the previous staff report.

![Diagram of study area]

The two potential Small Lot Infill Areas identified within the original study area

ANALYSIS:
Lot information and public input
Council requested a revised summary of the public feedback received. Attachment 1 of this report provides a breakdown of total households, total lots, lot width categories, and the public feedback received by staff.
Public engagement
The first public engagement opportunity was an open house in May 2016 attended by approximately 200 residents. A questionnaire was made available to the attendees and provided online. Staff received 138 completed questionnaires and additional input via email and letters. This represents a participation rate of 29% of households in the original study area (104 households out of 356 households). While this is an excellent response rate for the overall study area, not all parts of the study area were equally represented, with some areas responding at a higher rate than others. This limitation in the results was acknowledged by staff and noted by Council.

As recommended, Council directed staff to complete additional public engagement to ensure local residents had sufficient opportunity to make their views known to Council. Therefore, staff will host a second public engagement event on Wednesday, October 5, 2016 from 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm at the Canyon Heights Church (4840 Capilano Road). Invitation letters have been mailed to each property owner within the original study area and nearby neighbours. The event is also advertised online.

At this open house staff will seek public input on the creation of two potential SLIAs as identified in the above map and explore community interest in other infill housing forms within these two potential SLIAs (example: duplexes). In addition to the open house event, the display material and a questionnaire will be available online at www.dnv.org/small-lots after the open house, from October 6 to October 27, 2016. Staff will assess the response rate from the potential SLIAs and determine if further outreach is needed. Depending on the outcomes, additional consultation measures may be used to gather the views of residents including canvassing or targeted communications.

Timing/Approval Process: Following the online input period, and after the public input information is compiled, staff will report back at a Council Workshop before year end.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Foth
Community Planner

Attachment 1: Study area lot information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Community Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Agencies:
- Library Board
- NS Health
- RCMP
- NVRC
- Museum & Arch.
- Other:
Attachment 1: Study area lot information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area numbers correspond with map attached</th>
<th>Total study area</th>
<th>Area 1 Northeast</th>
<th>Area 2 Montroyal (east of Cliffridge)</th>
<th>Area 3 Montroyal (west of Cliffridge)</th>
<th>Area 4 Canyon/Clements</th>
<th>Area 5 Prospect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total lots by Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total privately-owned lots (with or</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without an address)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total DNV-owned lots</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lots</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lot sizes by Area (by lot frontage width)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area width</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>20 m (66 ft) or greater</th>
<th>Greater than 13.875 m (45 ft) and less than 20 m (66 ft)</th>
<th>Less than 13.875 m (45 ft)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 13.875 m (45 ft) and less than 20 m (66 ft)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 13.875 m (45 ft)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lots</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total households and responses by Area

Are you interested in further exploring the potential for creating a Small Lot Infill Area somewhere within the study area? (May 2016 questionnaire and public input)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area width</th>
<th>Total households</th>
<th>Total responses by household</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Household response rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>356</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Staff recognize the lower number of responses for Areas 2 and 3. Staff will encourage more household participation in the next phase of public engagement with the focus on households in the potential SLIAs.

1 Sufficient width to subdivide into two 10 m lots
2 Does not have sufficient width to subdivide into two 10 m lots
3 Categorized as a small lot in Approving Officer Subdivision Best Practices
4 There are fewer households than total lots as some lots do not have a house or one house straddles two lots.
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COUNCIL WORKSHOP
6:00 p.m.
Monday, July 4, 2016
Committee Room, Municipal Hall,
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver

AGENDA

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. July 4, 2016 Council Workshop Agenda

Recommendation:
THAT the agenda for the July 4, 2016 Council Workshop be adopted as circulated, including the addition of any items listed in the agenda addendum.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1. June 14, 2016 Council Workshop

Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the June 14, 2016 Council Workshop meeting are adopted.

2.2. June 20, 2016 Council Workshop

Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the June 20, 2016 Council Workshop meeting are adopted.

2.3. June 21, 2016 Council Workshop

Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the June 21, 2016 Council Workshop meeting are adopted.

3. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

3.1. July 2016 Town Centre Update and Early Input Opportunity

File No.

Recommendation:
THAT the June 27, 2016 memo of the Acting General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits entitled July 2016 Town Centre Update and Early Input Opportunity be received for information.

3.2. Upper Capilano Small Lots Study: Public Input and Next Steps

File No. 13.6480.30/003.000
Recommendation:
THAT staff be directed to proceed with a public engagement and rezoning process for the two potential Small Lot Infill Areas identified in the June 24, 2016 report of the Community Planner entitled Upper Capilano Small Lots Study: Public Input and Next Steps.

4. PUBLIC INPUT

(maximum of ten minutes total)

5. ADJOURNMENT

Recommendation:
THAT the July 4, 2016 Council Workshop be adjourned.
The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COMMITTEE

June 24, 2016
File: 13.6480.30/003.003.000

AUTHOR: Nicole Foth, Community Planner

SUBJECT: Upper Capilano Small Lots Study: Public input and next steps

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT staff be directed to proceed with a public engagement and rezoning process for the two potential Small Lot Infill Areas identified in this report.

REASON FOR REPORT:
This report updates Council on the results of the public input received at and after the Upper Capilano small lots open house held on May 3, 2016. At the July 4 Council Workshop, staff are seeking Council’s direction on whether to proceed toward the creation of two new Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIAs).

SUMMARY:
Based on public feedback and analysis, staff recommend continuing the process towards the creation of two new SLIAs in Upper Capilano, as follows and as illustrated in Figure 1.

1. Two blocks of Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard between Cliffridge Avenue and Belvedere Drive/lane with 15 of 19 households indicating interest in a Small Lot Infill Area, however excluding properties in the slope hazard Development Permit Area. There are 20 existing small lots of 45 total lots.

2. Three blocks on Montroyal Boulevard between Ranger Avenue and Cliffridge Avenue with 3 of 3 households indicating interest in a Small Lot Infill Area. There is a strong pattern of small lots. There are 42 existing small lots of 50 total lots.

Staff recommend no further exploration of potential SLIAs in the remainder of the study area at this time.
BACKGROUND:
SLIAs were first adopted by the District in the 1980s. There are currently 23 SLIAs across the District, including one in the Upper Capilano area. In 2004, residents proposed a SLIA for the 1000 block of Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard. At the time, Council deferred the proposal until the Upper Capilano Official Community Plan1 was reviewed. Since then, the current 2011 District-wide Official Community Plan (OCP) was adopted with policies that support exploration of infill housing (see Existing Policy section).

In April 2014, Council asked staff to look at issues related to small lot subdivisions in the Upper Capilano area in response to reoccurring issues that typically arise with individual subdivision and rezoning applications, such as parking and traffic. As a result of Council’s direction, staff embarked on a public engagement process to assess the level of interest, as well as issues and ideas relating to small lot subdivisions in the Upper Capilano area.

The process seeks to develop a long-term vision for housing needs and neighbourhood character now and in the future as homes rebuild in this area. The existing SLIA in Upper Capilano is nearly exhausted of subdivision potential (two eligible lots remain). Staff receive frequent enquires at the planning counter about the subdivision potential of lots in the Upper Capilano area outside the existing SLIA.

Study area
The selected study area for exploring the public's interest in small lots is located in Upper Capilano approximately between Montroyal Boulevard, Ranger Avenue, Prospect Avenue, and Capilano Road (Figure 1). It is adjacent to the existing Small Lot Infill Area 4A. A majority of houses in the study area were built in the 1950s and 1960s with many of these homes currently changing or likely to be renovated or rebuilt. Consultation at this juncture presents a timely opportunity to ask residents about their ideas for the future of the neighbourhood.

Small lot subdivision
The study area is zoned RS3, which permits a minimum lot width of 18 metres. Small lots are considered to be less than 13.875 metres (45 feet) wide and a minimum of 10 metres (33

---

1 Repealed with the adoption of the current Official Community Plan, but remains a policy reference document.
feet) wide. To create a small lot outside of a SLIA, a property owner must apply for rezoning in addition to subdivision. The rezoning requires a text amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to add the lot to the Zoning Bylaw Section 310 “Special Minimum Lot Sizes”.

A SLIA establishes a long-term vision for lot sizes in an area and provides greater clarity to residents regarding what type of lot sizes they may expect in the future. If approved by Council, new SLIAs would be added to the Zoning Bylaw. Zoning Bylaw Section 312 “Small Lot Infill Areas” permits parcels in SLIAs to have a minimum lot width of 10 metres, and specifies the locations of approved SLIAs. Within an approved SLIA, an applicant seeking a small lot subdivision would apply for subdivision, but no rezoning would be required.

EXISTING POLICY:
Official Community Plan (OCP)
Respecting the importance of maintaining single-family uses and neighbourhood character, the OCP recognizes there may be opportunities to sensitively introduce more housing choices in established single-family neighbourhoods. Examples include small lot subdivisions, designating additional SLIAs, duplexes, and coach houses (Policy 2.3.5, 7.1.2).

Subdivision Best Practices
At the November 5, 2013 Committee of the Whole, the Committee affirmed Approving Officer subdivision best practices. The best practices pertain primarily to small lot subdivisions and enhance the review of subdivision applications in the District. It includes prohibiting secondary suites on small lots without lane access, no mirror house designs with subdivision, non-tandem parking for suites, and 50% or more small lots on a block face for subdivision.

The best practices resulted from concerns related to small lot subdivision.

PUBLIC INPUT:
Open house
A drop-in open house was held on May 3, 2016 from 6:00 to 8:00 pm at Canyon Heights Elementary School Gym. Invitation letters were mailed to property owners in the study area and nearby neighbours within a 75-metre radius of the study area. Approximately 200 people participated in this event.

The purpose of the open house was to provide background information on SLIAs and to find out if there is community interest in opportunities for more small lots in this area. Nine display boards provided information about small lots, explained the purpose and intent of this inquiry about small lots, and encouraged the public to identify potential considerations for small lot areas. Participants shared their thoughts and ideas on a series of display boards and a questionnaire. An online version of the same questionnaire was available on the District website from May 4 to May 17, 2016.

Participation
Staff received 138 questionnaires from addresses in or near the study area. In addition, staff received public input via email and letters, including an anonymously-written form letter encouraging opposition to ‘small-lot housing experiments’ (26 form letters were received).
sum, staff received public input from 104 households (addresses) in the study area, and 23 households near the study area. The Edgemont and Upper Capilano Community Association executive provided a letter of support for the process and encouraged the designation of additional SLIAs in Upper Capilano as an appropriate course of action to provide greater housing diversity.

Summary of results
The key question at this stage was to determine the public's level of interest in the potential for creating one or more SLIAs somewhere within the study area. Responses to this question are reported by household in an effort to ensure equitable representation as some households had multiple responses. While overall 59 of 104 households (57%) in the whole study area indicated they are not interested in small lots, the results differ substantially when analysed geographically. The findings are reported in five geographic areas in Figure 2 and as follows (numbers correspond with Figure 2).

1. In the northeast area, 17 of 66 households (26%) indicated interest in small lots.

2. In the 1000 block of Prospect Avenue, 8 of 15 households (47%) indicated interest in small lots.

3. In the two blocks of Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard between Cliffridge Avenue and Belvedere Drive/lane, 15 of 19 households (79%) indicated interest in small lots.

4. In the three blocks on Montroyal Boulevard between Ranger Avenue and Cliffridge Avenue, 3 of 3 households (100%) indicated interest in small lots. It is noted there is a limited number of households that provided input in this area.

5. In the two blocks of Montroyal Boulevard between Cliffridge Avenue and Capilano Road, 1 of 1 household (100%) indicated interest in small lots. It is noted there is a limited number of households that provided input in this area.

A map of study area lot sizes is in Attachment 1.

The questionnaire asked about other aspects and issues around small lots. The input is summarized under key themes identified below. Full results of the questionnaire and public input are in Attachment 2.

Subdivision interest: 40 of 94 (43%) respondents who identified as property owners of 20 metre (66 ft.) lots indicated they would be interested in subdividing. This shows there is interest in the area, but that not necessarily that most property owners would subdivide if given the option to do so.
*Note that areas 4 and 5 had a limited number of households provide input. The information displayed represents received feedback from the initial phase of public input.
Lane access: A common theme from the comments indicated that the public values unopened lanes for trees and privacy. Others noted that lanes help with fewer cars parked on the street. Some felt that opened lanes should not be the only criteria for a SLIA since there are few opened lanes in the area.

Driveways and parking: Interest in narrower driveways to enable on-street parking varied widely whether the respondent was interested in SLIAs or not. Of those interested in SLIAs, 27 of 59 respondents (46%) were interested in narrower driveways, while 13 of 74 (18%) of respondents not interested in SLIAs favoured narrower driveways. Some noted concern that parking needs for a house should be accommodated on private property, garages should be used for vehicles, limited on-street parking, and that pedestrian safety on streets is an issue. With concerns about driveways and parking, and some interest in narrower driveways as one solution, these issues and other potential solutions may be further explored as part of further consultation if there is direction to proceed with the potential SLIAs.

Environment and geography: 71 of 138 respondents (52%) agreed that small lots should be avoided in environmental hazard areas (slope hazard and streamside protection Development Permit Areas). Comments showed concern about loss of trees and vegetation. Some felt that development would be acceptable if it met protection or engineering requirements. Others noted that development in environmental DPAs should be considered on case-by-case basis.

Other comments: Responses indicated other aspects to take into account include traffic (amount, congestion, infrastructure), transit (frequency, proximity), schools (proximity, capacity), that density should be near centres or closer to amenities, and having a mix of small and large lots per block.

This input on aspects related to small lots is valuable and informs the recommendations of this report with identification of potential SLIAs. If the process moves forward, public input will be welcomed on the potential SLIAs and the aspects and issues related to the areas.

ANALYSIS:
Considering public input, staff recommend proceeding with a modest exploration of SLIAs on the two blocks of Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard between Cliffridge Avenue and Belvedere Drive/lane that has 15 of 19 households (79%) supportive, and the three blocks on Montroyal Boulevard between Ranger Avenue and Cliffridge Avenue that already has 42 existing small lots of 50 total lots (82% of each block). No further exploration of other areas is recommended at this time given the limited interest, no clear consensus, or where there is not a strong existing small lot pattern. These areas may be considered in the future, in an incremental approach, as public input and other factors change.

Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard (Cliffridge Avenue to Belvedere Drive/lane)
These two blocks are potential candidates for a SLIA (Figure 3). There is strong interest from households in these two blocks. Moreover, the interest to form a SLIA from residents in this area has been on-going for over a decade as it is the same area of the 2004 resident-proposed SLIA. It is directly adjacent to the existing SLIA, as both blocks are along the same
streets. Without a through north-south street in the middle, it gives the impression of a continuous block with the existing SLIA. Another attribute is the existing opened lane, one of few in the study area that permits rear access between Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard to allow on-street parking space. In accordance with the Approving Officer subdivision best practices, secondary suites are permitted for small lots with opened rear lane access and must have a non-tandem off-street parking arrangement; small lots without lane access would be prohibited from secondary suites and secured by restrictive covenant.

The existing small lot pattern of most block faces is less than 50%. Clements Avenue (from Cliffridge Avenue to the lane) has 2 existing small lots of 11 total lots (18%) on each block face. Canyon Boulevard (from Cliffridge Avenue to Belvedere Drive) on the north side has 6 existing small lots of 13 total lots (46%), and on the south side has 10 existing small lots of 15 total lots (67%). However, the spread of public input on lot pattern from the questionnaire, including 27 of 59 respondents (46%) of those interested in SLIAs indicating that no previous small lot pattern may be needed, opens the opportunity to consider this area for a SLIA given the locational benefits and the households' clear interest.

There are some properties on Clements Avenue in this area within the Slope Hazard Development Permit Area (DPA). These five properties would be recommended to be excluded from a potential SLIA, with concurrence from the Environment Department. Because of requirements to maintain slope stability, development of these properties including subdivision potential may be constrained in the Slope Hazard DPA. Subdivision could be considered on a case-by-case basis, however, as with applications outside of a SLIA.

In sum, there are 13 lots with potential for small lot subdivision on Clements Avenue and 11 on Canyon Boulevard for a total of 24 lots which has a potential for a net increase of 24 houses, assuming all properties subdivide.
Montroyal Boulevard (between Ranger Avenue and Cliffridge Avenue)
The north side of these three blocks on Montroyal Boulevard are potential candidates for a SLIA (Figure 4). While input from households was lower for this area albeit favourable, there is a strong existing lot pattern with each of the three blocks exhibiting 82% existing small lots. These three blocks were also identified as a potential SLIA in the 1987 Small Lot Infill Report as they had some existing pattern of small lots at that time. For these three blocks there are 8 remaining lots with potential for small lot subdivision, which has a potential for a net increase of 8 houses assuming all properties subdivide.

Summary
In conclusion, the specified areas of Clements Avenue, Canyon Boulevard, and Montroyal Boulevard are recommended as potential candidates for SLIAs. This represents a total of 32 properties that have a frontage of 20 metres (66 feet) or greater giving them the potential to subdivide into two small lots if the owner so chooses. This represents a potential net increase of 32 homes.

At build out, estimates indicate net increase of vehicle volume would add about 0.5 vehicles per minute during PM peak hour with these trips distributed across the streets (ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, land use code 210). During most of the day, it would be lower.

Timing/Approval Process:
At present, this staff report is intended to aid Council’s evaluation of the received input to determine if staff should continue to explore the creation of one or more SLIAs within the study area. If Council directs staff to continue the process, the next steps are recommended as follows.

1. Public information meeting hosted by staff to discuss and gather public input on the locations under consideration for potential SLIAs, and areas excluded from further study. Timeline: September 2016.
2. Zoning Bylaw amendment to introduce new SLIAs prepared by staff for Council's consideration at first reading. At the same time, staff would report the public input from the public information meeting. The Zoning Bylaw amendment process would require further opportunity for public input at a public hearing. Timeline: Fall 2016.

Concurrence:
The recommendations of the report have been reviewed with Environment, Development Planning, Building, and Engineering (Transportation and Utilities).

Conclusion:
Adding SLIAs is one of the opportunities identified in the OCP to expand housing choices, through a variety of house sizes, to single-family neighbourhoods. Given the public input and analysis of potential SLIA locations within the study area, staff recommend proceeding with public consultation on the two proposed locations. As directed by Council and the results of further consultation, staff will then prepare a Zoning Bylaw amendment for Council's consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Foth
Community Planner
ATTACHMENT 1 – Study Area Lot Sizes
ATTACHMENT 2 – Questionnaire and Public Input Results

Responses include addresses in study area and from nearby neighbours (75-metre radius).

1. What is your street address?
   Responses: 138.

2. Are you interested in further exploring the potential for creating a Small Lot Infill Area somewhere within the study area?
   Responses to this question are reported by household (individual addresses) in an effort to ensure equitable representation as some households had multiple responses. In addition to the questionnaire, public input received by email and letter (with addresses) is included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total study area</th>
<th>Total near study area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Chart 1]</td>
<td>![Chart 2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households: 104.  
Households: 23.

We received some questionnaires or email input without addresses. There was some input from residents beyond the vicinity of the study area. This feedback is reported separately as the location could not be determined, and to avoid possible duplication.

Responses: 22.

Other input

![Chart 3]
Question 2 displayed geographically:

Note that areas along Montroyal Boulevard had a limited number of households provide input. The information displayed represents received feedback from the initial phase of public input.
3. Are you a property owner within the study area with a lot that is 20 metres (66 feet) or wider?  
   Responses: 138.

Respondents who indicated they are a property owner of a 20 m wide or larger lot were further asked:
Would you consider subdividing your property into two smaller lots at some time in the future? (Small lot frontages are minimum 10 metres / 33 feet)  
Responses: 91 indicated no, yes, or unsure.

4. Lot pattern: How many existing small lots should there be on a block to be considered as a potential Small Lot Infill Area?  
Responses: 131 indicated a percentage, none, or unsure.
Of those who responded they are not interested in considering a Small Lot Infill Area, 72% selected “none (do not want to explore potential for a Small Lot Infill Area)”.

Of those who responded they are interested in considering a Small Lot Infill Area,
- 46% (27 of 59) selected “0% existing small lots or more”;
- 17% (10 of 59) selected “25% existing small lots or more”; and
- 24% (14 of 59) selected “50% existing small lots or more”.

Do you have further comments about lot pattern?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common response themes</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer a mix of small lots and large lots</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small lots negatively impact character</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about loss of trees, vegetation, or both</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about traffic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small lots allow families to move to neighbourhood</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small lots offer relatively more affordable houses</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All properties should have same regulation (no different in or out of Small Lot Infill Area)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have varied housing styles (not ‘cookie cutter’)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For subdivision approvals since 2013, the District requires subdivided lots to have two unique house designs.

5. **Lane access: Should open lane access be considered for a block to be in a Small Lot Infill Area?**

**Question Interpretation**
The comments reveal that this question was interpreted in different ways. Some examples of how this question was interpreted include:
- should new lanes be opened;
- should an existing opened lane is a prerequisite for an area to be recommended a Small Lot Infill Area; or
- should an existing opened lane is one contributing factor, although not a prerequisite, for being recommended as a Small Lot Infill Area. This was the intention of the question.

The outcome is that respondents may have answered ‘no’ or ‘yes’ depending on how they interpreted the question. Therefore, input for this question can be summarized in the comments below.
Do you have further comments about lane access?

Common response themes
- Unopened lanes are valued for trees, vegetation, wildlife space, privacy
- Lanes help with fewer cars parked on the street
- Selecting properties with opened lanes is a limiting criteria because few properties in the study area would be eligible
- Lanes encourage traffic
- Do not want more lanes opened
- Want more lanes opened
- Garages used for storage, not cars
- Do not want secondary suites

Occurrences
- 10
- 10
- 6
- 4
- 3
- 3
- 3

6. Driveways and parking: Should narrower driveway entrances be considered for small lots to help enable on-street parking?
Responses: 124 indicated no, yes, or unsure.

Of those who responded they are interested in considering a Small Lot Infill Area, 46% (27 of 59) indicated they are interested in narrower driveways.

Of those who responded they are not interested in considering a Small Lot Infill Area, 18% (13 of 74) indicated they are interested in narrower driveways.

Do you have further comments about driveways and parking?

Common response themes
- Driveways/garages should accommodate the parking needs for a house (e.g. cars should park on property, enough space in driveways for cars)

Occurrences
- 12
Some garages not used for parking vehicles 7
Limited on-street parking is an existing issue 6
Concern about pedestrian and children safety on street with on-street parking 6
Narrower driveways provide opportunity for more green space 4
Some garages are too small for cars 4
Want sidewalks 3
Encourage carports 3
Concern about narrower street with on-street parking 3

7. Environment and geography: Should small lots be avoided in slope hazard and streamside protection development permit areas?
Responses: 95 indicated no, yes, or unsure.

Do you have further comments about environment and geography?
Common response themes Occurrences
Concern about loss of trees, vegetation, or both 20
Development acceptable if meets protection or engineering requirements 11
Consider development in environmental DPAs on case-by-case basis 10
8. What other considerations do you think should be taken into account in exploring appropriate blocks to be in a Small Lot Infill Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common response themes</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic (amount, congestion, infrastructure)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want better transit (frequency, proximity)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools (proximity, capacity)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density should be near centres or closer to amenities</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of small and large lots per block</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House design</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More amenities in area, including parks, playgrounds</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New house consistent with neighbourhood character</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you have any other ideas, comments, or concerns you would like to share about small lots? If so, please describe.

Response themes (not previously mentioned): concern about developer profits and housing not for families or seniors, comments that smaller homes are more affordable for families than larger homes, reduce house size, green building practices, better enforcement, consider townhouses, concern about noise.

10. Is there other information that would help you to better understand the small lots topic? If so, please describe.

Response themes (not previously mentioned): share results, length of study, next steps, further public input, other developments in area, restaurant zoning at Capilano Road and Clements Ave, positive and negative outcomes, decision-making process, number of lots able to subdivide, taxes, infrastructure, subdivision costs, housing prices.
DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
COUNCIL WORKSHOP

Minutes of the Council Workshop Meeting of the Council for the District of North Vancouver held at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, July 4, 2016 in the Committee Room of the District Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, British Columbia.

Present:  Mayor R. Walton
            Councillor R. Bassam
            Councillor M. Bond
            Councillor J. Hanson
            Councillor R. Hicks
            Councillor D. MacKay-Dunn
            Councillor L. Muri

Staff:    Mr. D. Stuart, Chief Administrative Officer
          Ms. C. Grant, General Manager – Corporate Services
          Mr. G. Joyce, General Manager – Engineering, Parks & Facilities
          Mr. D. Milburn, Acting General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits
          Mr. A. Wardell, Acting General Manager – Finance & Technology
          Ms. L. Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk
          Ms. S. Dal Santo, Section Manager – Planning Policy
          Ms. N. Foth, Planner
          Mr. M. Hartford, Planner
          Ms. S. Vukelic, Confidential Council Clerk

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. July 4, 2016 Council Workshop Agenda

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor MACKAY-DUNN
THAT the agenda for the July 4, 2016 Council Workshop be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1. June 14, 2016 Council Workshop

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor MACKAY-DUNN
THAT the minutes of the June 14, 2016 Council Workshop meeting are adopted.

CARRIED
2.2. June 20, 2016 Council Workshop

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor MACKAY-DUNN
THAT the minutes of the June 20, 2016 Council Workshop meeting are adopted.

CARRIED

2.3. June 21, 2016 Council Workshop

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor MACKAY-DUNN
THAT the minutes of the June 21, 2016 Council Workshop meeting are adopted.

CARRIED

3. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

3.1. July 2016 Town Centre Update and Early Input Opportunity
File No.

This item was deferred to a future Council Workshop.

3.2. Upper Capilano Small Lots Study: Public Input and Next Steps
File No. 13.6480.30/003.000

Mr. Dan Milburn, Acting General Manager Planning, Properties & Permits, provided an update on the results of the public input received at and after the open house regarding Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIAs) in Upper Capilano.

Mr. Milburn noted that subdivision enquiries from land owners have been on the rise in the Upper Capilano area. He noted that there have been three Council approved rezonings and subdivisions within the study area over the last five years.

The study area is as follows:
• Monroyal Boulevard to the South;
• Ranger Avenue to the East;
• Prospect Avenue to the North; and,
• Capilano Road to the West.

Mr. Milburn noted that there is an existing, designated SLIA directly adjacent to the study boundary.

Mr. Milburn reported that there are currently 23 SLIAs in the District. These designations were created and added to the Zoning Bylaw in the 1980’s. He noted that homeowners located in the established SLIA’s are permitted to make an application to subdivide their lot into smaller lots based on approval by the District’s Approving Officer. He noted that these lots could be as small as 10 meters in width.
Mr. Milburn advised that applications from owners of lots not located in the designated SLIA's are reviewed on a case by case basis and require the traditional rezoning application process.

Mr. Milburn mentioned that the District's Official Community Plan recognizes the opportunities to sensitively introduce more alternative housing options in established single-family neighbourhoods. Some examples include:
- Small lot subdivisions;
- Designating additional SLIA's;
- Duplexes; and,
- Coach Houses

Mr. Milburn commented on the suggested recommendations set out in the District's Approving Officer's Subdivision Best Practices, which include the following:
- Prohibit secondary suites where the lot size is less than 13.875 metres (45 ft) in width if there is no lane access provided;
- Require a unique design covenant to ensure the design of the dwellings are not mirror images of other house designs in the subdivision;
- Provide sufficient off street parking, in a non-tandem arrangement, where secondary suites are permitted;
- Predominant form on the block face to be developed as small lots to be given consideration for a small lot subdivision.

Ms. Nicole Foth, Planner, provided an overview of the public input session that was held on May 3, 2016 regarding the Capilano SLIA's:
- Approximately 200 people participated in the event;
- Purpose was to educate residents on SLIA's; and,
- Seek residents' interest and answer expressed concerns.

Ms. Foth advised that the total public input received was from 104 households in the study area and 23 households near the study area. She noted that public input was received in person, e-mail, letters and questionnaires.

Ms. Foth reported that 57% of 104 households that responded indicated that they were not in support of SLIA's. She explained the breakdown of the study's outcome:
- Northeast part of the study had 26% of the 66 households that responded were interested;
- Southeast part of the study had a small number of responses, but all who responded were in support of SLIA's;
- Southwest part of the study had one response that was in support;
- Clements Avenue and Canyon Avenue had 79% support of the 19 households that responded; and,
- Northwest part of the study had mixed input with 47% of 15 households that responded in favour of SLIA's.
Ms. Foth reported on the other aspects and issues put forth by residents of the study, which include the following:

- Mixed interest for owners who would like to subdivide their lot;
- Residents indicated a preference for unopened lanes to allow for trees and privacy;
- Others noted that lanes help with the parking congestion on the street;
- Varied interest was shown for narrower driveways to enable on-street parking;
- Sufficient parking needs for a house should be accommodated on private property;
- Pedestrian safety must be maintained;
- Respondents agreed that small lots should be avoided in environmental hazard areas with Development Permits applications being reviewed on a case-by-case basis;
- Loss of trees and vegetation was a concern;
- Traffic, schools and transit;
- Density should be near centres or closer to amenities; and,
- A mix of small and large lots per block.

Ms. Foth advised that following receipt of the public input and analysis of the area, staff recommend a moderate addition of SLIA's in two areas:

- The two blocks of Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard where there is a strong household support and an existing open lane for rear access. She noted that this area would be an adjacent continuation of a current SLIA; however, it would exclude the slope hazard area on Clements Avenue.

- Montroyal Boulevard between Ranger Avenue and Cliffridge Avenue. She noted that this area has an existing small lot pattern of over 80% on each block in the area. It was noted that interest has been shown by current owners who own some of the larger, remaining lots.

Ms. Foth remarked that the inclusion of the two proposed SLIA's could:

- Create more diversity and single family households in the area; and,
- A potential net increase of 32 homes, 24 on Clements Avenue and Canyon Boulevard and eight on Mount Royal Boulevard.

Mr. Milburn advised that another public input session may be held in September to gather more information and possibly propose a SLIA's bylaw to Council in the fall.

Council discussion ensued and the following comments and concerns were noted:

- Asked for further clarification of the public input results;
- Questioned why the area between Montroyal Boulevard and Cliffridge Avenue are not part of the study moving forward;
- Queried if the lot depths on the west side of Montroyal Boulevard meet the SLIA's subdivision requirements;
- Queried the location of the stop sign at the bottom of a steep hill at Ranger Avenue and Mount Royal Boulevard.
• Commented on the constrained drive-ways on Montroyal Boulevard;
• Expressed concern with limiting the study to two neighbourhoods and not the whole area as indicated on the map;
• Suggested a graph be devised to show the division between existing small lots and those that can be converted;
• Expressed concern with the parking and traffic on the street in SLIA’s;
• Expressed concern with the affordability of the lots;
• Council discussed options for alternative housing forms that could help add to the diversity of the SLIA lots;
• Queried the history of current subdivided lots;
• Questioned how staff will increase the sample size of the next public input session;
• Queried the process of obtaining the community’s input in relation to alternative housing options;
• Observed that there are new houses in the area and remarked that they should not be torn down to facilitate the SLIA’s;
• Urged for innovative ways to hear from residents located in the study area; and,
• Advised that the Edgemont Upper Capilano Community Association is in support of SLIA’s in its jurisdiction.

Mr. Milburn advised that land owners are interested in SLIA’s and that researching SLIA’s are following a District policy that outlines the need for community growth while maintaining the character and form of a neighbourhood.

Ms. Froth clarified that 138 questionnaire responses had been received from 104 households in the area.

Mr. Milburn explained that lots that are currently subdivided outside of a SILA’s have gone through a rezoning and/or subdivision process. He noted that these lands were originally subdivided in the early 1900’s and many were consolidated to form the lot pattern we see today.

Mr. David Stuart, Chief Administrative Officer, advised that staff will proceed with researching SLIA’s within the two neighbourhoods as outlined on the map. He also noted that staff will include alternative housing discussions in the next phase of the public input. Finally, he noted that the public consultation results will be revised and re-submitted to Council.

4. PUBLIC INPUT

Nil

5. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor MACKAY-DUNN
THAT the July 4, 2016 Council Workshop be adjourned.

CARRIED
(6:58 pm)