

**DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
PUBLIC HEARING**

**1944 & 1976 Fullerton Avenue, 1963-1985 Sandown Place & 2028-2067 Glenaire Drive
150 Unit Townhouse Development**

REPORT of the Public Hearing held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, B.C. on Tuesday, April 24, 2018 commencing at 7:01 p.m.

Present: Acting Mayor R. Hicks
Councillor R. Bassam
Councillor M. Bond
Councillor J. Hanson
Councillor L. Muri

Absent: Mayor R. Walton
Councillor D. MacKay-Dunn

Staff: Mr. D. Milburn, General Manager - Planning, Properties & Permits
Ms. J. Paton, Manager – Development Planning
Ms. L. Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk
Ms. S. Dale, Confidential Council Clerk
Mr. E. Wilhelm, Development Planner

District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan Bylaw 7900, 2011, Amendment Bylaw 8250, 2017 (Amendment 28)

Purpose of Bylaw:

Bylaw 8250 proposes to amend the OCP land use designation of the properties from Residential Level 2: Detached Residential (RES2) to Residential Level 4: Transition Multifamily (RES4) and to designate these properties as Development Permit Areas for Form and Character and Energy and Water Conservation and GHG Emission Reduction.

District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1358 (Bylaw 8251)

Purpose of Bylaw:

Bylaw 8251 proposes to amend the District's Zoning Bylaw by creating a new Comprehensive Development Zone 112 (CD112) and rezone the subject site from Single-Family Residential 7200 Zone (RS3) to CD112. The CD112 Zone addresses use, density, amenities, setbacks, site coverage, building height, landscaping and parking.

1. OPENING BY THE MAYOR

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

Acting Mayor Robin Hicks, stated that:

- All persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by the proposed bylaws will be afforded a reasonable opportunity to be heard and to present written submissions;
- Council will use the established speakers list. At the end of the speakers list, the Chair may call on speakers from the audience;
- Each speaker will have five minutes to address Council for a first time and should begin remarks to Council by stating their name and address;
- All members of the audience are asked to be respectful of one another as diverse opinions are expressed. Council wishes to hear everyone's views in an open and impartial forum;
- Council is here to listen to the public, not to debate the merits of the bylaws;
- At the conclusion of the public input Council may request further information from staff which may or may not require an extension of the hearing, or Council may close the hearing after which Council should not receive further new information from the public;
- Everyone at the Hearing will be provided an opportunity to speak. If necessary, the Hearing will continue on a second night;
- After everyone who wishes to speak has spoken once, speakers will then be allowed one additional five minute presentation;
- Any additional presentations will only be allowed at the discretion of the Chair;
- The binder containing documents and submissions related to these bylaws is available on the side table to be viewed; and,
- The Public Hearing is being streamed live over the internet and recorded in accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

2. INTRODUCTION OF BYLAWS BY THE CLERK

Ms. Linda Brick, Deputy Municipal Clerk, introduced the proposed bylaws, stating that Bylaw 8250 proposes to amend the OCP land use designation of the properties from Residential Level 2: Detached Residential (RES2) to Residential Level 4: Transition Multifamily (RES4) and to designate these properties as Development Permit Areas for Form and Character and Energy and Water Conservation and GHG Emission Reduction. Bylaw 8251 proposes to amend the District's Zoning Bylaw by creating a new Comprehensive Development Zone 112 (CD112) and rezone the subject site from Single-Family Residential 7200 Zone (RS3) to CD112. The CD112 Zone addresses use, density, amenities, setbacks, site coverage, building height, landscaping and parking.

3. PRESENTATION BY STAFF

Mr. Erik Wilhelm, Development Planner, provided an overview of the proposal elaborating on the introduction by the Deputy Municipal Clerk. Mr. Wilhelm advised that:

- The development site is located within the peripheral area of the Lions Gate Town Centre;
- The overall development site is approximately 3.36 acres and consists of sixteen single-family lots;
- Capilano River Regional Park is located north of the development site;
- West of the site (across Fullerton Avenue) are existing single-family homes; however, townhouses have already been approved on the north side of Glenaire Drive and a preliminary application for townhouses has been submitted on the south side of Glenaire Drive;

- There are four single-family homes south of the development site and are identified for higher density in accordance with the Lions Gate Peripheral Policy;
- The single-family homes east of the site (across Sandown Place) are eligible for higher density in accordance with the Peripheral Policy; however, no significant redevelopment applications are currently proceeding in this area;
- The area east-northeast of the site along McLallen Court and Sandown Place is to remain a single family neighborhood for the foreseeable future;

In July of 2014, the Peripheral Policy was endorsed by Council; this policy outlined the envisioned housing forms, density, heights, local connections and general design guidelines envisioned for the peripheral area of Lions Gate Village. The Peripheral Policy supports three-storey townhouse proposals up to 1.2 FSR on sites larger than 12,000 sq. ft. and accordingly, the townhouse proposal being considered is compliant with the density, height and housing form provisions within the Peripheral Policy. The Peripheral Policy also provided for a neighbourhood buffer zone on the eastern edge of the development site and the Peripheral Policy stipulated setbacks of approximately 15 ft. and design measures to step down to two-storeys where new development is adjacent to longer-term single-family zoned lands.

- As the the site is within easy walking distance to a frequent transit corridor along Marine Drive, the development's location will foster a more compact community which will reduce the reliance on cars and promote walking, biking and transit use;
- The project has been measured against policies outlined in the Official Community Plan and Development Permit Guidelines for:
 - Form and Character for Ground-oriented Housing;
 - Energy and Water Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction;
 - Streamside Protection;
 - Lower Capilano Village Centre: Peripheral Area Housing Policy & Design Guidelines; and,
 - Lions Gate Public Realm Strategy;
- The proposal is for 150 townhouses in twelve separate buildings with an FSR of 1.15 and all buildings in the complex are three-storeys tall with rooftop decks;
- Vehicular access to the underground parkade is provided from Glenaire Drive and there are a minimum of 242 parking stalls, including sixteen visitor stalls;
- The proposal provides a 15 metre setback along Capilano River Regional Park which is compliant with Streamside Protection guidelines as outlined in the OCP;
- The development proposal provides a 45 ft. setback along the eastern edge of the development. This widened buffer allows for ample room to provide the necessary public walkways, landscaping and create generous space to allow sunlight penetration to the properties bordering the site along McLallen Court;
- The developer has worked directly with staff and neighbours along McLallen Court to provide a landscape plan acceptable to the McLallen Court neighbours;
- There are a number of public bike and pedestrian connections that are created within the development site and all connections through the site will be secured through a statutory right of way and maintenance of the landscaping and pathways will be the responsibility of the strata;
- There will be a primary east-west connection created to link Sandown Place and Glenaire Drive;

- The north-south trail connection will create a direct linkage from Capilano River Regional Park southwards to the Village Centre and this trail connection will align with the multi-use path being constructed on the western edge of the Larco Site;
- The third connection created will link Glenaire Drive and Capilano River Regional Park and will be provided adjacent to Fullerton Avenue;
- The development provides a mix of units ranging from one to four bedrooms. The range of unit size is aimed to provide housing both for the missing middle and families. The bylaw requires a minimum of forty 3-bedroom units and thirty 4-bedroom units. These larger units are primarily focused on providing housing for families;
- There is a central amenity and play area that will be available for residents and the public, secured through registration of a statutory right-of-way;
- Larger trees will be located closer to the townhouse building and lower growing vegetation will be provided next to the McLallen Court neighbours to ensure sunlight penetration, which was of concern for the neighbours;
- There will be a retaining wall built within the confines of the development site. This wall will be built to a height which matches the existing grade of McLallen Court properties and be provided proper drainage facilities to ensure the integrity of the neighboring properties;
- The public pathways will be lower (by approximately two to three feet) and acceptable fencing and vegetation provided to ensure privacy of the adjacent neighbours;
- In order to ensure public access on the pathways, there will be signage at each end of all pathway connections providing proper wayfinding information;
- The developer has provided enhanced planting, moved the walkway and elevator shaft and provided for building modifications along the interface of 1959 Sandown Place;
- The development site provides similar use of colors, materials and height massing throughout; however, each building has slight design modifications (and changes in building length) in order to create variety throughout the development site;
- There are ground floor entrances provided for each unit within the development. Only the townhouses on the north side of Glenaire Drive are conventional three-storey walkup townhouses while the remaining units are stacked townhouses; and,
- The buildings throughout the site provide for rooftop decks which are accessed through a covered stairwell.

Mr. Wilhelm further advised that a facilitated Public Information meeting was held on November 29, 2016 and approximately thirty-eight members of the public attended. At that time the application included 164 townhouse units within sixteen buildings. Building setbacks along the McLallen Court neighborhood buffer area ranged from 15 to 25 ft. Upon feedback from the Public Information meeting, the development application was modified. Accordingly, a second facilitated Public Information meeting was held on April 29, 2017 which was attended by approximately thirty-two members of the public. The modified application included 156 units and one less building, which was removed along the neighborhood buffer area to improve privacy and overall siting within the development. Building setbacks along the McLallen Court ranged from 15 to 25 ft. Following the second Public Information meeting, staff met with a group of neighbours. The feedback received was then passed onto the developers and the proposal was once again modified to provide a minimum 25 ft. setback along the McLallen Court buffer area and increase the parkade setback in this area. Staff and three Councilors met with a group of local residents on February 1, 2018 and the current development proposal was reached which provides a total of 150 units, a reduced FSR to 1.15 and most notably provided a 45 ft. setback along the McLallen Court buffer area. The integrity, size and layouts of the units were not

compromised to create the current proposal. Primarily the loss of six units in conjunction with omitting building breaks in two buildings allowed for the increased 45 ft. setback in the neighborhood buffer area.

4. REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE APPLICANT

4.1. Mr. James Howard, Woodbridge Properties:

- Spoke to the history and context of the proposed development;
- Noted that extensive community consultation has taken place and the developer has worked with the community and owners of the single-family homes to address their needs;
- Highlighted the benefits and amenities of the proposed development;
- Commented on the lack of availability of townhouses on the North Shore;
- Commented on the site's proximity to the transit corridor;
- Noted that the creation of the new trail will create a key neighbourhood connection that will benefit the entire area; and,
- Advised that in recognition of the concerns raised, the proposed development was revised to increase the building setbacks along the McLallen Court properties resulting in a decrease of units, larger public walkways, buffer vegetation and grading of the site to address privacy.

5. REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

5.1. Mr. Pohsi Lee, 1900 Block Sandown Place: OPPOSED

- Commented that the proposed off-site upgrades will improve the neighbourhood;
- Expressed concern with loss of privacy and sunlight; and,
- Stated that his home will be the most negatively impacted.

5.2. Mr. Danny Birch, 1000 Block Lynn Valley Road: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed project;
- Opined that there is a shortage of townhouses in the District; and,
- Noted that the proposed development will provide affordable housing options for young families.

5.3. Ms. Min Lee, 1900 Block Sandown Place: OPPOSED

- Stated that her parents home will be the most negatively impacted;
- Expressed concern with loss of privacy and sunlight;
- Stated that the proposed development is too large; and,
- Opined that the proposed modifications do not address the needs of her parents.

5.4. Mr. Andrew Williams, 1000 Block Richards Street: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed project;
- Noted housing options and opportunities are needed for young families;
- Opined that the proposed development is aesthetically pleasing and will enhance the neighbourhood; and,
- Noted that the proposed development is close to transit.

5.5. Mr. Eric Chen, 4400 Block Primose Road: OPPOSED

- Expressed concern with the volume of traffic; and,

- Expressed concern with regards to the loss of sunlight.

5.6. Mr. Doug Anderson, 1500 Block Kilmer Road: IN FAVOUR

- Commented on the suitability of the proposed development for downsizers;
- Noted that the proposed development is in close proximity to transit and walking trails; and,
- Urged council to support the proposed project.

5.7. Ms. Haruko Oqawa, 900 Block Marine Drive: OPPOSED

- Spoke to the loss of the Lee's privacy due to the proposed development.

5.8. Mr. Barry and Ms. Mary McCormick, 1900 Block Belle Isle Place: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed project;
- Commented that the developers have addressed the needs of the community;
- Opined that there is a need for this type of housing in the Lower Capilano area; and,
- Commented that the proposed development will enhance the area.

5.9. Ms. Yumi Peterson, 400 Block East 14th Street: OPPOSED

- Expressed concern with traffic in the lower Capilano area; and,
- Expressed concern with regards to the loss of privacy.

5.10. Mr. David Moretto, 500 Block Alpine Court: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed development;
- Noted that the proposed development is close to transit;
- Spoke to the opportunity for the younger generation to stay on the North Shore; and,
- Commented that the developers have worked with the residents to address their needs.

5.11. Ms. Sharon Wu, 400 Block 13th Street East: OPPOSED

- Commented that the Lee family may be forced to move out of their family home.

5.12. Mr. Matthew Bennett, 900 Block Foster Avenue: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed development;
- Commented on the limited opportunities to purchase affordable townhomes;
- Noted that the proposed development is close to transit; and,
- Opined that the proposed housing will provide more affordable housing options for younger families and professionals.

5.13. Ms. Daisy Tsai, 1300 Block Dempsey Road: OPPOSED

- Expressed concern that there is too much development occurring on the North Shore;
- Expressed concern with the loss of privacy and sunlight; and,
- Stated that the developer must address the needs of the current residents before moving forward with the proposed project.

5.14. Mr. Mano Dauvar, 800 Block Clements Avenue: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed development;

- Commented on the suitability of the proposed development for families;
- Noted that the proposed development is close to transit;
- Suggested that one level townhomes are ideal for downsizers; and,
- Commented that the proposed installation of the traffic circle will improve safety.

5.15. Ms. Jessie Fan, 2000 Block McLallen Court: OPPOSED

- Expressed concern with regards to the intensity of development in the Lower Capilano area;
- Expressed concern regarding traffic issues; and,
- Expressed concern that the needs of the long-term residents have not been addressed.

5.16. Ms. Jodie Parente, 1200 Block Derwent Crescent: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed development;
- Spoke to the issue of affordable housing; and,
- Commented that the proposed development will provide an opportunity for the younger generation to stay on the North Shore.

5.17. Ms. Kelly Bond, 1200 Block Emery Place: OPPOSED

- Commended the developer for including a large number of units suitable for families;
- Noted that the proposed development does not address the need of replacement rental units; and,
- Noted that older rental stock is important to the community.

5.18. Ms. Christine Baracos, 800 Block West 16th Street: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed project;
- Commented on the close proximity to the Lions Gate Bridge; and,
- Spoke to the benefits and amenities of the proposed development.

5.19. Mr. John Miller, 1600 Block Tatlow Avenue: OPPOSED

- Spoke in opposition to the proposed development;
- Opined that the proposed fifteen metre setback along Capilano River should be increased to a thirty metre setback; and,
- Commented that too much development is happening all at once.

5.20. Mr. Grant Longhurst, 4700 Block Headland Drive: IN FAVOUR

- Commented that there is a shortage of townhouses in the District;
- Spoke in support of density; and,
- Commented that the proposal will provide vibrancy to the community.

5.21. Mr. Arthur Klein, 1800 Block Tatlow Avenue: OPPOSED

- Expressed concern with traffic issues;
- Suggested that a percentage of rental units be required; and,
- Commented on the importance of working collaboratively with all parties involved to mitigate the impacts on the community during the construction phase.

- 5.22. Ms. Maureen Elliott, 800 Block Montroyal Blvd: IN FAVOUR**
- Opined that development is needed and will provide a much-needed refresh for the Lower Capilano community;
 - Commented that the proposed development would allow residents to age in their community;
 - Spoke to the quality of schools surrounding the Lower Capilano area; and,
 - Noted that the proposed development is close to transit.
- 5.23. Ms. Antoinette Dumalo, 2000 Block McLallen Court: OPPOSED**
- Noted that approximately 70% of the one hundred single-family homes have been acquired by developers;
 - Expressed concern regarding density, inadequate buffer zones and a compromised skyline;
 - Commented that residents need guidance and technical expertise to interpret developer's plans and noted that a clear understanding of the application is critical in the decision making process; and;
 - Urged the District to strike a committee consisting of technical experts and community members that reports to Council to ensure that single-family home owners who chose to stay in the District have a forum to address their concerns.
- 5.24. Mr. Paul Riches, 1100 Block Strathaven Drive: IN FAVOUR**
- Commented that the proposed development will provide affordable housing options;
 - Suggested that the proposed project will provide a heart to the community; and,
 - Opined that the proposed development is aesthetically pleasing and will enhance the neighbourhood.
- 5.25. Mr. Joey Tai, 900 Block Seymour Road: IN FAVOUR**
- Spoke in support of the proposed development;
 - Stated that more townhouse developments are needed in the District;
 - Spoke to the issue of affordable housing on the North Shore; and,
 - Noted that the proposed development will provide housing for both young families and residents looking to downsize.
- 5.26. Mr. David Wysota, 100 Block Brew Street: IN FAVOUR**
- Commented that more townhouse developments are needed in the District;
 - Commented that the proposed development will provide an opportunity for aging residents to stay within their community;
 - Spoke in support of townhouses noting that they provide a viable and more affordable alternative to single-family homes enabling support for families and the "missing-middle"; and,
 - Commented that the developer have addressed the concerns of the residents.
- 5.27. Mr. Andrew Buttler, 900 Block Clements Avenue: IN FAVOUR**
- Spoke in support of the proposal;
 - Noted that the proposed development will provide housing for both young families and residents looking to downsize; and,
 - Noted the close proximity to transit and shopping amenities.

5.28. Mr. Liam Graham, 400 Block West 16th Street: IN FAVOUR

- Commented that the proposed development will allow the younger generation to stay on the North Shore;
- Noted that the proposed development is close to transit and outdoor amenities;
- Opined that Lower Capilano is a good location for density; and,
- Commented that the proposed development will provide affordable housing options.

5.29. Mr. Jons Edstrand, 1100 Block McLallen Court: IN FAVOUR

- Commented on the lack of townhomes on the North Shore;
- Spoke to the issue of affordability; and,
- Opined that the proposed development addresses the need of downsizers.

5.30. Mr. Jason Boudreau, 900 Block Montroyal Blvd: IN FAVOUR

- Acknowledged that the proposed development will create more affordable housing options;
- Opined that Lower Capilano is a good location for density;
- Suggested that the proposed development would provide housing options for downsizers; and,
- Commented that there is a shortage of townhouses in the District.

5.31. Mr. Phil Hean, 3100 Block Regent Avenue: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed project;
- Commented on the lack of affordable housing supply on the North Shore;
- Commented that the younger generation cannot afford single-family homes;
- Noted that the proposed development provides downsizers an opportunity to age in their community; and,
- Opined that the proposed development is aesthetically pleasing and will enhance the neighbourhood.

5.32. Mr. Owen Yates, 1300 Block East 27th Street: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed development;
- Commented that many residents are forced off the North Shore due to a lack of affordable housing; and,
- Opined that more townhouses are need on the North Shore.

5.33. Mr. Phil Chapman, 1000 Block Handsworth Road: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed project;
- Commended the developer for addressing the needs of most of the community;
- Spoke to the improved trail connectivity options;
- Noted that the proposed development would provide valuable outdoor play space; and,
- Opined that the proposed development will create a complete community.

5.34. Mr. Bill Phillips, 900 Block Canyon Boulevard: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke to the issue of affordability on the North Shore;
- Commented that the proposed development satisfies the vision of the Official Community Plan; and,

- Commented that the proposed development will provide affordable housing options on the North Shore.

5.35. Ms. Vivian Wei, 900 Block Waivertree Road: OPPOSED

- Expressed concern with traffic issues; and,
- Urged the developer to continue to work with the Lee family to address the issue of privacy and loss of sunlight.

5.36. Mr. Jai Jadgav, 1800 Block Belle Isle Place: IN FAVOUR

- Opined that the proposed development will revitalize the area;
- Commended the developer for addressing the needs of the community;
- Spoke to the improved connectivity to surrounding area; and,
- Urged Council to support the project.

5.37. Mr. Corrie Kost, 2800 Block Colwood Drive: COMMENTING

- Spoke to the setback requirements;
- Suggested that the shadow study fails the standard measurements;
- Stated that the proposed units will not be affordable;
- Opined that the proposed project does not address the issue of affordable housing;
- Opined that the proposed townhouses are unsuitable for downsizers because of the stairs; and,
- Spoke in opposition to density transfers.

5.38. Mr. German Imarin, 200 Block East 6th Street: IN FAVOUR

- Spoke in support of the proposed project.

5.39. Ms. Min Lee, 1900 Block Sandown Place: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME

- Expressed concern with the loss of sunlight; and,
- Expressed concern with the loss of greenspace and a view of a retaining wall.

5.40. Ms. Cathy Adams, 2000 Block McLallen Court: OPPOSED

- Expressed concern with transit and noted that busses are often full;
- Expressed concerns with traffic issues;
- Questioned how the public walkways would be protected in the future; and,
- Urged staff to work with the developer to address the needs of the Lee family.

5.41. Mr. Corrie Kost, 2800 Block Colwood Drive: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME

- Commented on the loss of affordable housing on Fern Street;
- Expressed concern with regards to congestion; and,
- Opined that people will continue to drive cars.

5.42. Ms. Jessie Fan, 2000 Block McLallen Court: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME

- Expressed concern with transit and noted that busses are often full; and,
- Expressed concern with the loss of sunlight and privacy issues.

5.43. Mr. Corrie Kost, 2800 Block Colwood Drive: SPEAKING A THIRD TIME

- Expressed concern with the proposed rooftop decks stating that they may create privacy issues;

- Expressed concern that no rental units are proposed; and,
- Opined that the setback to the Capilano River should be increased.

5.44. Ms. Min Lee, 1900 Block Sandown Place: SPEAKING A THIRD TIME

- Expressed concern with regards to the proposed building setback.

6. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

In response to a question from Council, it was noted that in advance of the Public Hearing District staff, the developer and the owners of the property at 1959 Sandown Place met to discuss a solution to address the concerns of their loss of privacy and compromised livability. Modifications discussed include:

- Decrease the building length of Building #5 by eliminating Unit B2 and reducing the size of Units P and Q;
- In place of the eliminated Units, create a landscaped park area with tall 20-40 foot trees at maturity, to improve privacy and views without blocking off the Residents' access to sky and light;
- Create a landscape border of smaller trees and hedges along the "L" shaped perimeter of the property border, to increase security and privacy from the pedestrian path currently hugging the property line, but would not block off the Residents' access to sky and light. This would also allow the pedestrian path to shift further away from the property border;
- Create a landscaped border of 40 foot trees at maturity, along the east face of the property border on the Development's side, to increase privacy from the pedestrian path and from Building #5 and #6 units facing the Residents' home; or,
- Density removed from Building #5 would transfer to: premium river-facing units (Phase 3 of the same proposal) by shifting location of walkways, and/or to the south-west end of Building #2 (Phase 1 of the same proposal).

Staff further advised that according to the *Local Government Act*, Council may, without further notice or Public Hearing, adopt or defeat the bylaw after the closing of the Public Hearing or alter then adopt the bylaw provided the alteration does not alter the use, increase the density or without the owners consent, decrease the density.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the setback required in the Lower Capilano Village Centre: Peripheral Area Housing Policy & Design Guidelines between this site and McLallen Court is 15 ft. It was noted that the setback within the buffer area has been increased to 45 ft. with increased vegetation and the parking garage setback within the buffer area has increased to approximately 13 ft.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that a typical setback between a two and three-storey multi-family building in the District is 10 ft.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the Strata Rental Protection Policy applies to this project and would require a Housing Agreement to ensure that future strata bylaws could not prevent owners from renting their units on a long-term basis.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the two properties adjacent to the development fronting Fullerton Avenue have a 15 ft. setback at the pinch-point similar to that at 1559 Sandown Place.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the developer revised the development proposal to increase the building setbacks along McLallen Court properties and resulted in a loss of six units.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that in order to address the privacy of McLallen Court neighbours, the developer will be providing trees within the buffer area, a building setback, a wide public pathway and tree planting along the perimeter of the site. The developer has also offered to provide additional vegetation on the neighbour's property and would be provided for Council's consideration at the Development Permit stage should the OCP amendment and rezoning bylaws proceed.

In response to a question from Council regarding the cost of units, the developer advised that the sale prices have not been set but noted that townhouses are anticipated to range in price from \$550,000 to \$1.3 million depending on the square footage of the unit.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the portion of the site north of Glenaire Drive is included within the Streamside Protection Development Permit Area. As structures and development activities are outside the fifteen metre Capilano River riparian buffer area, the proposal is consistent with the Streamside Protection Area Development Permit Area guidelines.

In response to a question from Council, the developer advised that the overhang from the rooftop decks have been removed to address privacy issues.

In response to a question from Council regarding the Traffic Impact Assessment report, staff advised that this document was made available to the public and was included in the Public Hearing binder at the District hall as well as on the District's Public Hearing website.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that 543.5 square metres of density has been lost on this site.

In response to a question from Council regarding the shadow analysis, the architect advised that there is no impact to the property at 1959 Sandown Place as it is on the south side.

In response to a question from Council with regards to the square footage of the two units at the end of the building block adjacent to the property at 1959 Sandown Place, the developer advised that the unit is 1400 sq. ft. on the northern side of the building and a portion of the unit on the southern side is 300 sq. ft.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the existing setbacks of the single-family homes at 1912, 1890 and 1886 Fullerton Avenue is approximately thirteen to sixteen metres from the existing homes to the rear of their property line.

In response to a question from Council regarding the traffic analysis, staff advised that the development would not unduly affect traffic within the Lions Gate Village Centre area.

In response to a question from Council with regards to bus capacity improvements, staff advised that the B-line improvement has been approved and is to be implemented by the end of 2019.

Staff further highlighted additional off-site improvements which would include:

- Sidewalk upgrades;
- The installation of a roundabout within Fullerton Avenue; and,
- Trail upgrades and offsite restoration and enhancement within Capilano River Regional Park north of the development site to improved connectivity to the core of Lions Gate Village.

Council requested that staff report back on the options discussed with the owners at 1959 Sandown Place to address their concerns and the developer's response.

6. COUNCIL RESOLUTION

**MOVED by Councillor BASSAM
SECONDED by Councillor BOND**

THAT the April 24, 2018 Public Hearing be closed;

AND THAT "District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan Bylaw 7900, 2011, Amendment Bylaw 8250, 2017 (Amendment 28)" be returned to Council for further consideration;

AND THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1358 (Bylaw 8251)" be returned to Council for further consideration.

CARRIED
(10:05 p.m.)

CERTIFIED CORRECT:



Confidential Council Clerk