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REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

7:00 p.m.
Monday, July 22, 2019
Council Chamber, Municipal Hall,
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver

AGENDA

BROADCAST OF MEETING

- Online at http://app.dnv.org/councillive/

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS NOT AVAILABLE FOR DISCUSSION

- Bylaw 8262 – OCP Amendment 1923 Purcell Way

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. July 22, 2019 Regular Meeting Agenda

Recommendation:
THAT the agenda for the July 22, 2019 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. Nancy Cottingham Powell, North Van Arts
Re: North Shore Culture Map Update.

Attachment 1: Form
Attachment 2: Background Information
Attachment 3: PowerPoint Presentation
6. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

6.1. July 8, 2019 Regular Council Meeting

Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the July 8, 2019 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 be approved without debate.

9.1. Remedial Action Requirements – 5748 Sunshine Falls Lane - Unsafe Dilapidated House

File No. 08.3221.02

Report: Chief Building Official, July 8, 2019

Opportunity for representation:
- Building Inspector
- Property Owner

Recommendation:
THAT Council:

1. Declares the building (the “Building”) located on property at 5748 Sunshine Falls Lane (the “Property”) legally described as:

   PID 014-834-855
   Lot 1 AM (RP 1281) of lot E of lot 5, Block 2, District Lot 950, Plan 1384

   to be in an unsafe condition and to create an unsafe condition and to be a nuisance;

2. Orders that Chernijager Holdings Ltd., (the “Owner”) must:

   a. by September 3, 2019 apply for and obtain a demolition permit to completely demolish and remove the Building, and then completely demolish and remove the building pursuant to said issued building permit and restore the Property to
a neat and tidy condition to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official; or, alternatively

b. return the Building to a safe condition by strictly complying with all of the following requirements:

(i) by September 3, 2019, provide to the District a report from a qualified Professional Engineer(s) providing structural, electrical and mechanical analyses of the Building and a remediation plan for the Building which must include all of the following to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official and must be submitted to the Chief Building Official for approval:

A. Itemized and detailed description of work required to remediate the unsafe condition of the Building in compliance with the District’s Zoning, Construction and Fire Bylaws (the “Remedial Work”);

B. Certification that completion of the Remedial Work will render the Building safe for the use intended;

C. Itemized schedule of work for carrying out the Remedial Work establishing to satisfaction of the Chief Building Official that if the proposed schedule is met then all of the Remedial Work will be completed by April 6, 2020 (the “Remediation Plan”);

(ii) by October 7, 2019, submit complete applications for all permits required to carry out the Remediation Work to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official;

(iii) by April 6, 2020, complete the Remedial Work in accordance with the issued building permit and the Remediation Plan to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official;

3. Council directs that in the event that the Owner does not complete an action required under sections 2(a) or 2(b), as applicable, then the District, by its staff, agents and contractors, may enter onto the Property and completely demolish and remove the Building, and the costs of such action shall be treated as a debt owed to the District of North Vancouver, which if unpaid at the end of the calendar year in which the building is demolished and removed, will be added to the property taxes pursuant to section 258 of the Community Charter.

9.2. Temporary Use Permit 8.19 – 2300 Block, Old Dollarton Road (Dykhof Nurseries)

File No. 08.3060.20/008.19

Report: Development Planner, July 10, 2019
Attachment A: Temporary Use Permit 8.19
Attachment B: Dykhof Letter to Council, Dated February 22, 2018
Attachment C: Arborist Report and Tree Removal Plan, Prepared by Acer Tree Services, Ltd., Dated July 7, 2019
Recommendation:
THAT Temporary Use Permit 8.19, to allow for a plant nursery and garden centre on a site located within the 2300 Block of Old Dollarton Road, is ISSUED.

9.3. Delbrook Lands 2019 Planning and Engagement Process - Consultation Results
File No. 13.6440.01/000.000

Report: Community Planner, Manager – Strategic Communications, Manager – Parks, July 3, 2019
Appendix A: Survey #1 Respondents by Postal Code
Appendix B: Delbrook Lands Survey 1 Data Analysis Updated June 10, 2019
Appendix C: Conceptual Park Drawings Option 1 and Option 2

Recommendation:
THAT the results of the Delbrook Lands 2019 Planning and Engagement Process consultation is received for information;

AND THAT Council provide staff with direction on next steps in determining park design, community services and affordable housing on the Delbrook Lands site.

File No. 01.0530

Report: Chief Administrative Officer, July 12, 2019
Attachment 1: Council Directions 2019-2022

Recommendation:
THAT Council adopts Council Directions 2019-2022 as its public statement of priority issues, approaches and initiatives for its term of office;

AND THAT staff is directed to incorporate actions associated with the priority directions into the organization’s Corporate Plan and departmental work plans.

9.5. Non-Medical Retail Cannabis Policy
File No. 13.6440.50/000.000

Report: Planner, July 16, 2019
Attachment 1: Non-Medical Retail Cannabis Policy

Recommendation:
THAT the Non-Medical Retail Cannabis Policy as attached to the July 16, 2019 report of the Planner entitled Non-Medical Retail Cannabis Policy is approved;
AND THAT staff be directed to begin the application intake process for non-medical retail cannabis businesses on a first-come-first-served basis, as applications are forwarded to the District from the Provincial Liquor & Cannabis Regulation Branch;

AND THAT staff be directed to draft bylaw amendments to the Zoning Bylaw 3210, Business Licence Bylaw 4567, Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, and the Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458 to create the ability for approvals of cannabis retailing, manufacturing and warehousing.

9.6. **AED Request and Options**

File No. 08.3060.10/007.19

Report: Mayor Mike Little, July 11, 2019

*Recommendation:*
THAT the July 11, 2019 report of Mayor Little entitled AED Request and Options is received for information.

9.7. **North Shore Winter Club (1325 Keith Road) – Preliminary Rezoning Application**

File No. 08.3060.10/007.19

Report: Development Planner, July 11, 2019
Attachment A: Preliminary Application Drawing Package
Attachment B: Darwin Application Rationale Letter – Dated June 18, 2019
Attachment C: North Shore Unitarian Church Letter – Dated June 7, 2019

*Recommendation:*
THAT Council provide direction to staff regarding the consideration of this Preliminary Application for rezoning.

9.8. **East 29th Street Corridor Safety and Mobility Improvements – Update**

File No. 16.8620.20/054.000

Report: Manager – Engineering Services/Deputy General Manager, July 11, 2019
Attachment 1: Property Access Correspondence from Residents
Attachment 2: Concepts Rejected and Referred Back to Staff by Council May 6, 2019 to Improve Bicyclist Safety

*Recommendation:*
THAT the July 11, 2019 report of the Manager – Engineering Services/Deputy General Manager entitled East 29th Street Corridor Safety and Mobility Improvements – Update is received for information.

10. **REPORTS**

10.1. Mayor

10.2. Chief Administrative Officer

10.3. Councillors
10.4. Metro Vancouver Committee Appointees

10.4.1. Industrial Lands Strategy Task Force – Councillor Back
10.4.2. Housing Committee – Councillor Bond
10.4.3. Aboriginal Relations Committee – Councillor Hanson
10.4.4. Board – Councillor Muri
10.4.5. Regional Parks Committee – Councillor Muri
10.4.6. Liquid Waste Committee – Mayor Little
10.4.7. Mayors Committee – Mayor Little
10.4.8. Mayors Council - TransLink – Mayor Little
10.4.9. Performance & Audit Committee – Mayor Little
10.4.10. Zero Waste Committee – Mayor Little

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12. ADJOURNMENT

Recommendation:
THAT the July 22, 2019 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adjourned.
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Delegation to Council Request Form

District of North Vancouver
Clerk’s Department
355 West Queens Rd, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Questions about this form: Phone: 604-990-2311
Form submission: Submit to address above or Fax: 604.984.9637

COMPLETION: To ensure legibility, please complete (type) online then print. Sign the printed copy and submit to the department and address indicated above.

Delegations have five minutes to make their presentation. Questions from Council may follow.

Name of group wishing to appear before Council: North Van Arts

Title of Presentation: North Shore Culture Map Update

Name of person(s) to make presentation: Nancy Cottingham Powell

Purpose of Presentation:

☐ Information only
☐ Requesting a letter of support
☐ Other (provide details below)

Please describe:

In March 2017, North Vancouver District Council provided a letter of support and $5000 toward this regional project to build an online mapping resource to create awareness of the cultural sector of the North Shore which was leveraged to receive $421,000 from the Canadian Heritage Strategic Initiatives component of the Canada Cultural Investment Fund. We would like to update Council on the progress of this project, spearheaded by North Van Arts.

Contact person (if different than above):

Daytime telephone number: 604-988-6844

Email address: nancy@northvanarts.ca

Will you be providing supporting documentation? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes:

☑ Handout
☑ PowerPoint presentation

☑ DVD

Note: All supporting documentation must be provided 12 days prior to your appearance date. This form and any background material provided will be published in the public agenda.

Presentation requirements:

☐ Laptop
☑ Multimedia projector
☐ Tripod for posterboard
☐ Flipchart

☐ Overhead projector

Arrangements can be made, upon request, for you to familiarize yourself with the Council Chamber equipment on or before your presentation date.
Delegation to Council Request Form

Rules for Delegations:
1. Delegations must submit a Delegation to Council Request Form to the Municipal Clerk. Submission of a request does not constitute approval nor guarantee a date. The request must first be reviewed by the Clerk.
2. The Clerk will review the request and, if approved, arrange a mutually agreeable date with you. You will receive a signed and approved copy of your request form as confirmation.
3. A maximum of two delegations will be permitted at any Regular Meeting of Council.
4. Delegations must represent an organized group, society, institution, corporation, etc. Individuals may not appear as delegations.
5. Delegations are scheduled on a first-come, first-served basis, subject to direction from the Mayor, Council, or Chief Administrative Officer.
6. The Mayor or Chief Administrative Officer may reject a delegation request if it regards an offensive subject, has already been substantially presented to council in one form or another, deals with a pending matter following the close of a public hearing, or is, or has been, dealt with in a public participation process.
7. Supporting submissions for the delegation should be provided to the Clerk by noon 12 days preceding the scheduled appearance.
8. Delegations will be allowed a maximum of five minutes to make their presentation.
9. Any questions to delegations by members of Council will seek only to clarify a material aspect of a delegate’s presentation.
10. Persons invited to speak at the Council meeting may not speak disrespectfully of any other person or use any rude or offensive language or make a statement or allegation which impugns the character of any person.
11. Please note the District does not provide grants or donations through the delegation process.
12. Delegation requests that are non-jurisdictional or of a financial nature may not be accepted.

Helpful Suggestions:
- have a purpose
- get right to your point and make it
- be concise
- be prepared
- state your request, if any
- do not expect an immediate response to a request
- multiple-person presentations are still five minutes maximum
- be courteous, polite, and respectful
- it is a presentation, not a debate
- the Council Clerk may ask for any relevant notes (if not handed out or published in the agenda) to assist with the accuracy of our minutes

I understand and agree to these rules for delegations

Nancy Cottingham Powell 15 April 2019
Name of Delegate or Representative of Group Date

Signature

For Office Use Only

Approved by:
Municipal Clerk
Deputy Municipal Clerk

Rejected by:
Mayor
CAO

Appearance date: July 23, 2019
Receipt emailed on: April 16, 2019

Applicant informed on: __________________
Applicant informed by: __________________

The personal information collected on this form is done so pursuant to the Community Charter and/or the Local Government Act and in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. The personal information collected herein will be used only for the purpose of processing this application or request and for no other purpose unless its release is authorized by its owner, the information is part of a record series commonly available to the public, or is compelled by a Court or an agent duly authorized under another Act. Further information may be obtained by speaking with The District of North Vancouver’s Manager of Administrative Services at 604-990-2207 or at 355 W Queens Road, North Vancouver.
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Background

North Van Arts (aka The North Vancouver Community Arts Council) has taken the lead on a project to map the cultural assets of the North Shore of Vancouver including: the District of North Vancouver, the City of North Vancouver, the District of West Vancouver, and the lands of the Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations. Having been a key cultural player on the North Shore for the past 49 years, North Van Arts is well aware we have a vibrant arts and culture scene, but many in the sector still feel invisible. So, we formed an advisory committee made up of cultural players from government, non-profit, tourism, and business sectors and together we decided to do something about it.

Information about the cultural assets within the three municipalities and two First Nations will be compiled into a free, online, GIS driven, interactive mapping tool that will become a hub for North Shore culture and available to everyone. This tool is intended for residents, tourists, planners, and the cultural sector, and will help build audiences, drive tourism, fill gaps, and encourage partnerships to better highlight our rich cultural diversity.

Why Cultural Mapping?

"A creative economy extends beyond the culture sector to harness creativity in order to bring about positive social and economic changes across a broad spectrum of industries, sectors and social organizations."

The Conference Board of Canada, 2008

- Provides a cultural information hub that is used widely across sectors
- Supports economic development by building audiences, driving tourism, and extending stays
- Identifies cultural ‘gaps’, thereby encouraging new start-ups
- Promotes diversity and inclusiveness
- Supports partnerships and collaboration across the cultural sector and between the cultural and other sectors
What will be the outcome?

The North Shore Culture Map is a free, dynamic, online map for residents, tourists, local organizations, planners, events, and developers to highlight the cultural opportunities in the region.

The cultural mapping project uses leading edge geographic information systems (GIS) technology to highlight the creativity and culture of the North Shore on an interactive, web-based map. The map has been created in a GIS format, currently described as a public facing web-mapping solution. The website allows users to access the resource on any device (computer, laptop, tablet, phone) that will not require downloading a separate app. The North Shore Culture Map features images, video links, audio, and stories or descriptions about each asset.

Who benefits?

Residents
Tourists + Visitors
Cultural Organizations
Artistic Community
First Nations
Municipal Planners + Event Planners
Developers
Businesses

Scope

The project covers the geographic area of the District of North Vancouver, the City of North Vancouver, and the District of West Vancouver and the territories of the Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations. Future projects may link the North Shore Culture Map with similar resources in the Sea to Sky Corridor and the Sunshine Coast.
Project Team

North Van Arts Staff
Taking the lead in the project, North Van Arts staff oversee project development, fundraising, budget, and reporting; liaise with the Advisory Committee; work closely with the project team; oversee branding and marketing, community engagement, the launch; and maintain the final product for continued relevancy.

Advisory Committee
Since January 2016, North Van Arts has been working with an Advisory Committee to develop the project scope and categories. The role of the Advisory Committee is to suggest cultural assets to be included, establish criteria for inclusion, provide guidance in marketing, assist in development of project management, assist in determining project budget and funding sources, establish connections to the project through their networks, assist in naming the final product, share GIS data where applicable, and assist in maintaining project focus. The full list of current Advisory Committee members is included in this document. New members are added on an ongoing basis.

Project Team
To see the project to fruition, contractors have been and will be hired for project management, marketing, promotions, communications, GIS expertise, data collection, and website design & development. GIS specialists with the Environmental Systems Research Institute (Esri), will assist in developing a product that best suits data collected and showcases the North Shore’s cultural story.

Nancy Cottingham Powell
Michelle Richard
North Van Arts Staff Project Leads

Advisory Committee

Lori Baxter & Sheryl McGraw
Project Managers

Johnny Trinh
Community Engagement Manager

Esri - GIS systems specialists

Data Collection Assistants

Squamish Nation Cultural Consultant
Rebecca Duncan

Marketing Firm
MPMG
### Advisory Committee as of May 2019

**ARTS ORGANIZATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTS ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>ROLE/TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kay Meek Centre</td>
<td>Rob Gloor</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver Community Arts Council</td>
<td>Nancy Cottingham Powell, Michelle Richard</td>
<td>Executive Director, Project Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygon Gallery</td>
<td>Reid Shier, Jessica Bouchard</td>
<td>Director, Associate Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation House Theatre</td>
<td>Kim Selody</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver Community Arts Council</td>
<td>Jennifer Lord</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver Art Museum</td>
<td>Darrin Morrison</td>
<td>Administrator / Curator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour Art Gallery</td>
<td>Vanessa Black</td>
<td>Curator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (YOUTH AND FAMILIES) / MULTICULTURAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (YOUTH AND FAMILIES) / MULTICULTURAL</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>ROLE/TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of North Vancouver</td>
<td>Lea Herman</td>
<td>Coordinator, Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of North Vancouver</td>
<td>Annie Mauboules</td>
<td>Social Planner Sustainable Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Multicultural Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS Immigrant Inclusion Partnership</td>
<td>Olivia Bornik</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CULTURAL SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL SERVICES</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>ROLE/TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of West Vancouver</td>
<td>Doti Niedermeyer, Glenn Madsen</td>
<td>Senior Manager, Cultural Dev’t Cultural Services Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver Recreation &amp; Culture Commission</td>
<td>John Rice, Karen Pighin</td>
<td>Cultural Services Officer Community Arts &amp; Culture Animator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>ROLE/TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School District #44</td>
<td>Yolande Martinello</td>
<td>Artists for Kids Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District #45</td>
<td>Lynne Tomlinson</td>
<td>Director of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capilano University – Blue Shore Financial Performing Arts Centre</td>
<td>Sandra McRae</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capilano University – School of Motion Pictures</td>
<td>Michael Thoma</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIRST NATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NATIONS</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>ROLE/TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Squamish Nation</td>
<td>Rebecca Duncan</td>
<td>Language Teacher/Translation Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsleil-Waututh Nation</td>
<td>Michelle George</td>
<td>Referrals Analyst, Treaty, Lands &amp; Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HERITAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HERITAGE</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>ROLE/TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of North Vancouver</td>
<td>Shirley Sutherland</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver Museum &amp; Archives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIBRARIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBRARIES</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>ROLE/TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of North Vancouver</td>
<td>Deb Hutchison Koep, Mikale Fenton</td>
<td>Chief Librarian, Community, Program &amp; Service Dev’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNV Library Services</td>
<td>David Milner</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver Memorial Library</td>
<td>Pat Cumming, Taren Urquhart</td>
<td>Customer &amp; Community Experience Arts &amp; Special Events Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOURISM / ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOURISM / ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>ROLE/TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambleside-Dunderave BIA</td>
<td>Stephanie Jones</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capilano Suspension Bridge</td>
<td>Jared Martin</td>
<td>Multimedia Marketing Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of West Vancouver</td>
<td>Stephen Mikicich</td>
<td>Manager, Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouse Mountain</td>
<td>Julia Grant</td>
<td>Manager, Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Lonsdale BIA</td>
<td>Greg Holmes</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Patrick Stafford-Smith, Lorelei Phillips</td>
<td>CEO &amp; CDO, Marketing &amp; Communications Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver’s North Shore Tourism</td>
<td>Jennifer Belak</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Debbie Janson</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financials

**Total Project Budget** = $753,000 (over 3 years, including cash and in-kind);

**Confirmed cash contributions** = total $452,000;
- Canadian Heritage, Canada Cultural Investment Fund, Strategic Initiatives Component $421,000
- Metro Vancouver, Cultural Grants $10,000
- Canada Summer Jobs Program $6000
- District of North Vancouver $5,000
- City of North Vancouver $5,000
- District of West Vancouver $5,000

**Confirmed in-kind contributions** = total $79,495 value;
City of North Vancouver, District of North Vancouver, District of West Vancouver, North Vancouver Recreation & Culture Commission, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations, Advisory Committee partners.

**Projected Earned revenues** = total $19,800.

**Pending cash and in-kind contributions** = total $201,705.
Definitions of Asset Categories

The following are definitions developed to inventory cultural assets based on best practices in the field and in consultation with the Advisory Committee. Each category is further defined using keywords. Assets may appear in multiple categories.

**Cultural Organizations**
Organizations that represent arts, heritage, and ethno-cultural interests in the community. These are usually non-profits.

**Sample Keywords:** Artisan/Craft, Dance, Film, Design, Digital/Media Arts, Fashion, Historical/Heritage, Indigenous, Music, Literary, Multicultural, Performing Arts, Photography, Textile, Theatre, Visual Arts, Architecture

**Cultural Spaces & Facilities**
A physical space, building or site that hosts cultural activity where people gather to experience arts or heritage-related activities (may include spaces in the public, private, and non-profit sectors, and everything from purpose-built facilities, to facilities that include cultural programming).

**Sample Keywords:** Art & Design Studios, Art Galleries, Cinemas, Cultural Centres, Performing Arts Centres/Theatres, Festival Sites, Religious Spaces, Artist Hubs

**Cultural/Creative Industries**
Businesses that provide the creation, production, manufacturing, and/or distribution of goods and services that are cultural in nature (includes everything from recording studios, theatre costume making, to creative software design).

**Sample keywords:** Dance, Digital Arts, Film, Literary, Music, Theatre, Visual Arts

**Cultural & Natural Heritage**
The legacy of buildings and/or sites, physical artifacts, activities, and intangible attributes of a group or society, of historical, cultural, and educational value that are inherited from past generations, maintained in the present, and bestowed for the benefit of future generations. It also includes assets in the natural environment that have cultural significance, including flora and fauna, cultural landscapes (natural features that have cultural attributes), or strictly delineated natural areas of particular value from a cultural point of view (municipal parks, conservation areas, and botanical gardens).

**Sample Keywords:** Archives, Built Heritage, Conservation Areas, Gardens, Heritage Registers, Historic Plaques and Monuments, Heritage Districts, Historic Sites, Architecture, Intangible Assets, Museums, Nature Centres, Significant Parks, Trails, Walking Tours
Festivals & Events
A period or program of activities, events, and/or entertainment celebrating and/or educating one or many social cultures (may include performing arts events, tours of culturally significant places, seasonal celebrations)
Sample Keywords: Gallery/Studio Tours, Multicultural Festivals, Film Festivals, Street Festivals, Workshops

First Nations
Places, stories, events, customs, and traditions that represent the culture of local First Nations. Working closely in partnership with the Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations, it will be determined which assets are to be shared through the cultural map and the most appropriate way to present the information. Sample keywords: Squamish, Tsleil-Waututh

Intangibles
Consists of non-physical aspects of a particular culture, including traditions, customs and practices, aesthetic and spiritual beliefs, artistic expression, language and other aspects of human activity. Sample Keywords: Legends, Oral History, Language Preservation, Placemaking

Public Art
Original, one-of-a-kind work that creatively reflects the culture, heritage and/or natural environment of the site or surrounding area. A distinctive cultural asset, public art provides a deep-rooted sense of place and serves as an artistic legacy for future generations. Sample Keywords: Installation, 3D, 2D

Public Institutions
A public institution is a public body that operates accessible facilities and services for the public good, including but not limited to: elementary, secondary, and post-secondary schools or institutions, local authorities at the municipal, provincial, or federal level. Sample Keywords: Civic Offices, Community & Recreation Centres, Health Centre/Hospital, Libraries, Senior Centres, Schools

Service Organizations
A service club or service organization is a non-profit organization where members meet regularly to perform charitable work either by direct hands-on efforts or by raising money for other organizations. A service club is defined by its service mission and membership benefits, such as social occasions, networking, and personal growth opportunities that encourage involvement. Sample Keywords: Arts Councils, Artist Guilds, Charities, Legion, Volunteer
Beta Test Period

To build a tool that is effective and useful for our target audience, a beta test version was launched in limited release on April 30, 2019.

at
northshoreculturemap.ca

Testing Period: May 1 – September 1, 2019

During this testing phase, we are asking the public to test the map in its current state and provide feedback about the functionality. Links to the feedback form can be found on the map site.

Notes for the Beta Testing Period:
Only a sample of assets are included in this version. Assets will be added to the map on an ongoing basis.
The ‘look' (colour, style, icons, etc) and name of the map is temporary, as a brand will be developed for the official launch in 2020.
Two different coloured maps are used in this version, seeking feedback on the preferred colour/style. Asset listings and images are provided to us by the asset, through an online form, linked in the Feedback & Contact area of the map site.

Information collected during this testing phase will be used to complete development for the final tool to be launched in spring 2020.
You Are Here Calendar – Cultural Mapping Fundraiser

As a promotional and fundraising tool for the North Shore Cultural Mapping project, North Van Arts launched the **You Are Here Calendar** in 2017 and will continue to produce the calendars to the launch of the online tool in 2020 and beyond.

Images in the calendar depict recognizably ‘North Shore’ scenes or locations and are created by local artists. The calendar includes a map to situate the scenes, providing a visual element to tell the story of North Shore Culture.

Artists donate their images, as the calendar is intended to raise funds for the North Shore Cultural Mapping. Exhibitions of the original artwork take place around the North Shore where the work is for sale (sale proceeds go to the artist).

Calendars are $20 each (plus tax) and are available at various locations across the North Shore.

![Calendar Images]
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Project Update

PROJECT TIMELINE

2016  PHASE 1
Research & Development
Building Relationships

2017 | 2018 | 2019
PHASE 2
Funding
Production
Marketing

2020
PHASE 3
Launch Spring 2020
Ongoing Promotion & Engagement

Ongoing
Promotion
& Engagement
SCOPE

- City of North Vancouver
- District of North Vancouver
- District of West Vancouver
- Squamish Nation
- Tsleil-Waututh Nation

MAP USERS

- Residents
- Tourists/Visitors
- Arts & Cultural Organizations
- Businesses
- Developers (Real Estate)
- Festival & Event Organizers
- First Nations
- Planners: City, Culture, Heritage, Events
COLLABORATION/RELATIONSHIPS

Key to Success

Municipalities  First Nations
Advisors & Partners  Tourism Agencies
North Van Arts

North Shore Culture Map

Business Community

Funding

Provincial 64%
Federal 5%
Private Sector 7%
Earned Revenue 14%
Municipal In Kind 12%
North Van Arts 5%
First Nations In Kind 9%
Municipal & Regional 44%
HUB FOR NORTH SHORE CULTURE

- No downloading
- No passwords or log in
- Access via computer, tablet, phone
PARTNER

INTEGRATED EVENTS LISTING

FIRST NATIONS ENGAGEMENT

“Making us more visible.”
Chris Lewis, Councillor & Spokesperson for Squamish Nation, 2017

“...goal is to re-establish a Tsleil-Waututh ‘face’ on the traditional territory by becoming part of all social, economic, and political activities that impact lands and waters within this territory...”
Cates Park/Whey-Ah-Wichen Park Master Plan and Cultural Resources Interpretation Management Plan, 2006

First Nations category and layer on map
Supports Heritage Strategic Plan

**GOAL #2: INCREASE HERITAGE EDUCATION AND AWARENESS**
Promote and support the knowledge and celebration of the District’s heritage values and historic places.

**GOAL #3: MAKE HERITAGE MORE ACCESSIBLE**
Improve access to heritage resources and information, both online and physical.

“The fastest growing sector of the tourism market is cultural tourism...performing arts; museums and galleries; visual arts; heritage events; visits to historic sites; genealogical research; multicultural/ethnic events; and some tourist attractions.”

DNV Draft Heritage Strategic Plan, 2019

residential and commercial buildings, bridges, fountains, natural areas, trees, cultural sites, and archaeological resources.

---

**GIS TECHNOLOGY**

“Giving You the Tools to Change the World”

- Compliments existing GIS systems on North Shore
- Options including map customization and event calendar integration
- Advanced data management & analysis
KEY MILESTONES

- Secured major funding
- Project Team & GIS Specialists
- Consultations & Surveys
- Work Plans
- Data Collection
- Engagement & Outreach Activities
- Beta launch

Beta Version
now in testing phase
BETA TESTING
May to September 2019
northshoreculturemap.net

MAINTAINING THE MAP

- Maintenance on current festivals & events data
- Updating asset data
- Community outreach and engagement
- Ongoing marketing
- Map next steps
Contact
North Shore Culture Mapping Project Team
North Van Arts
culturemap@northvanarts.ca
T: 604-988-6844
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DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Council for the District of North Vancouver held at 7:04 p.m. on Monday, July 8, 2019 in the Council Chambers of the District Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, British Columbia.

Present: Mayor M. Little
Councillor J. Back
Councillor M. Bond
Councillor M. Curren
Councillor B. Forbes
Councillor J. Hanson
Councillor L. Muri

Staff: Mr. D. Stuart, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. G. Joyce, General Manager – Engineering, Parks & Facilities
Mr. D. Milburn, General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits
Mr. J. Gordon, Manager – Administrative Services
Ms. A. Reiher, Confidential Council Clerk
Mr. M. Hartford, Planner
Ms. C. Rucci, Social Planner

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Councilor MURI requested the addition of an item of business regarding 29th Street Bike Lanes.

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT item 9.9, 29th Street Bike Lanes, be included in the agenda.

CARRIED

1.1. July 8, 2019 Regular Meeting Agenda

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT the agenda for the July 8, 2019 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adopted as amended, including the addition of any items listed in the agenda addendum.

CARRIED

2. PUBLIC INPUT

2.1. Ms. Lindy Libke, 700 Block East 29th Street:
- Expressed concern about street parking on East 29th Street, the lack of a driveway to her home and back lane access;
- Expressed concern about accessibility for the elderly and disabled and delivery trucks for home-based businesses; and,
• Suggested that less frequented roadways may be used as cycling routes.

2.2. Ms. Debra Mickelson, 300 Block East 29th Street:
• Expressed concern about street parking on East 29th Street and the manner in which residents were notified;
• Expressed concern about deliveries to residents and accessibility for the disabled to their homes; and,
• Requested that a compromise to restore street parking be considered.

2.3. Ms. Mary McWilliam, 900 Block East 29th Street:
• Spoke about proposed safety improvements for East 29th Street and requested there be community consultation regarding the design process;
• Expressed concern about the perceived lack of community engagement and reduced accessibility for seniors and the disabled; and,
• Suggested that the proposed bike lane is not a safe route and referenced the City of Vancouver guideline.

2.4. Mr. Peter Coles, 1000 Block East 29th Street:
• Spoke in opposition to the parking restrictions on East 29th Street;
• Expressed concern about the distance to park from his home and suggested there are other alternatives for bike routes; and,
• Expressed concern regarding the safety of bike lanes and requested that parking restrictions be reviewed.

2.5. Mr. Sven Robinson, 4000 Block Dundas Street:
• Spoke in favour of item 9.8 and applauded Council for their position on environmental matters; and,
• Requested Council support the motion and read the Urban Policymakers Report.

2.6. Mr. Kevin Kang, 700 Block East 29th Street:
• Expressed concern about street parking on East 29th Street and potential loitering at bus stops; and,
• Requested that Council reconsider their plans.

2.7. Mr. Dwayne Canderan, 900 Block East 29th Street:
• Expressed concern about street parking on East 29th Street and the perceived lack of community public input;
• Spoke about a survey for the East 29th Street commute and expressed concern about the safety of residents backing out of their driveways; and,
• Suggested that an alternate bike route be considered.

2.8. Ms. Judith Brook, 2400 Block Lauralynn Drive:
• Spoke about item 9.8 and expressed support for the reduction of green-house-gas emissions; and,
• Thanked Council for following evidence based facts and requested that the Mayor speak with TransLink regarding SeaBus emissions.

2.9. Mr. Don Piercy, 3900 Block Braemer Place:
• Expressed support for protected bike lanes along East 29th Street;
• Suggested that the Official Community Plan and Community Energy and Emissions Plan support the initiative; and,
• Stated that action needs to be taken to protect the environment and to encourage the use of alternative forms of transportation.

2.10. Mr. Fred Rathje, 600 Block Roslyn Boulevard:
• Commented about road improvements for East 29th Street and applauded Council for the installation of safe cycling routes; and,
• Queried about the ability to create parking spaces between cycling routes and residential properties.

3. PROCLAMATIONS

Nil

4. RECOGNITIONS

Nil

5. DELEGATIONS

5.1. Emily Pickett & Shiqi Xu, Vancouver Humane Society & Sutherland Secondary School
Re: Municipal plant-based food procurement and purchasing

Ms. Emily Pickett, Maranda, Anna and Alissa, commented about their initiatives to bring plant based meals to schools across North Vancouver. They discussed outreach and educational efforts with the School Board, the environmental impacts of meat-based food diets and the benefits of plant based food. They recommended a multi-pronged approach to a climate-friendly diet through a climate action plan, a tangible target for municipal plant-based food procurement and a public awareness campaign.

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor CURREN
THAT the delegation of the Vancouver Humane Society & Sutherland Secondary School is received for information.

CARRIED

6. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

6.1. May 27, 2019 Regular Council Meeting

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT the minutes of the May 27, 2019 Regular Council meeting are adopted.

CARRIED
6.2. June 17, 2019 Regular Council Meeting

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT the minutes of the June 17, 2019 Regular Council meeting are adopted.

CARRIED

6.3. June 24, 2019 Special Council Meeting

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT the minutes of the June 24, 2019 Special Council meeting are adopted.

CARRIED

7. RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING DECISIONS

7.1. January 21, 2019 Closed Special Meeting of Council
File No. 01.0360.20/076.000

7.1.1. Hollyburn Family Services Society – Agreement to Lease

THAT Council directs staff to advise Hollyburn Family Services Society that:
1. Council has decided that the Burr Place site is not supported;
2. Hollyburn Family Services Society is accordingly released from its obligations under the agreement to lease dated September 13, 2018; and,
3. The District will ascertain verifiable out of pocket expenses incurred by Hollyburn Family Services Society and BC Housing with respect to the Burr Place site only and report back to Council.

7.2. June 17, 2019 Closed Special Meeting of Council

7.2.1. Advisory Oversight Committee Recommendations and Appointments

THAT the following 11 members are appointed to the Rental, Social and Affordable Housing Task Force for a two-year term:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sarah Bermel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kelly Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Keith Collyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bruce Crowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ian Cullis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hesam Deihimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Phil Dupasquier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Katherine Fagerlund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Heather Fowler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ellison Mallin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Michael Sadler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. COUNCIL WORKSHOP REPORT
Nil

9. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

Councillor BOND declared a potential conflict of interest in the following matter citing his Board membership with an organization. He left the meeting at 7:49 p.m.

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor CURREN
THAT items 9.1 and 9.2 are included in the Consent Agenda and be approved without debate.

CARRIED
Absent for vote due to a conflict of interest: Councillor BOND

9.1. 2019 Community Service Grant Recommendations

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor CURREN
THAT the 2019 Community Service Grant allocations of $298,033 in accordance with Attachment A of the June 20, 2019 report of the Community Planner entitled 2019 Community Service Grant Recommendations are approved;

AND THAT staff is directed to refer the request for an inflation adjustment to the Community Service Grant budget to the 2020 financial planning process.

CARRIED
Absent for vote due to a conflict of interest: Councillor BOND

9.2. 2019 Child Care Grants Report

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor CURREN
THAT the 2019 Childcare Grant allocations of $54,857 in accordance with Table 1 contained within the June 20, 2019 report of the Community Planner entitled 2019 Child Care Grants Report are approved;

AND THAT staff is directed to refer the request for an inflation adjustment to the Childcare Grant budget to the 2020 financial planning process.

CARRIED
Absent for vote due to a conflict of interest: Councillor BOND

Councillor BOND returned to the meeting at 7:50 p.m.
9.3. Development Variance Permit 87.18 – 1282 Brantwood Road  
File No. 08.3060.20/087.18

Public Input:

Mr. Scott Hewett, 1200 Block Brantwood Road:
- Spoke in favour of the item; and,
- Spoke about the design challenges and neighbourhood support for the proposal.

MOVED by Councillor MURSECONDED by Councillor BOND  
THAT Development Variance Permit 87.18, to allow for a new single-family dwelling with a secondary suite at 1282 Brantwood Road, is ISSUED.  
CARRIED

9.4. Development Variance Permit 80.18 (Coach House) – 345 Beachview Drive  
File No. 08.3060.20/080.18

Public Input:

Mr. James Norris, 300 Block Beachview Drive:
- Spoke in favour of the item; and,
- Spoke about the design of the project to support their future family needs.

MOVED by Councillor MURSECONDED by Councillor BOND  
THAT Development Variance Permit 80.18, to allow for a coach house at 345 Beachview Drive, is ISSUED.  
CARRIED

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

9.8. Declaring a Climate & Ecological Emergency and Calling for Transformative Action  
File No.

Public Input:

Ms. Nichol Reichardt, 300 Block West 2nd Street:
- Spoke in favour of the item;
- Commended Council for committing to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate (IPC) targets by January 2020; and,
- Requested that objectives to measure emissions be implemented by 2020 and be included in the motion.
MOVED by Councillor CURREN
SECONDED by Councillor MURI
THAT the District of North Vancouver declare a climate & ecological emergency;

AND THAT staff are directed to incorporate more urgent climate action and ecological protection into strategic and financial planning processes;

AND THAT Council commit to meeting our carbon pollution targets which align with the most current IPCC science, and which were unanimously supported January 21, 2019;

AND THAT the District of North Vancouver establish an annual carbon budget for corporate and community carbon pollution beginning no later than January 2020;

AND THAT a North Shore Climate & Biodiversity Committee be formed;

AND THAT this declaration & climate commitment is shared with the community via dnv.org and via email to staff and partner agencies.

CARRIED

Council recessed at 8:29 p.m. and reconvened at 8:34 p.m.

9.9. 29th Street Bike Lanes
File No.

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Mayor LITTLE
THAT the issue of 29th Street Bike Lanes be referred to the July 22, 2019 Regular Council meeting;

AND FURTHER THAT staff report back to Council in the fall, or at their earliest convenience, on the impact of removing all parking on arterial routes in the District of North Vancouver so Council can understand, plan and discuss with users, residents and businesses impacts.

CARRIED

Councillor FORBES declared a potential conflict of interest in the following matter as she has a neighbour who keeps pigeons. She left the meeting at 8:58 p.m.

9.5. Keeping of Pigeons Bylaw
File No.

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor CURREN
THAT staff be directed to prepare a bylaw for Council’s consideration to amend the Keeping of Pigeons Bylaw (No. 4078) as described in the April 26, 2019 report from Councillor Lisa Muri entitled Keeping of Pigeons Bylaw to ban the keeping of pigeons in the District.
9.6. **Braemar School Street Mural**
File No.

Public Input:

Mr. Lyle Craver, 4700 Block Hoskins Road:
- Spoke in opposition of the item; and,
- Expressed concern about the lack of public input.

Councillor FORBES returned to the meeting at this point in the proceedings. (9:08 p.m.)

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor BACK
THAT staff are authorized to approve a street mural at Braemar Elementary School;

AND THAT staff develop a policy for street murals for Council’s future consideration.

CARRIED

9.7. **BC Housing Affordable Home Ownership Program**
File No.

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor BOND
THAT the June 27, 2019 report from the Development Planner entitled BC Housing Affordable Home Ownership Program is received for information.

CARRIED

10. **REPORTS**

10.1. **Mayor**

Mayor Little reported on his attendance at the Canada Day celebrations.

10.2. **Chief Administrative Officer**

Nil

10.3. **Councillors**

10.3.1. Councillor Muri reported on her attendance at the Canada Day celebrations.
10.4. Metro Vancouver Committee Appointees

10.4.1. Industrial Lands Strategy Task Force – Councillor Back

Nil

10.4.2. Housing Committee – Councillor Bond

Councillor Bond reported on his attendance at the Metro Vancouver Housing Committee meeting on July 3, 2019 where the ten year strategic plan for housing was discussed.

10.4.3. Aboriginal Relations Committee – Councillor Hanson

Nil

10.4.4. Board – Councillor Muri

Nil

10.4.5. Regional Parks Committee – Councillor Muri

Nil

10.4.6. Liquid Waste Committee – Mayor Little

Nil

10.4.7. Mayors Committee – Mayor Little

Nil

10.4.8. Mayors Council - TransLink – Mayor Little

Mayor Little reported on his attendance at the Mayor’s Council meeting where the bus route for Phibbs Exchange to MetroTown was approved.

10.4.9. Performance & Audit Committee – Mayor Little

Nil

10.4.10. Zero Waste Committee – Mayor Little

Nil

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Nil
12. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor CURREN
THAT the July 8, 2019 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adjourned.

CARRIED
(9:55 p.m.)

Mayor ........................................ Municipal Clerk ......................................
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The District of North Vancouver

REPORT TO COUNCIL

July 8, 2019
File: 08.3221.02

AUTHOR: Brett Dwyer, Chief Building Official

SUBJECT: Remedial Action Requirements - 5748 Sunshine Falls Lane - Unsafe Dilapidated House

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Declares the building (the "Building") located on property at 5748 Sunshine Falls Lane (the "Property") legally described as:

   PID 014-834-855
   Lot 1 AM (RP 1281) of lot E of lot 5, Block 2, District Lot 950, Plan 1384

   to be in an unsafe condition and to create an unsafe condition and to be a nuisance;

2. Orders that Chermijager Holdings Ltd., (the "Owner") must:

   a. by September 3, 2019 apply for and obtain a demolition permit to completely demolish and remove the Building, and then completely demolish and remove the building pursuant to said issued building permit and restore the Property to a neat and tidy condition to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official; or, alternatively

   b. return the Building to a safe condition by strictly complying with all of the following requirements:

      (i) by September 3, 2019, provide to the District a report from a qualified Professional Engineer(s) providing structural, electrical and mechanical analyses of the Building and a remediation plan for the Building which must include all of the following to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official and must be submitted to the Chief Building Official for approval:
SUBJECT: Remedial Action Requirements - 5748 Sunshine Falls Lane - Unsafe Dilapidated House

July 8, 2019

A. Itemized and detailed description of work required to remediate the unsafe condition of the Building in compliance with the District’s Zoning, Construction and Fire Bylaws (the “Remedial Work”);

B. Certification that completion of the Remedial Work will render the Building safe for the use intended;

C. Itemized schedule of work for carrying out the Remedial Work establishing to satisfaction of the Chief Building Official that if the proposed schedule is met then all of the Remedial Work will be completed by April 6th, 2020 (the “Remediation Plan”);

(ii) by October 7, 2019, submit complete applications for all permits required to carry out the Remediation Work to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official;

(iii) by April 6, 2020, complete the Remedial Work in accordance with the issued building permit and the Remediation Plan to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official;

3. Council directs that in the event that the Owner does not complete an action required under sections 2(a) or 2(b), as applicable, then the District, by its staff, agents and contractors, may enter onto the Property and completely demolish and remove the Building, and the costs of such action shall be treated as a debt owed to the District of North Vancouver, which if unpaid at the end of the calendar year in which the building is demolished and removed, will be added to the property taxes pursuant to section 258 of the Community Charter:

REASON FOR REPORT:
To address the unsafe and unsightly condition of the dilapidated house at 5748 Sunshine Falls Lane by making a remedial action order as above.

SUMMARY:
The Building is vacant in an advanced state of deterioration and is clearly in an unsafe condition and the Chief Building Official is of the opinion that the recommended remedial action order is required to address the unsafe condition.

BACKGROUND:
The District has received a number of complaints from neighbouring property owners regarding the run-down state of the Building at 5748 Sunshine Falls Lane. The District has also received a complaint from the British Columbia Ministry of Environment with public safety and pollution concerns should the building collapse into Burrard Inlet.

The District sent a letter to the Owner of the Property on January 23, 2019 advising the Owner to address the unsafe condition of the Building by February 20, 2019. In response to
this letter a male on behalf the Owner made one phone call to the District saying that he would address the unsafe condition, but nothing has happened and we have not heard from him since.

The following map shows the location of the property.

The following photos show the current condition of the Building. Note that the building has lost all structural support from the front row of foundation.
EXISTING POLICY:
A Municipal Council has the authority to impose Remedial Action Requirements under sections 72 and 73 of the Charter with respect to hazardous conditions in relation to a building or structure. Council can require an Owner to remove, demolish, alter, or otherwise deal with the matter in accordance with the directions of Council or a person authorised by Council.

Section 73 of the Charter specifically authorizes local governments to impose a remedial action requirement where council considers a "matter or thing is in or creates an unsafe condition or the matter or thing contravenes the provincial building regulations or a bylaw under section 8(3)(1) of Division 8 [building regulation] of this Part."

The resolution imposing a remedial action requirement must specify a time by which the required action must be taken which must be at least 30 days after a notice of the order is sent. If the person wishes to appeal, they have 14 days to request a reconsideration by Council.

If the remedial action requirements are not completed within the time permitted, the District can complete the requirements at the expense of the property owner (per s. 17 of the Charter). If the costs are unpaid at the end of the year, they may be added to the property taxes (s. 258).
ANALYSIS:
Again, the Building at 5748 Sunshine Falls Lane is in an unsafe condition and is a nuisance. The Owner has not complied with the District’s demand to remove or remediate the unsafe condition.

Council has the authority to impose remedial action requirements as outlined above. The proposed remedial action requirements set out in the recommendations at the beginning of this report will require the Owner to remove the unsafe Building and restore the Property to a neat and tidy condition. If the Owner fails to comply, the District may complete the work at the Owner’s expense.

Timing/Approval Process:
In light of the risks posed by the condition of the Building, it is recommended that the deadline for completing the remedial action requirements be as soon as possible. The Charter requires that the deadline cannot be earlier than 30 days after the notice of the remedial action requirements is sent to the owner. Accordingly, staff recommends the imposition of the dates stipulated in the recommended remedial action order.

Concurrence:
This report has been reviewed and is supported by the Municipal Solicitor.

Financial Impacts:
In the case of default, the District may undertake the remedial action requirements at the expense of the owner and recover the costs as debt (s. 17 of the Charter). If the debt remains unpaid on December 31st, the amount may be added to the property taxes (s. 258 of the Charter).

Conclusion:
This Building is clearly in a very unsafe condition and efforts to achieve voluntary compliance to remedy this have proven ineffective. Therefore, staff is recommending that Council impose a remedial action order on the Owner in accordance with the Community Charter.

Options:
1. Council impose the recommended Remedial Action Requirement on the Owner.
2. Provide direction to staff on alternative action.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Brett Dwyer
Chief Building Official
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>External Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
<td>Development Engineering</td>
<td>Clerk's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Engineering Operations</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bylaw Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RCMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NVRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum &amp; Arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July 8, 2019
The District of North Vancouver

REPORT TO COUNCIL

July 10, 2019
File: 08.3060.20/008.19

AUTHOR: Darren Veres, Development Planner

SUBJECT: TEMPORARY USE PERMIT 8.19 – 2300 Block, Old Dollarton Rd (Dykhof Nurseries)

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT Temporary Use Permit 8.19, to allow for a plant nursery and garden centre on a site located within the 2300 Block of Old Dollarton Road is ISSUED.

REASON FOR REPORT:
The Director of Planning, Permits and Bylaws has referred consideration of this Temporary Use Permit to Council.

SUMMARY:
Dykhof Nurseries (Dykhof) has applied for a Temporary Use Permit (TUP) to use four vacant District-owned properties and a portion of unopened road and lane allowance, as a plant nursery and garden centre.

The site is located within the Maplewood Village Centre and is designated in the Official Community Plan (OCP) for “Light Industrial Artisan” use. The four District-owned properties are currently zoned Residential Single Family (RS4), which does not permit the proposed uses.

Temporary Use Permit 8.19 (Attachment A) would allow the business to operate while a permanent location is secured. In addition to the TUP, a licence agreement will be required to allow for short-term tenancy of the District-owned land.
Staff recommend the issuance of the TUP for a period of three years which, upon application, may be considered for a single extension for an additional period of up to three years.

BACKGROUND:
Dykhof has been operating out of their current location at 460 Mountain Highway since 1957, making it one of the oldest continually-operating businesses in the District of North Vancouver. In 2015, Dykhof agreed to sell their property as part of a larger land assembly, and has since been leasing the land back to continue operation of the business. Despite on-going efforts, Dykhof has to date been unable to find a new location suitable for their business.

In the letter to Mayor and Council, dated February 22, 2018, (Attachment B), Dykhof requested support for the temporary use of District land, in order to remain in business while a permanent location is secured.

SUBJECT PROPERTY:
The site is approximately 2,742 m² (29,512 sq ft) in size and is located in the Maplewood Village Centre, in the 2300 Block of Old Dollarton Road. The site consists of four vacant District-owned properties, which are currently unoccupied, and a portion of adjacent unopened road and lane allowance.

There is an existing single-family dwelling to the east, undevolved District-owned land to the north and west, and light industrial uses to the south.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal involves the construction of a 465 m² (5,000 sq ft) sales building and storage area, and two 232 m² (2,500 sq ft) greenhouses (see rendering and site plan on following page). The proposal also includes an outdoor display area and 27 on-site parking spaces. Compliance with the commercial parking requirements of Part 10 of the District’s Zoning Bylaw will be confirmed at the Building Permit stage.
Customer access is proposed from Old Dollarton Road at the southwest corner of the site and access for commercial loading is proposed from Old Dollarton Road at the southeast corner.
The submitted Arborist report (Attachment C) assessed a total of 39 trees and identifies 32 trees for removal, 7 of which are off-site on other District lands. A detailed Arborist report including a wind-throw and construction impact assessment of trees within 20m of the site, and a tree protection and removal plan has recently been submitted to staff for review. Based on the findings of this report, modifications to the project plans may be required to provide for the retention of protected trees and this requirement is included in TUP 8.19. A restoration planting plan for the Streamside Protection Area may also be required.

EXISTING POLICY:

Temporary Use Permits:
On July 10, 2017, Council adopted Bylaw 8217 which amended the Zoning Bylaw to allow TUPs to be considered anywhere in the District except for residential-zoned lands outside the District’s four growth centres. The intention of the bylaw amendment was to allow greater flexibility within the District to accommodate short-term commercial or industrial opportunities. As the site is located within the Maplewood Village Centre, the Zoning Bylaw allows for issuance of a TUP.

Official Community Plan:
The site is located in the Maplewood Village Centre and the Official Community Plan designates the site for “Light Industrial Artisan” use, which allows up to 2.50 FSR. While the temporary uses do not comply with the OCP designation, it is unlikely that the proposed plant nursery and garden centre will be the highest and best use for the site in the future, and future redevelopment would respond to OCP objectives.

Existing Zoning:
The site is currently zoned Residential Single Family (RS4), which does not permit the proposed uses. The existing zoning on the site would remain unchanged throughout the duration of the TUP and at the end of the permit term, the proposed use would be removed and the site restored as required by the District.

ANALYSIS:

Timing/Approval Process:
The authority to issue TUPs has been delegated to the General Manager of Planning, Properties and Permits. The General Manager has referred consideration of this TUP to Council. If Council issues the TUP for a period of three years, the General Manager of Planning, Properties and Permits may approve an extension. An extension can occur once only and can be for up to a maximum period of three years.
Licence Agreement:
A licence agreement is required to allow for short-term tenancy of the District-owned land. The licence agreement outlines the terms and conditions of the temporary use including but not limited to:

- Length and termination of the agreement;
- Permitted uses and improvements;
- Site maintenance and repair;
- Restoration of the site upon expiry or termination of the agreement; and
- Fees payable for restoration of the site, if the site is not returned to its original condition upon expiry or termination of the agreement.

This agreement will be finalized by staff, should the TUP be issued by Council.

Exit Strategy:
An exit strategy outlining a plan for cessation or relocation of the use once the permit is lapsed, is required for the TUP. An exit strategy has been provided for this proposal, and includes the following:

- Structures to be disassembled and shipped to a new site for reconstruction, once a permanent location is secured;
- In the event that Dykhof does not find a permanent location, they will take the necessary steps to terminate the business operation, including sale of any remaining items and structures on the property;
- Any in-ground drainage systems and footings will be removed;
- Gravel base will be removed and either reused or recycled;
- All site and environmental protection fencing will be removed, unless otherwise required by the District;
- All material will be repurposed and/or recycled, where possible; and
- The site will be replanted, as required by the District. A replanting and landscape plan and security is to be provided to the District prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

Staff have reviewed and are satisfied with the proposed exit strategy, and the restoration of the site upon termination will be secured through the required licence agreement.

Development Permits:
The site is in Development Permit Areas (DPAs) for Protection of Development from Hazardous Conditions (Creek Hazard), Energy and Water Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction, Protection of the Natural Environment, its Ecosystems and Biological Diversity (Streamside Protection), Protection of the Natural Environment, and Form and Character for Commercial and Mixed-Use Buildings.

In accordance with Bylaw 8217, a TUP may be exempted from the requirement to obtain a Development Permit. Staff recommend that this proposal be exempt from the requirement to obtain permits under all aforementioned DPAs.
Environment:
While Development Permits will not be issued, the TUP includes conditions as recommended by qualified environmental professionals and the District’s Environment Department. Staff will continue to work with the applicant to complete all conditions required prior to issuance of a Building Permit. Included below is a summary of the environmental conditions.

Trees:
- As per the Arborist Report, prepared by Acer Tree Services Ltd., dated July 7, 2019 (Attachment C), it is anticipated that approximately 32 trees will need to be removed, 7 trees of which are off-site on other District lands.
- Trees located within the Streamside Protection Area are protected and should be retained. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the following are required:
  - A detailed Arborist report, prepared by a qualified professional, which includes a wind-throw and construction impact assessment of all trees within 20 m of the site and a tree protection and removal plan.
  - A replanting and landscape plan and security deposit for the restoration of the site at the end of the site’s use, or expiration of this permit.

Streamside Protection Area:
- All recommendations provided in the natural environment report, titled Technical Memo, prepared by McElhanney, dated March 7, 2019 (Attachment D), must be met.
- A minimum 15 m Streamside Protection Area from the wetland to the north must be maintained and delineated with a fence, prior to any construction on the site. The proposed site layout has been designed in consideration of this setback requirement.
- A Streamside Protection Area restoration planting plan and associated security may also be required, based on the findings of the detailed Arborist Report.

Flood Hazard:
- The flood hazard assessment, titled Technical Memorandum, prepared by Kerr Wood Leidal, dated December 6, 2018 (Attachment E) has been reviewed by the District’s Environment Department and no concerns have been identified. All recommendations outlined in the report must be followed and will be secured through the licence agreement.

Stormwater Management:
- Captured rainwater is to be integrated into the drainage system design and used for landscape irrigation. A revised site grading and stormwater management plan is required to demonstrate how the rainwater will be directed to nearby wetlands, and not to adjacent properties.

Off-site Improvements:
The proposal includes the construction of road improvements along the property frontage on the north side of Old Dollarton Road as well as stormwater network upgrades.

The development cost charge rate applicable to this project will be as set out in the Development Cost Charge Bylaw in effect on the date of the issuance of the Building Permit.
Construction Traffic Management Plan:
The Construction Traffic Management department has reviewed the proposal and has determined that there are unlikely to be significant impacts to local traffic as a result of development of the site. In order to reduce development impacts on pedestrian and vehicular movements, the applicant is required to provide a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) as a condition of a Building Permit, and this requirement is noted in TUP 8.19

Neighbour Impacts:
It is not anticipated that the proposed temporary use will adversely impact adjacent neighbours as:
- The hours of operation are generally between 9 am to 6 pm, with some extended hours during peak season;
- The customer entrance and parking lot will be on the west portion of the site, oriented towards undeveloped District land to the west and north and light industrial uses on the south side of Old Dollarton Road;
- Privacy and security fencing will be installed along the full perimeter of the site;
- The customer entrance and parking lot and display yard access will be secured by gates outside of operating hours.

In addition, the Temporary Use Permit contains “good neighbour” conditions under which the proposed temporary uses must operate.

Public Input:
Municipal notification advising that Council will be considering issuance of a TUP will be sent to the property owners within approximately a 200-metre radius of the site and to the Maplewood Community Association. Response to the notification will be provided to Council prior to consideration of this application.

Concurrence:
The proposal has been reviewed by staff from the Properties, Property Use/Business Licencing, Environment, Building, Legal, Parks, Engineering, Development Planning, Transportation, and Fire Departments.

CONCLUSION:
Temporary Use Permits are intended to allow greater flexibility within the District to accommodate short-term commercial or industrial opportunities. Providing conditional permission for this use for three years, with the opportunity to extend the permit for up to an additional three years, allows the business owner to continue to operate their business while providing them time to identify a suitable, permanent site.
SUBJECT: TEMPORARY USE PERMIT 8.19 — 2300 Block, Old Dollarton Rd (Dykhof Nurseries)
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Options:
1. THAT Temporary Use Permit 8.19, to allow for a plant nursery and garden centre on a site located within the 2300 Block of Old Dollarton Road is ISSUED (staff recommendation);

2. THAT Temporary Use Permit 8.19, to allow for a plant nursery and garden centre on a site located within the 2300 Block of Old Dollarton Road is DENIED.

Respectfully submitted,

Darren Veres
Development Planner

Attachments:
A. Temporary Use Permit 8.19
B. Dykhof Letter to Council, dated February 22, 2018
C. Arborist Report and Tree Removal Plan, prepared by Acer Tree Services, Ltd., dated July 7, 2019
D. Natural environment report, titled Technical Memo, prepared by McElhanney, dated March 7, 2019
E. Flood hazard assessment, titled Technical Memorandum, prepared by Kerr Wood Leidal, dated December 6, 2018

REVIEWED WITH:

□ Sustainable Community Dev.  □ Clerk’s Office  □ External Agencies:
□ Development Services  □ Communications  □ Library Board
□ Utilities  □ Finance  □ NS Health
□ Engineering Operations  □ Fire Services  □ RCMP
□ Parks  □ ITS  □ NVRC
□ Environment  □ Solicitor  □ Museum & Arch.
□ Facilities  □ GIS  □ Other:
□ Human Resources  □ Real Estate
TEMPORARY USE PERMIT 8.19

Temporary Use Permit 8.19 is hereby issued to Dykhof Nurseries Ltd. to allow nursery use and garden centre use on the four parcels within the 2300 Block of Old Dollarton Road, legally described as:

Lot 1, Block 41, District Lot 611, Plan 2353 (PID: 014-215-730);
Lot 2, Block 41, District Lot 611, Plan 2353 (PID: 014-215-756);
Lot 3, Block 41, District Lot 611, Plan 2353 (PID: 014-215-764);
Lot 4, Block 41, District Lot 611, Plan 2353 (PID: 002-468-387);

and a portion of lane and road allowances abutting the lots above as indicated on the attached plan (TUP 8.19 – 5).

Subject to the following terms and conditions:

A. The following requirements are hereby imposed under section 497 of the Local Government Act:

1. This Temporary Use Permit is valid for a period no longer than 3 years from the date of issuance.

B. The following conditions are hereby imposed under subsection 493 (2) (b) of the Local Government Act:

1. The temporary uses are permitted in accordance with the attached drawings (TUP 8.19 – 1-5) and in accordance with the recommendations of the following qualified professional reports:


2. A reasonable effort must be made to retain the significant trees which border the property line to the north to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Planning, Properties and Permits.
3. Fencing that delineates the 15 m Streamside Protection Area setback is required to be installed prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, in accordance with the drawing attached as TUP 8.19 – 1.

4. Security and privacy fencing is to be installed along the full perimeter of the site prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit, in accordance with the drawing attached as TUP 8.19 – 1.

5. All signage proposed must comply with the District of North Vancouver Sign Bylaw.

6. The temporary uses must not unreasonably interfere with orderly and efficient development of the neighbourhood.

7. The temporary uses must operate at an intensity of use suitable to the surrounding area and must be compatible with regard to design and operation with other uses in the vicinity.

8. The temporary uses are subject to conditions identified in Section 414 of the Zoning Bylaw: “Good Neighbour Requirements for Employment Zones”.

9. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the following shall be submitted, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Planning, Properties and Permits, to:

   (i) Environment:

      (a) A detailed Arborist report, prepared by a qualified professional, which includes a wind-throw and construction impact assessment of all trees within 20 m of the site and a tree protection and removal plan. Modifications to the attached drawings (TUP 8.19 – 1-5) may be required for the retention of trees within the Streamside Protection Area, based on the findings of the detailed Arborist report and in accordance with the following:

         i. A Streamside Protection Area restoration planting plan including the replanting of protected trees at a ratio of 3:1 and the replanting of 1 plant per 1m² along with an associated cost estimate prepared by a qualified professional, if the final detailed Arborist report indicates impacts to this area.
(b) A replanting and landscape plan and associated cost estimate, for the restoration of the site at the termination of the temporary uses or expiration of this permit, prepared by a qualified professional.

(c) A revised site grading and stormwater management plan, prepared by a qualified professional, which demonstrates how rainwater will be integrated into the drainage system design and directed to wetland areas.

(ii) Engineering:

a) A finalized accepted Construction Traffic Management Plan to limit impacts on surrounding roadways and properties during the construction process.

b) Revised and accepted civil drawings to show upgrades to the stormwater network and construction of on-street parking along the property frontage.

(iii) Planning:

a) Revised drawings for review and acceptance if it is determined that modifications to the attached drawings (TUP 8.19 - 1 – 5) are required for the retention of trees within the Streamside Protection Area.

C. The following conditions are hereby imposed under section 495 of the Local Government Act:

1. The site must be cleared and left vacant within 30 days of the termination of the site’s use or expiration of this permit, whichever comes first.

2. The site must be replanted to restore the site, in accordance with the approved replanting and landscape plan or as required by the General Manager, Planning, Properties and Permits, within 30 days of the end of the site’s use or expiration of this permit, whichever comes first, subject to the following conditions:

   (i) Any required replanting must be completed in the fall, or the spring if it cannot be completed in the fall, at the approval of the Environment Department.
D. The following conditions are hereby imposed under section 496 of the Local Government Act:

1. A security deposit equal to $10,000 to ensure removal of structures and materials from the site at the termination of the site’s use or expiration of this permit, whichever comes first. The deposit must be provided prior to issuance of a Building Permit for the development on the Land and will be held as security for the removal of structures and materials from the site.

2. A security deposit equal to the greater of 125% of the estimated cost of the replanting required for the restoration of the site at the end of the commercial garden centre use or expiration of this permit, or a minimum of $25,000. The deposit must be provided prior to issuance of a Building Permit for the development on the Land and will be held as security for landscaping works.

3. A security deposit equal to the greater of 125% of the estimated cost of any required restoration works in the Streamside Protection Area, or a minimum of $25,000. The deposit must be provided prior to issuance of a Building Permit for the development on the Land and will be held as security for restoration works.

______________________________
Mayor

______________________________
Municipal Clerk

Dated this ____ day of __________, 2019
SKETCH PLAN OF TOTAL USEABLE AREA CALCULATION OVER A PORTION OF FORESTER STREET, LOTS 1, 2, 3 AND 4, ALL OF BLOCK 41 DISTRICT LOT 611 GROUP 1 NWD PLAN 2353
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Dear Mayor Walton and Members of Council –

February 22, 2018

I am writing to you as President of Dykhof Nurseries, which as you may know has been selling plants and garden supplies at 460 Mountain Highway since 1957, making it now among the oldest continually operating businesses still active in the District of North Vancouver.

Originated by my parents, at a time when little else existed in the neighborhood now known as Lynn Creek, the company is now on its third generation of our family, with my adult children playing an active role in the day to day business.

With a large base of established and loyal customers, our hope was to continue at this location for many more decades to come, but the adoption of the new Official Community Plan in 2011, and with it the designation of Lynn Creek as a Town Centre, immediately affected those plans. Suddenly we were a non-conforming use, with our block specifically targeted for significant residential and commercial re-development, and it became clear through all subsequent interactions with District staff that it would be impossible to continue to operate as we have at this location for much longer.

As a result, we agreed in 2015 to sell our property to a residential developer, who had already reached agreement with the neighboring owners, and the sale closed last summer. The developer granted us a one-year leaseback of the land in our sale agreement, giving us the means to continue to run our business here while seeking out and securing a replacement site, ideally on the east side of the District where so many of our customers are based.

A year later, with our lease soon to expire and the developer moving closer to development approval, we remain without a new home, despite the diligent, on-going efforts of both our family and our realtor (Colliers International) to explore and pursue every possible opportunity in the surrounding community, limited though they have been. The reality, as we’ve discovered, is that given the tightness of the commercial/light industrial markets on the North Shore, and in the District in particular, there is virtually no turn-over of land, with next to nothing coming to market in the short term and no existing land users willing to respond to unsolicited offers (and we’ve written many).
Our need for at least half an acre of land (our current site is an acre) with reasonable access and exposure has only made the search more difficult, not to mention the recent and dramatic increases in commercial land values, no doubt stimulated by the total lack of supply. Both we and our agent have also explored with District staff the potential of our use on Municipally owned land, but to-date those discussions have yielded no opportunities for us, even on a long-term lease basis.

These circumstances have led me to write to all of you today. It remains our hope that a permanent new home for Dykhof Nurseries can be found in the near future, but with our time on Mountain Highway soon to end our focus has shifted to finding a temporary solution at least, so that our family can avoid the economic peril of being a company with no where to go and no means of running our business.

As part of our exploration of all corners of the community we have actively followed the process leading up to the recent adoption of the Maplewood Village Centre Plan. There appears to be some potential for us eventually in the Maplewood North sector where Darwin Properties are the primary developer, and we’ve had discussion with Darwin through our agent in that regard, but as you’re aware any opportunity that may result there is several years away.

Maplewood seems like an ideal place for us to re-establish, given its reasonably close proximity to our present location and to our established customers, along with the many new residents who will settle into that neighborhood in the coming years and likely need our products and services (since once we’re gone from Mountain Highway there will be no Garden Supply Nursery on the eastern side of the Municipality).

This has led us to the two blocks of Old Dollarton Road east of Riverside Drive, now designated as “Light Industrial/Artisan”, and viewed as a Live/Work corridor. As we understand it, the Municipality owns most of the land on these two blocks, particularly on the north side, and it appears to be an area that will take some time to be built out as envisioned. Our agent has spoken with staff several times in regard to these two blocks, and has been told that while our use would conform to the plan guidelines, our understandable need for open space to accommodate greenhouses and larger plant material would not.

Here’s where we’re sincerely hoping you can help us, at least in the short term. Having exhausted all other options, we are seeking your support for our temporary use of at least half an acre of the raw, undeveloped and unoccupied District Land on the north side of those two blocks of Old Dollarton Road.

If granted that opportunity we would happily enter into a land lease agreement with the District at market rates, ideally for at least two years, and ask only to put temporary signage at either Riverside Drive or the corner of Dollarton and Old Dollarton so as to direct customers to our location.

Our impact on the land would be minimal, with a small mobile office and 2-3 greenhouses, and we would leave it in as good a condition or better than we found it. Given the somewhat hidden nature of these two blocks, and the almost total absence of traffic or activity presently other than the trucking company at the eastern end, the visits that our presence there would generate could well have a beneficial effect in raising awareness of the area and it’s potential.
Thank you for your attention to this – as a family company that is in its 61st year of operation in the District of North Vancouver, we want to stay here, and your accommodation on at least a temporary basis will go a long way towards achieving that goal. We would welcome a meeting with council and staff if that would be the appropriate next step, and look forward to hearing from you.

Your Sincerely,

Dykhof Nurseries Ltd.

Ineke Milligan

CC: Scott Peters – Colliers Intl; Jennifer Paton, Karen Rendek & Janine Ryder – District of NV
July 7, 2019

Arborist Report for development purposes

Written by: Sylvain Gaudreau  
ISA Arborist # PN-8542A  
ISA Tree Risk Assessor # PN-8542A  
Diploma in Arboriculture, 1998/99  
&  
Mosen Zadeh, Director  
ISA Arborist # PN-950  
Wildlife Danger Tree Assessor # P2351

Site location: 2300 Old Dollarton  
District of north Vancouver, BC

For: District of north Vancouver

Initial Site inspection: November 10, 2018. Clear weather  
Update Site Inspection: July 7, 2019. Rainy weather

The Tree Risk Assessment is based on 3 years’ time frame
Acer Tree Services Ltd.
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Acer Tree Services Ltd.

Introduction:

Acer tree services Ltd. has been contracted by Dykhof Nurseries to provide a written tree inventory, arborist report and a tree risk assessment and the undertaking between the designates of the subject site and Acer Tree Services LTD (pursuant to the Tree Protection bylaw 7671) for development purposes for 4 subject lots at 2300 Old Dollarton, combined in one parcel. The intent of the development is to build a plant nursery with green houses, garden, office and parking lot.

The location of the majorities of trees is precisely indicated on the survey map, which should be provided with this report. These observations are only valid on the date on this report, and if weather patterns or any site activities such as excavation, tree work or construction is performed, this report will not reflect any changes on the sites. I visited the site in early November 2018 on several occasions with my most recent visit on July 7, 2019 to reinspect the trees in order to conclude some amendments to this report from its original version.

Only trees specified in the scope of work were assessed.

Beyond six months from the date of this report, the client must contact Acer Tree Services to confirm its validity, as site base plans and tree conditions may change beyond the original assessment. Additional site visits and report revisions may be required after this point to ensure report accuracy. Site visits and reporting required after the first submission are not included within the original proposal fee and will be charged to the client at an additional cost.

This report contains an inventory of protected on and off-site trees and summarizes management recommendations with respect to future development plans and construction activities. Off-site trees are included because pursuant to municipal by-laws, site owners must include the management of off-site trees that are within the scope of the development.

The assessment scope of the subject site includes 20 meters within the off-site SPEA (Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area) boundary just adjacent to the west and north side of the property.

Trees within the scope are naturally regenerated native species.

This report outlines the existing condition of protected trees on and adjacent to the property, summarizes the proposed tree retention and removal, and suggests guidelines for protecting retained trees during the construction process.
For the trees that will be retained, tree protection guidelines must be carried out or directed by the project arborist and are to be performed by an ISA certified arborist according to ANSI A300 and ANSI Z133 Standards and best management practices.

The project arborist should perform or supervise performance of:

a) Pre-construction supervision of trees including pruning of roots and branches if needed.

b) Site inspections during construction on a regular basis, reporting any tree violation against the Tree Protection bylaw 7671

c) Landscape activities and land disturbances.

d) Any replacement trees requirement.

The designates is/are would be 100% responsible to arrange an inspection by the Environmental Protection Officer before any work commences, and refrain from commencing work until the Environmental Protection Officer has approved the tree protection barrier; and ensure that the tree protection barrier remains in place until written approval of its removal is received from the Environmental Protection Officer. No work is permitted within the "protection zone" referred to in section 11(c) except in accordance with plans and procedures authorized by a tree permit. Acer Tree Services Ltd is available to comply as required at the designates request.

**Owner's responsibility:**

It is the designates responsibility to understand this document and the Tree Protection bylaw 7671. Acer Tree Services Ltd is not responsible for ensuring the designates education of the Tree Protection bylaw 7671. We have incorporated a copy of the Tree Protection bylaw 7671 to this report for the client's convenience.
Acer Tree Services Ltd.

**Scope of Work:**

The scope of this report is to provide;

- The trees location;
- The specifications and a brief description of the condition of the trees on site with pictures;
- An overall tree risk assessment based on present condition for the future targets related with the proposed site development;
- An overall windthrow assessment based on North Vancouver Harbour’s Data
- Recommendations for tree retention and removal; (See Tree Protection Procedures & Tree Replacement Plan)
- Limitation of Assessment;

**A Level 2 Basic Assessment** was completed for this report which consists of a visual inspection from the ground identifying the General Health of the tree including the root flare, the main stem, the canopy, structural branches, growth habits and other site factors to detect if any major defects and conditions are present that could increase potential for tree failure. A Level 2 Basic Assessment was determined to suffice in this case. Further level of assessment may be required.
Acer Tree Services Ltd.

Site Location: 2300 Old Dollarton

See Survey Map for high resolution
BACKGROUND:

The subject lot is located at 2300 Old Dollarton. We have been contracted to provide observations and recommendations pertaining to the bylaw-protected trees on an environmental lot. We have been provided with a legal lot survey, produced by Target Land Surveying. We have added 5 trees on the original survey that are conflicting with the proposed development that weren’t marked in the first place. They are trees #3,13,16,17,18.

Most trees on this lot are conflicting with the proposed project and lie in the striking distance of the future targets. Most of the trees are in poor to fair health condition; few of the trees are dead, or extremely hazardous and very few specimens could be retained but would require monitoring and mitigations intervention such as pruning and topping to minimize the risk of uprooting and striking the targets due to wind and site factors. Some of the trees were planted along the frontage of the previous house on the property and have inadvertently been topped and turned into a Cedar hedge.

Poor tree maintenance practices have been performed throughout the years past. You can find many household’s garbage showing that the site has been use as a dumpster. Many of the trees on site have been drastically topped to contain the height and to provide satellite reception. Some trees have also been pruned by utility contractors maintaining clearance requirements for overhead conductor lines along Old Dollarton.

There are 39 trees in this report which are the most prominent trees on the property. The site has a high volume of overgrown vegetation due to years of lack of maintenance. A vast list of shrubs and small trees under 10 cm can be found on the property and will be cleared out. The ground is uneven, and the vegetation density makes it hard to assess the root plate for any cracks or other tips on the anchorage of the trees. This area is part of a wet land; and although some of the trees on the property seem to have an overall fair to good health condition; such swampy terrain with high-water table are often associated with shallower roots system with poor anchorage. But-tress roots are observed throughout the site. There is an uprooted Cherry tree in this area that went down several years ago. The site has a full wind exposure and branch and trunk breakages can be seen through the trees. Now the trees are protecting and supporting themselves. Note that if selected vegetation mentioned in this report is going to be cleared out for development purposes, that may have an impact on the stability of the remaining standing trees isolated on their own, suddenly having more exposure to wind condition and such, and a new tree risk assessment should be performed accordingly in the new site management. This report advocates for the general clean-up and removal of any trees within the striking targets distance of the new development of the property in order to mitigate the risks for the proposed business activities. If any trees are wished to be retained, tree protection guidelines must be carried out or directed by the project arborist and are to be performed by an ISA certified arborist according to ANSI A300 and ANSI Z133 Standards and best management practices.

All specifications in the arboricultural inventory and report reflects the proposed development and takes into consideration the present and foreseen site disturbance and constructions. Also note that the residual risk of removing such a quantity of trees in this area, may increase the likelihood of flooding on the surrounding site.
Discussion & Summary:

Recommendations for the tree retention or removal were determined by taking into account a tree’s retention value rating and its location in relation to the proposed development infrastructure.

There are 13 protected trees on the site out of the 39 trees. Of those, 8 of them reside off-site and 5 of them reside on-site.

There are 32 trees slated for removal at 2300 Dollarton. In total, 10 large diameter protected trees are recommended for removal as part of this development proposal.

There are 5 off-site large protected trees recommended as removal, trees # (17,18,36,37 & # 22) and 2 off-site small diameter trees # (24,28) that are conflicting with the project development and have a low retention value due to their future proximity to urban activities. Roots severing is inevitable on these suggested removals and given the precarity of the site, these trees are not suitable for retention within striking distance. Some of these trees # 17,18,36,37 (Cottonwood) are notoriously known for their weak structure and decay is clearly observable on one of them. A portion of the CRZ of Tree # 22 is encroaching with the proposed building. Its foliage's weight resides in the upper crown, exerting more leverage at the base increasing the probability of uprooting, especially by having all its neighboring trees removed, compounding the problem of windthrow. Tree # 24 is insignificant and also interfering with the service lines. Tree # 28 is part of a small group of three trees that should be treated as one entity and are structurally problematic for the future.

People will often be shopping and working within striking distance of these trees and the owner is not comfortable with the level of risk that these trees pose. The owner is keen to replace them with more valuable species, to benefit from now and for future generations to come.

Also note that trees # 22 ,24 & 28 are conflicting with the service lines and tree # 36 & 37 are conflicting with the drainage as planned to evacuate the water in the swamp on the northeast of the property.

In total, 7 SPEA trees are recommended for retention with mitigations actions. (See Tree Protection Procedures)

The number of replacement trees has been calculated based on the number of protected trees removed.

The bylaw requires 30 trees to be replanted and a minimum of 10 trees to be large native conifer species. 7 trees are suggested to be retained in the protected area. Below, are the Tree Protection Procedures followed with the Tree Replacement Plan required to determine how many trees are going to be replaced, species and approximate location.
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Tree Protection Procedures for trees # 11, 12, 13, 23, 25, 29, 30.

Tree Protection and Replacement Tree protection zones were calculated for each tree according to the minimum requirements for fencing to dripline.

An Arborist may be needed to supervise the excavation procedure for the service lines within the TPZ of tree # 29 only. To ensure the health of this tree, the project arborist is to supervise the soil excavation within the TPZ of the tree. The arborist will need to provide some clearance pruning for the roots that are excavated, then shored and backfilled with the same soil prior to reinstalling the TPB.

A project arborist is required for this site to supervise ground penetrating work within 3 feet from any tree protection zone (TPZ) and inside any TPZ, as outlined in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree#</th>
<th>Mitigation Options</th>
<th>Tree Protection Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TPZ required / can be protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Re-top to previous level</td>
<td>TPZ required / can be protected No other intervention needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TPZ required / can be protected Root pruning may be needed during excavation supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TPZ required / can be protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bracing</td>
<td>TPZ required / can be protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bracing</td>
<td>TPZ required / can be protected Root pruning may be needed during excavation supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re-top to previous level</td>
<td>TPZ required / can be protected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Tree Replacement Specifications.**  

R = Tree Replacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Caliper</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Note:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1 to R10 Thuja plicata</td>
<td>4 to 10 cm</td>
<td>North &amp; West</td>
<td>Trees to be planted in the swamp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11 to R15 Acer Species</td>
<td>4 to 10 cm</td>
<td>North &amp; West</td>
<td>Trees to be planted in the swamp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16 to R20 Sorbus Species</td>
<td>4 to 10 cm</td>
<td>North &amp; West</td>
<td>Trees to be planted in the swamp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21 to R25 Crataegus Species</td>
<td>4 to 10 cm</td>
<td>North &amp; West</td>
<td>Trees to be planted in the swamp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R26 to R30 Prunus Species</td>
<td>4 to 10 cm</td>
<td>North &amp; West</td>
<td>Trees to be planted in the swamp area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Survey Map](image.png)

See Survey Map for high resolution
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**Legend**

**Tree #** - Denotes the tree number in this report and on the tree management drawing.

**DBH:** Denotes the trunk diameter, measured in cm at 1.3 m above grade.

**Spread:** Denotes the approximate spread of the branch canopy in diameter extended around the tree.

**CRZ:** The critical root zone of the tree. This is the area of the root plate required for the tree to maintain its health and to support itself in the ground.

**LCR:** The ratio of the height of the live crown to the height of the entire tree.

**TPZ:** The tree protection zone. Term used to identify the area around a protected tree, usually delineated by a tree protection barrier erected around a tree.

**Tree protection barrier:** Tree protection fencing; the distance usually measured from the center of the tree trunk to the tree protection fence. The tree protection barrier represents the TPZ.

**Hoarding:** A tree protection barrier erected around a retained tree to protect it during demolition, construction and landscaping activities.

**Structure rating scale:**
- **Good:** Normal with no significant structural defects.
- **Moderate:** The tree has some structural defects. Monitoring and mitigating are needed if retained or its environment is disturbed.
- **Poor:** The tree has several structural defects and weaknesses. The tree is mostly not suitable for retention within the striking range of targets.
- **Hazard:** The likelihood of failure and impact of the tree is high.

**Condition rating scale:**
- **Dead:** The tree is in an unrestorable decline.
- **Hazardous** (based on TRAQ).
- **Very poor:** The tree is in advanced decline or dying.
- **Poor:** tree is in questionable health; low vigor; minor defects; restorable defects.
- **Fair:** The tree's overall vigor is normal to good.

**Retention Value rating:**
- **High:** The tree is appropriate for retention. It has a good structure and condition rating.
- **Medium:** The tree may be appropriate for retention with a good to moderate structural rating. Monitoring and mitigating work is needed to adjust minor defects or if any site disturbance has taken place.
- **Low:** The tree suitability for retention either requires major mitigating work with post monitoring. The tree may have a structural rating of poor with major defects. The anchorage of the tree may be precarious. Any site disturbance may result in the tree failure.
- **Nil:** Removal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag#</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH (cm)</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Spread (m)</th>
<th>CRZ (m)</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Retention value rating</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Actions/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Topped Decayed</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poplar tree Populus trichocarpa</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Live crown ratio to height is low</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Western Red Cedar Thuja plicata</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Western Red Cedar Thuja plicata</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>3 co-dominant trunks included bark</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Severely decayed</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hemlock Pseudotsuga</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DEAD</td>
<td>DEAD</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>DEAD</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hemlock Tsuga heterophylla</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poplar tree Populus trichocarpa</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>EXT</td>
<td>Severely decayed</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bigleaf maple Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag#</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH (cm)</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Spread (m)</th>
<th>CRZ (m)</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Retention Value Rating</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Actions/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Red alder</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Topped</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hemlock Pseudotsuga</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Broken top</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bigleaf maple Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Covered in Ivy</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Spruce Picea</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Co-dominant trunk at 6m</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Covered in Ivy</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Poplar tree Populus trichocarpa</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Dead wood</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Poplar tree Populus trichocarpa</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Dead wood</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cherry Prunus</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Western Red Cedar Thuja plicata</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Western Red Cedar Thuja plicata</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag#</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (cm)</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Spread (m)</td>
<td>CRZ (m)</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Retention value rating</td>
<td>Risk Rating</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Actions/Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Red alder Alnus rubra</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Red alder Alnus rubra</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Heavy lean towards targets</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Included bark</td>
<td>Retain/Bracing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Unbalanced crown</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Unbalanced crown</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Unbalanced crown</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Western Red Cedar Thuja plicata</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Included bark</td>
<td>Retain/Bracing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Topped Declining</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag#</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (cm)</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Spread (m)</td>
<td>CRZ (m)</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Retention value</td>
<td>Risk Rating</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Actions/Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Topped</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO Hemlock Tsuga heterophylla</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DEAD</td>
<td>DEAD</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>DEAD</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Douglas Fir Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Topped</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Western Red Cedar Thuja plicata</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DEAD</td>
<td>DEAD</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>DEAD</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Poplar tree Populus trichocarpa</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Dead wood</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Poplar tree Populus trichocarpa</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Decay</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Red alder Alnus rubra</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Red alder Alnus rubra</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Half the tree is dead</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations / recommendations:

#1 – Douglas Fir
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking and building on the west side of the lot. The tree has been topped as the result of growing under the conductors compromising its structure. Decay is expected. The trunk is covered with Ivy. According to the project development, this tree should be removed.

#2 – Cottonwood
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking and building on the west side of the lot. The live crown ratio to height is low resulting in an unbalanced crown with all the leverage weight at the top. The canopy has major dead wood and according to the project development, this tree should be removed.
#3 – Douglas Fir
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking on the west side of the lot. The trunk is covered with Ivy. Its live crown ratio is low but the tree seems in fair condition. According to the project development, this tree should be removed.

#4 – Western Red Cedar
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking on the west side of the lot. The tree is in fair condition. According to the project development, this tree should be removed.
#5 - Western Red Cedar
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking on the west side of the lot. It has three co-dominant stems with moderate included bark at union, approximately starting at 3m from the ground and according to the project development, this tree should be removed.

#6 - Douglas Fir
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking and building on the west side of the lot. The tree has been topped and has major decay at the top that can be seen from the ground compromising its structure. According to the project development, this tree should be removed.
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#7 - Douglas Fir
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking and building on the west side of the lot. The tree is in fair health condition with no obvious defects. According to the project development, this tree should be removed.

#8 - Hemlock
Tree is dead. Remove
**#9 – Hemlock**
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking and building on the west side of the lot. This tree has an unbalanced crown and a low live crown ratio. This tree is declining and should be removed.

**#10 – Cottonwood**
Extremely hazardous. Advanced decay. A perimeter within the danger zone of this tree should be established as a restricted area for any civilian access. This tree should be removed at the earliest convenience.
#11 Maple
Tree is within the setback on north side of the lot 1. It has co-dominant crossing stems starting at the base with an unbalanced crown. According to the project development, this tree could be retained.

#12 Red Alder
Tree is within the setback on the north side of the lot. This tree had been topped (expected decay) and it heavily leans towards the future parking. The live crown ratio is low and the tree is problematic for the site development. Alders are known to be structurally weak. According to the project development, this tree should be removed or mitigated.
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**#13 Hemlock**
Tree is within the set back on the north side of the lot. However, this tree has a broken top from the wind and decay is expected. It is covered in ivy and its live crown ratio is practically non-existent. It leans towards the targets and should be removed or mitigated.

**#14 Maple**
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking on the west side of the lot. Unbalanced crown. According to the project development, this tree should be removed.
#15 Spruce
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking and building on the west side of the lot. It has co-dominant stems with included bark at the union, approximately starting at 6m from the ground. Covered in Ivy, its live crown ratio is low and according to the project development, this tree is in the striking distance and should be removed.

#16 – Douglas Fir
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking on the west side of the lot. Covered with Ivy, this tree is unbalanced and its live crown ratio is insignificant. According to the project development, this tree should be removed.
#17, 18 – Cottonwood
These 2 trees are conflicting with the proposed parking on the west side of the lot. Major dead wood and broken branches are observed, and one third of the main trunks are covered in ivy. Their health condition seems fair. However, these trees are sheltered from the prevailing wind by a grove of trees that will be removed for the parking. These species are not suitable for retention in proximity to urban activities within striking distance. They are notoriously known for their weak structure. Decay is expected. These trees should be removed and replaced with more valuable species.

#19 Cherry
Tree is conflicting with the proposed parking on the west side of the lot. Its health condition is fair. According to the project development, this tree should be removed.
#20,21 – Western Red Cedar
These 2 trees are conflicting with the proposed parking and building on the west side of the lot. Their health condition is fair. According to the project development, these trees should be removed.

#22 – Douglas Fir
Tree’s critical root zone is conflicting with the proposed building on the north side of the lot 1. Half of the tree is within the setback. The crown is unbalanced, major dead wood is observed. According to the project development, this tree is in the striking distance and should be removed given the circumstances that all neighboring trees will be removed, leaving this tree isolated on its own. We are recommending removing this tree to be replaced with more suitable candidate for its location.
#23, 24 Red Alder
Trees are within the setback on the north side of the lot 1. The crowns are unbalanced and one of the trees has a significant lean. Alders are known to be structurally weak. The leaning tree # 24 should be removed.

#25 – Douglas Fir
Tree is within the setback of the proposed development on the north side of the lot 2. It has co-dominant stems with included bark at the union, approximately starting at 1m from the ground. Bracing is recommended. Can be retained.
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#26, 27, 28 – Douglas Fir
Trees critical root zone are conflicting with the proposed development on the north side of the lot 2. Half of the tree #28 is within the setback. Their health condition seems fair. However, their crowns are unbalanced, their live crown ratio is low and are leaning towards the future targets. This cluster of trees should be considered as one entity. They either all stay or all go. According to the site development within the critical root zone, these trees should be removed.

#29 – Western Red Cedar
Tree is within the setback on the north side of the lot 2. It has co-dominant stems with included bark at the union, approximately starting at 1m from the ground. The tree has grown over detritus such as pipes and wires left in its crotch years ago. (see arrow) Its live crown ratio is significant. Its health condition is fair. However, its structure is questionable. The tree lies in the striking distance and mitigation actions such as bracing is recommended. Can be retained.
#30 – **Douglas Fir**
Tree is within the setback on the north side of the lot 2. Its live crown ratio is low and the tree has been topped. Decay is expected. Mitigation action should be taken.

#31, 32, 33, 34 – **Douglas Fir**
Trees are conflicting with the site development within the critical root zone. This cluster of trees are structurally poor. Some trees have been topped. Decay is expected. One small dead hemlock is standing amongst them. According the project development, these trees should be removed.
#35 – Western Red Cedar
This tree is dead. Remove or keep for wild life.

#36,37 – Cottonwood
One of these trees is within the setback on the north side of lot 4. The other tree, over the neighbour's house, shows cavity at the base. (See arrow) Decay is observed. The flare at the base of the tree is larger than normal and the exposed buttress roots may also indicate that root decay is present. Major dead wood is observed. Their health condition seems fair. However, these species are not suitable for retention in proximity of urban activities within striking distance. They are notoriously known for their weak structure. The foliage's weight resides in the upper crown exerting more leverage at the base increasing the probability of uprooting under wind condition. These trees are also conflicting with proposed drainage on the northeast. Should be removed.
#38,39 Red Alder
These two trees are outside the proposed development. The tree slightly leaning over the neighbour's house seems in fair condition while the other specimen with a dead co-dominant trunk have decay at the base and seems to be declining. Further assessment is needed. Alders are known to be structurally weak, potentially being more problematic in proximity of urban activities.

Cedar hedge constituted of 12 trees at the frontage of lot 3

5m stumps covered in Ivy from previous wind damage on unconstructed Forester street

Small fir at the front of lot # 1
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The generalization of this Tree Risk Assessment is for the trees outside or within the setback of the proposed project development sharing a common target if retained. The risk categorization is based on the possibilities of whole tree failure or branch breakage.

### Target Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Number</th>
<th>Target description</th>
<th>Target protection</th>
<th>Target zone</th>
<th>Target within Drip line</th>
<th>Target within 1 x Ht.</th>
<th>Target within 1.5 x Ht.</th>
<th>Occupancy Rate</th>
<th>Practical to move</th>
<th>Restriction practical?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Green house</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Next door house</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Risk Categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target (Target number or description)</th>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>Condition(s) of concern</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Failure</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Failure &amp; Impact</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,13</td>
<td>Decayed Leaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Site disturbance Unbalanced Isolated, wind</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Site disturbance Unbalanced Isolated, wind</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Site disturbance Unbalanced Isolated, wind</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Site disturbance Unbalanced Isolated, wind</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Site disturbance Unbalanced Isolated, wind</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Risk Categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target (Target number or description)</th>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>Condition(s) of concern</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Failure</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Failure &amp; Impact</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26,27,28</td>
<td>Site disturbance Unbalanced leaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Site disturbance Unbalanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Topped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36,37</td>
<td>Site disturbance Unbalanced decay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matrix 1. Likelihood matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood of failure</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imminent</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improbable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matrix 2. Risk rating matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood of Failure &amp; Impact</th>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Windthrow Assessment

Coordinates: 49.308-123.01
(Data based on North Vancouver Harbour station)

Prevailing winds: NE & SE

This Windthrow Assessment is only relevant for the remaining trees along the woodland after the removals and do not reflect catastrophic windthrow, but rather endemic windthrow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month of year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant wind direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind probability &gt;= 4 Beaufort (%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Wind speed (mph)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average air temp. (°F)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WIND STATISTICS

Statistics based on observations taken between 07/2014 - 06/2017 daily from 7am to 7pm local time. You can order the raw wind and weather data in Excel format from our historical weather data request page.

Wind direction distribution in %

---
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LIKELIHOOD OF EXCEEDING WINDTHROW THRESHOLDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Both assessed likelihood for penetration and amount are not close to thresholds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Assessed likelihood does not exceed either thresholds but may be close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Assessed likelihood somewhat exceeds amount threshold, but does not seem to exceed penetration threshold (where applicable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Assessed likelihood considerably exceeds amount threshold, and/or seems to exceed penetration thresholds by a small amount (if applicable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Assessed likelihood considerably exceeds penetration threshold, as well as amount threshold (if both apply).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated likelihood of exceeding windthrow thresholds:

- Non-Timber: NIL
- Timber: NIL

WINDTHROW RISK ASSESSMENT

DIAGNOSTIC QUESTION: If the thresholds for windthrow are exceeded as expected, what will be the consequences for management values, safety, liabilities and other management concerns??

Risk = □ Very High (very negative) □ High (negative) □ Moderate (slightly negative) ☑ Low (minimal to no consequences)
Conclusions of Windthrow Assessment

The grove of trees that will be left at the edge of the woodland after the proposed removals, are considered a high treatment risk due to the southeast winds. However, given the present space in between the protected trees and the proposed removals, all remaining and neighboring trees have been partially exposed to wind conditions for years and have likely acclimated to the prevailing wind.

Conclusion of Report:

Given the overall uncertainties and circumstances of the site development in a partial to full wind exposure, the location of the trees within the target zone, the prospect of high traffic business activities, the client wishes the trees mentioned above to be removed to be comfortable with the level of acceptable risk.
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General waiver and limitations of assessment

I confirm that the trees listed in this report have been inspected. I have no current or prospective financial interest in the vegetation or the property which is the subject of this report and have no personal interest in favour of, or against, any of the involved parties of the respective position if any.

The findings, conclusions and recommendations made in this report reflect Acer Tree Services professional judgment based on current scientific procedures and facts. This report has been prepared according to accepted arboriculture standards and practices for British Columbia.

The information included in this report only reflects the condition of the trees that were examined, as of the time and date of inspection.

This report is valid for the day of inspection only as this is natural entity and weather conditions and the surrounding site can change.

This report are the opinions expressed herein are not intended nor should they be construed as any type of warranty or guarantee regarding the condition of the subject trees in the future. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all statements and information in this report or true and correct and information provided by others is assumed to be true and correct.

I am not an attorney or engineer. This report does not cover those areas of expertise and represents advice only of arboricultural nature. It is understood that nothing contained in this report is intended as legal advice, or advice or opinions regarding soil stability, or zoning laws, and this report should not be relied upon to take the place of such advice.

Sincerely,

Sylvain Gaudreau

Mosen Zadeh
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Dykhof Nurseries requested the qualified environmental professional (QEP) from McElhanney Consulting Services (McElhanney) to provide environmental services with respect to their proposed greenhouse nursery development. The temporary development is to be located west of the property addressed as 2336 Old Dollarton Road, North Vancouver, BC utilizing four abandoned residential lots and the Forester Street right of way (the site) on the north side of Old Dollarton Road for parking, store building, greenhouses and outdoor plant display and storage.

Environmentally sensitive features immediately north of the proposed development site include a wetland swamp and mature riparian forest which provide wildlife habitat. This environmental review memo was written to provide information with respect to the mitigations and protections of the adjacent wetland and its riparian area to be provided by the development. The location of the wetland area to the proposed development (site outlined in red) is provided in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Proposed temporary development (site outlined in red) adjacent to wetland (outlined in green with inflow and outflow watercourses in blue). Wetland boundary from a 2015 study.
Methods

The top of bank of the wetland was staked along its southern extents located within 30 m of the proposed development area by the QEP on October 29, 2018. Target Land Surveying Ltd. (Target) provided the survey of the staked top of bank on October 31, 2018. The staked and surveyed top of bank was used to locate the riparian setbacks and guide the site plan (Figure 2). Top of bank (TOB) and the proposed 15 m setback (Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA)) or streamside protected area are as defined in the District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan Schedule B amended October 2018.

Figure 2. Surveyed top of bank flagging of wetland by Target showing applied setbacks from the wetland.

The southern boundary of the wetland appears somewhat different between the 2015 earlier study (Figure 1) and the flagged top of bank and subsequent survey by Target in 2018 (Figure 2). The 2018 survey was completed with more accuracy and detail than the earlier 2015 survey which had utilized a portable Trimble with low accuracy and with fewer top of bank locations surveyed. Please note that the wetland boundary moves northward after the most western surveyed point in the Forester Street right of way.

Proposed Site Plan

In discussions with the District of North Vancouver environmental staff the sensitivity of the wetland with respect to the proposed development resulted in a general agreement with the QEP that the development, with application of protective setbacks and use of best management practices during construction, would have low impact to the environmental resources in the area.

The 15 m Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA) will be clearly defined (Figure 3). Prior to construction of the temporary buildings and yard facilities, fencing will be installed to prevent any inadvertent encroachments into the SPEA or use of the setback area during or after construction.
Figure 3. Proposed site plan with respect to 15 m setbacks and protection of the Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area by fencing.

Discussion

The proposed development occurs within previously disturbed areas that were once single-residential family homes with accessory buildings and general residential landscaping. Demolition has already occurred to remove the residential buildings. The site will be cleared of remaining trees and vegetation and grubbed as needed. The 1.8 m chain link fencing will be installed to protect the 15 m setback from the wetland, which will prevent incursions during and after construction, and gravel and materials laid down to grade. The elevated gravel surface will stabilize the site and raise the working surface above the area near the wetland that is prone to the minor seasonal flooding from the wetland during the rainy season.

A brief table of best management practices during site clearing and site construction is provided in Table 1 which is meant to provide mitigative strategies to protect wildlife and water resources.

Table 1. Potential Impacts of Construction and Recommended Best Management Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Activity</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Recommended Mitigation or BMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation:</td>
<td>Riparian area disturbance</td>
<td>• Restrict vehicles and equipment from accessing natural soil surfaces to be retained. Exclusion fencing must be installed for no-go zones, including the SPEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leave cut trees on the remaining forest floor to provide habitat and foraging opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Activity</td>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Recommended Mitigation or BMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tree Clearing & Grubbing | • All equipment brought on site is thoroughly cleaned (e.g. remove dirt from other work sites that has accumulated on the tracks, undercarriage, tires) prior to arrival and departure.  
• Cut no vegetation in the SPEA (riparian zone); this can cause bank erosion and sediment input to the wetland.  
• Only areas that have been approved for construction will be cleared.  
• Areas of sensitive habitat will be clearly marked, protected and conserved where possible.  
• Retain as much of the native vegetation as possible.  
• Revegetate disturbed areas by planting or seeding native tree and shrub species, or provincially approved seed stock or plantings. Consider planting a slower growing species to replace faster growing deciduous. |
| Nesting birds / raptors | • Timing constraints: Follow least risk timing windows for clearing vegetation and schedule construction activities that generate noise that could disturb breeding birds within the least risk window.  
• The general bird-breeding season is March 1 August 15 of any year.  
• The raptor-breeding window spans January 1 to August 15 (MOE 2013).  
• Nests of eagles, peregrine falcons, gyrfalcons, ospreys, herons and burrowing owls are protected at all times (Section 34 Wildlife Act).  
• Provide an QEP to monitor active bird nests within the study area during construction outside the least risk window. QEP monitoring of active nests for disturbance within 100 m of construction noise is recommended.  
• Buffer zones to be placed around active nests. Monitoring of active nests for disturbance during construction. QEP to determine impacts. |
| Vegetation impacts including invasive species | • Protection fencing is recommended around retained trees / vegetation.  
• Root protection zone is the extent of the tree crown of each tree.  
• Due care should be taken to protect the site and surrounding area from the introduction or spread of invasive plants during construction.  
• Areas requiring clearing and grubbing should be screened by the EM for the presence of invasive plants. If invasive species are identified, they should be flagged, removed, segregated, and transferred under cover to a facility capable of accepting such material (i.e. transfer station).  
• Monitor areas with disturbed soils and remove regulated weeds as per the Weed Control Act.  
• All equipment brought on site is thoroughly cleaned (e.g. remove dirt from other work sites that has accumulated on the tracks, undercarriage, tires) prior to arrival and departure.  
• Know the origin of gravel or other fill used and that it is free of invasive plant species, invasive plant seeds, or rhizomatous plant parts. Avoid using fill from known sites of invasive plant infestation.  
• Noxious weeds and invasive plant species that are encountered and are to be removed to facilitate construction activities will be bagged to prevent spread or disbursement and removed from site for incineration at an approved facility. |
<p>| Construction Wildlife Interactions | • Construction will be occurring during the bird breeding season. Noisy activities can result in non-compliance to the provincial Wildlife Act 34 a, c which prohibits |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Activity</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Recommended Mitigation or BMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential injury or mortality of wildlife or humans</td>
<td>disturbance of breeding birds. A qualified biologist should be hired for nest monitoring if an active nest is found. • A zero-tolerance policy regarding the feeding of wildlife will be implemented to reduce interactions or conflicts. Bear, deer, raccoon, and skunk are active in the area. • All domestic and food waste must be removed from site each day. • The wildlife is not to be harassed, including yelling or trying to engage in order to get a better photograph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion and Sedimentation</td>
<td>• Clearing and grubbing activities should take place when there is favourable weather and low water conditions to minimize erosion or turbid water movement from disturbed soil surfaces. • Complete works as soon as possible once they are started. Always protect and stabilize exposed soil areas at the end of the work day. • Inspect and maintain erosion control measures as works progress. • Cover and stabilize exposed materials including stockpiles and slopes with polyethylene-sheeting, erosion blankets or seeding and planting the soil surface with native vegetation. • Manage through standard ESC plans (e.g., sediment fences or sandbag berms) • Water quality parameters such as TSS and turbidity should be monitored by an QEP during construction activities that have the potential to release turbid water to the aquatic environment. • Equipment or machinery should be operated away from open water of the wetland. • Install sediment control measures prior to starting any works that may result in sediment mobilization (i.e. straw waddles, silt fencing, check dams). • Inspect and maintain sediment control measures as works progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Operation</td>
<td>• Materials such as rock, gravel backfill, or other materials placed around or within the active drainage channels or the floodplain of the wetland should be inert and free of silt, overburden, debris, or other substances deleterious to aquatic life. • Equipment used for site preparation, construction, maintenance must operate, as much as possible, in dry weather. • Equipment will arrive onsite clean, free of leaks and maintained for the duration of the works. • Leaks shall be repaired immediately to mitigate potential environmental effects. • Equipment and fuels must be placed within secondary containment. • Spill kits shall be made immediately available for deployment during instances of hydrocarbon or hydraulic fluid spills. • Refuelling to be conducted at minimum 30 m from wetland Top of Bank. • Minimize disturbance of existing vegetation on and adjacent to the stream banks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality</td>
<td>• Minimize drop height when transferring soil to and from trucks. Follow of all speed limits along roads, and further restriction of speed during dry conditions. • Minimizing stockpile handling. • Install wind fences in areas where there is high potential for the generation of dust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality (dust generation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Construction Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction and Operation</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Recommended Mitigation or BMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accidental spill of deleterious substances such as, fuel, oil, antifreeze / glycols, asphalt millings, or other spills from equipment working in and around watercourses</td>
<td>• Spill kits on heavy equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Runoff from contaminated and clean soil stockpiles has the potential to enter nearby watercourses potentially discharging &quot;deleterious&quot; substances into the environment.</td>
<td>• Cleaning and sweeping public road surfaces used by heavy equipment daily or as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Runoff from contaminated and clean soil stockpiles has the potential to enter nearby watercourses potentially discharging &quot;deleterious&quot; substances into the environment.</td>
<td>• Small quantities of gasoline may be maintained at the work site for fueling cut-off saws and power generators. Fuel containers will be CSA-approved from 10 to 30 L in size and metal containers are mandatory. When the container is not in use, pour funnels will be inverted and functional lids and air bleeder caps will be in place and kept tightly fastened at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Containers used to carry petroleum products shall be designed for that purpose and will not be more than 5 years old. Containers will have all their seals in place and, when not being used to fuel a particular tool, will be kept in an equipment and supply truck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• When refueling equipment, secondary containment of fuel containers and equipment will be employed to prevent or contain spills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No bulk fuel will be stored on site. Truck-mounted tidy tanks or a similar fuel service only will be permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Refueling of equipment and refilling of small field containers will be carried out a minimum of 30 m, respectively, from any watercourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All equipment (e.g. generators, pumps, compressors) will have secondary containment (110% capacity), including containment for distribution connections and dispensing locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hazardous materials and wastes will only be transported by appropriately licensed transporters and transportation will be carried out in accordance with applicable regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular inspection of vehicles and equipment for oil or hydraulic fluid leaks shall be carried out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In Closing

The temporary development of Dykhof Nurseries along Old Dollarton Road is expected to have a minimal impact on environmentally sensitive resources in the area with the installation of fence to protect the SPEA area along the adjacent wetland and the implementation of best management practices during site preparation and construction and operation.

We trust that this report has provided the information needed to support the development permit application. If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact Cindy Lipp, R.P. Bio. at the contact information provided below.

Regards,

MCELHANNEY LTD.

Cindy Lipp, R.P. Bio.
Senior Biologist
clipp@mcelhanney.com
phone: 604 424 4866
Technical Memorandum

DATE: December 6, 2018

TO: Kevin Milligan
   Dykhof Nurseries Ltd
   Via Email

FROM: Andrew Kolper, P.Eng.
      Project Manager

RE: DYKHOF NURSERIES TEMPORARY USE PERMIT
    Old Dollarton Road, North Vancouver
    Our File 3939.001-300

1. Introduction
Dykhof Nurseries has retained Kerr Wood Leidal Associates Ltd. (KWL) to undertake a flood hazard assessment in support of a Temporary Use Permit application for the above-noted proposed development. It is understood that as part of the Temporary Use Permit, Dykhof Nurseries is required to retain a Qualified Professional to determine if the site is safe for temporary use.

1.1 Scope of Work
KWL’s current scope of work is limited to the following:
   • Project initiation and background information review;
   • Site visit;
   • Coastal water level analysis (joint probability);
   • Flood hazard assessment letter; and
   • Review of available drawing packages.

1.2 Project Team
KWL’s project team comprises:
   • Andrew Kolper, P.Eng. – Project Engineer; and
   • Mike V. Currie, M.Eng., P.Eng., FEC – Technical Reviewer.
2. Site Location and Existing Conditions

2.1 Proposed Development

The property on Old Dollarton Road is owned by the District of North Vancouver (DNV), and is currently a partially treed and unused piece of property adjacent to the proposed innovation district. The property is bounded Parkland on the north and west of the site, a private residence to the east and Old Dollarton Road to the south. The site is proposed to be developed as the temporary home of Dykhof Nursery. The nursery is looking to occupy the site for a term of three years with an option to extend to a maximum of 5 years.

2.2 Legal Description

The legal description for the proposed development on Old Dollarton Road is as follows:

- LOTS 1, 2, 3, 4
- BLOCK 41
- DISTRICT LOT 611
- PLAN 2353

3. Applicable Guidelines

The preliminary flood hazard assessment has been prepared with consideration of the following applicable provincial, industry, and local government guidelines:

- Provincial flood hazard area land use guidelines¹;
- Engineers and Geoscientists BC professional practice guidelines for flood assessments²; and
- District of North Vancouver creek hazard development permit area guidelines³.

The applicable guidelines are generally consistent in requiring that flood hazard assessments consider climate change impacts in assessing hazards and developing floodproofing measures. This flood hazard assessment considers climate change impacts in terms of sea level rise, land subsidence, and increased creek flow due to changes in precipitation. This is discussed further in the following sections.


³ Refer to https://www.dnv.org/property-development/creek-hazard-development-permit-area-dpac
4. **Background Information Review**

4.1 **Background Information**

The following information was reviewed for this flood hazard assessment:

- DNV Official Community Plan, Revised October 2018, Schedule B, Section 2 - Creek Hazard DPA;
- Creek Hydrology, Floodplain Mapping and Bridge Hydraulic Assessment – KWL, October 2014;
- District of North Vancouver interactive GIS viewer (http://www.geoweb.dnv.org/);
- Topographic Plan – Target Land Surveying (NW) Ltd, October 2018;
- Preliminary Site Plan Drawing A1.0, Nov 2018 – DraftOnSite;
- Preliminary Site Plan/Tree Data Drawing A1.1, Nov 2018 – DraftOnSite; and

4.2 **Information Review**

The Creek Hydrology, Floodplain Mapping and Bridge Hydraulic Assessment (KWL, 2014) indicates that the site is subject to a coastal flood hazard, but is not subject to a creek flood hazard. This report provides an estimated 200-year return period coastal flood depth between 0.3 and 0.5 m above existing ground on Old Dollarton Road and Dollarton Highway (under existing conditions with no allowance for sea level rise).

The Maplewood area is potentially subject to a dam outbreak flood hazard associated with the Seymour Falls Dam that is operated by Metro Vancouver. The dam is a high consequence dam that is subject to stringent hydrologic design criteria. For such dams, dam breach hazards are beyond the probability of flood hazard considered for downstream development approval. A dam breach analysis is outside the scope of this flood assessment.

5. **Flood Hazards**

Coastal flooding is the predominant flooding mechanism that potentially affects the site. The District is working toward an overall coastal flood management strategy in conjunction with several neighbouring municipalities and first nations. This section quantifies the coastal flood hazard.

In addition, ‘nuisance flooding’ is also considered. Currently, the site is below the road and the drainage mechanism is via infiltration and through the wetland along the back of the property. Shallow ponding may occur on the site during and after large rainfall events.

5.1 **Coastal Flood Hazard**

The site is located near the Burrard Inlet shoreline and is subject to flood hazards from coastal floods. Coastal flooding is the predominant flooding mechanism that affects the project site.

Tide and storm surge are the primary components of the coastal flood level. The Canadian Hydrographic Service (CHS) Vancouver Harbour tide station (#7735) is relatively close to the site and was used for the analysis. Storm surge is the rise in mean water level due to atmospheric pressure change and wind from storms.

The joint probability of tide and storm surge was assessed for the site using KWL’s in-house joint probability water level analysis tool. Table 1 presents the results.
5.2 Nuisance Flood Hazard

The depth of nuisance flooding would increase until overflow occurs to the southeast across Old Dollarton Road and onto Dollarton Highway. Allowing for a 0.3 m ponding depth above the low point on the adjacent road (approximately 3.15 m elevation, CVGD28) would result in a nuisance flood elevation of 3.45 m, rounded to 3.5 m (CVGD28).

6. Flood Assessment

6.1 Flood Construction Level

The flood hazard analysis is used to develop a flood construction level (FCL) for the site. As is standard practice in BC, the FCL is based on a 200-year return period. As the proposed development is temporary, it is not deemed necessary to allow for future sea level rise nor land subsidence.

The 200-year return period coastal flood level would result in an FCL of 3.4 m CVGD28 (including 0.6 m freeboard, excluding sea level rise and subsidence). The proposed nuisance flood level of 3.5 CVGD28 would result in a slightly higher FCL and is considered appropriate for this temporary development.

6.2 Floodproofing Measures

The FCL applies to the top of concrete floor slab of the proposed building. The FCL shall be achieved by compacted landfill. No areas below the FCL may be used for habitation, business, the storage of goods susceptible to damage by floodwaters, or the installation of fixed equipment damageable by floodwaters.

7. Project Implementation

Safe for Intended Use

Based on this flood assessment, and subject to the proposed floodproofing measures, the proposed development on the subject property can be considered "safe for the intended use" as it relates to coastal flooding to Year 2024 and nuisance flooding. In this context, ‘safe’ is defined as protected against the design flood conditions as documented in the Creek Hazard DPA.
Closing

Please contact Andrew Kolper with any questions regarding this draft flood assessment report. We look forward to finalizing this draft flood assessment report after discussing the findings and recommendations.

KERR WOOD LEIDAL ASSOCIATES LTD.

Prepared by: Andrew Kolper, P.Eng.

Reviewed by: Mike V. Currie, M.Eng., P.Eng., FEC

Project Manager

Technical Reviewer / Senior Water Resources Engineer

This document is a copy of the sealed and signed hard copy original retained on file. The content of the electronically transmitted document can be confirmed by referring to the filed original.

Statement of Limitations

This document has been prepared by Kerr Wood Leidal Associates Ltd. (KWL) for the exclusive use and benefit of the intended recipient. No other party is entitled to rely on any of the conclusions, data, opinions, or any other information contained in this document.

This document represents KWL’s best professional judgement based on the information available at the time of its completion and as appropriate for the project scope of work. Services performed in developing the content of this document have been conducted in a manner consistent with that level and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the engineering profession currently practising under similar conditions. No warranty, express or implied, is made.

Copyright Notice

These materials (text, tables, figures, and drawings included herein) are copyright of Kerr Wood Leidal Associates Ltd. (KWL). Dykhof Nurseries is permitted to reproduce the materials for archiving and for distribution to third parties only as required to conduct business specifically relating to the Temporary Use Permit - Flood Hazard Assessment. Any other use of these materials without the written permission of KWL is prohibited.

Revision History
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>December 6, 2018</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>For Review</td>
<td>AJK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>December 6, 2018</td>
<td>FINAL</td>
<td>For Support of a Temporary Use Permit</td>
<td>AJK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COUNCIL

July 3, 2019
File: 13.6440.01/000.000

AUTHORS: Shazeen Tejani, Community Planner
Mairi Welman, Manager, Strategic Communications
Susan Rogers, Manager, Parks

SUBJECT: Delbrook Lands 2019 Planning and Engagement Process -- Consultation Results

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council receive for information the results of the Delbrook Lands 2019 Planning and Engagement Process consultation and;

THAT Council provide staff with direction on next steps in determining park design, community services, and affordable housing on the Delbrook Lands site.

REASON FOR REPORT:
To provide Council with the results of the neighbourhood consultation and seek Council direction regarding next steps.

SUMMARY:
As directed by Council on April 5, 2019, staff conducted an expedited neighbourhood consultation process, which consisted of two surveys and a neighbourhood open house, held on June 18, 2019 at Delbrook Recreation Centre.

The majority of participants agreed that:

- seniors’ respite care should be included on the site (88% approval)
- the character of the building should be West Coast design (62% approval)

Residents who live inside the neighbourhood zone prefer a shorter affordable housing building, while those who live outside the zone prefer a taller affordable housing building. For the neighbourhood park, survey results identified general agreement on park features and uses, which helped to inform the planning of two park concept options which were
presented at the open house. While the open house survey results showed a preference for Option 1, staff anticipate working with the community in the Fall to develop a preferred conceptual park plan, which could combine elements of Option 1 and Option 2.

BACKGROUND
A District-wide consultation on the future of the Delbrook Lands, called the Delbrook Dialogue, was undertaken in 2015/16.

Recommendations were reported to Council on September 19, 2016, with the majority of participants favouring a mix of affordable housing funded by senior government, some form of seniors care and child care, and a park.

On March 12, 2019 Council met with the Delbrook Community Association in a workshop to discuss the group’s concerns.

On April 5, 2019 Council directed staff to engage the local and broader community in an expedited and concurrent process of determining park design, community services, and the form and character of an affordable housing building on the site.

ANALYSIS:

Engagement Process:
Council identified a specific zone to be considered the ‘local neighbourhood’ for the purpose of this engagement process.
There are 373 mailing addresses within the designated zone. These residents received two individually addressed postcards; the first inviting participation in the initial survey, and a second inviting participation in the open house and last survey.

As well, participants in the previous Delbrook Dialogue received two emails informing them of these additional input opportunities.

Postal codes were required on all survey responses to differentiate the preferences of the local residents within the 'neighbourhood' zone from those of the overall community.

Maps showing the distribution of respondent postal codes provided in Appendix A.

Public Input Results:

The following sections summarize the preferences of both groups regarding desired park features and functions, the form and character of the affordable housing building, and the inclusion and location of community services on the site.

Full results of the surveys are provided in Appendix B.
FIGURE 1.0
“how would you use this park?” – First Preference

All Respondents

FIGURE 1.1
“how would you use this park?” – First Preference

By Neighbourhood
FIGURE 2.0

Top 10 Features

"tell us how important these potential park features are to you"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>OUTSIDE NEIGHBOURHOOD ZONE</th>
<th>INSIDE NEIGHBOURHOOD ZONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Washroom</td>
<td>Washroom</td>
<td>Landscape &amp; Habitat Enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Landscape &amp; Habitat Enhancements</td>
<td>Accessible Features</td>
<td>Accessible Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accessible Features</td>
<td>Landscape &amp; Habitat Enhancements</td>
<td>Washroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Cycling Paths</td>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Cycling Paths</td>
<td>Picnic &amp; Seating Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Picnic &amp; Seating Areas</td>
<td>Multi Use Open Grass Space</td>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Cycling Paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Multi Use Open Grass Space</td>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Multi Use Open Grass Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Picnic &amp; Seating Areas</td>
<td>Bridge Across Mission Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bridge Across Mission Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Across Mission Creek</td>
<td>Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>On Site Parking</td>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Multi Purpose Sport Court</td>
<td>Multi Purpose Sport Court</td>
<td>Community Garden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 3.0

"which neighbourhood park option do you prefer?"

All Respondents

![Bar chart showing the preference for Option 1, Option 2, and No Response.]

FIGURE 3.1

"which neighbourhood park option do you prefer?"

By Neighbourhood

![Bar chart showing the preference for Option 1 and Option 2 by Neighbourhood Zone, with a small number of No Responses.]

- Outside Neighbourhood Zone: n=155
- Inside Neighbourhood Zone: n=56
FIGURE 4.0

"please rank your preference for building style/character" –
First Preference
All Respondents

FIGURE 4.1

"please rank your preference for building style/character" –
First Preference
By Neighbourhood
FIGURE 5.0

"who should live in this building?" - First Preference

All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count of Respondents, First Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with special needs or accessibility challenges</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are homeless</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 5.1

"who should live in this building?" - First Preference

By Neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count of Respondents, First Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with special needs or accessibility challenges</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are homeless</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Outside Neighbourhood Zone: n=147
- Inside Neighbourhood Zone: n=55
FIGURE 6.0

"please select your preferred housing option"

All Respondents

FIGURE 6.1

"please select your preferred housing option"

By Neighbourhood
Community Services Type and Location:
In the first survey 88% of respondents favoured inclusion of senior’s respite care on the site.

Therefore, in the second survey and public open house materials, we showed options for various building heights all with the inclusion of senior’s respite care on the ground floor.

The seniors’ respite care can be integrated into the new building while existing child care would continue elsewhere on the site.

Affordable Housing
Through the Delbrook Deliberative Dialogue process, and in Council’s workshop with the Delbrook Community Association, it was determined that there is a willingness to consider development of a building on the southeast corner of the site where the current surface parking lot is located, to provide new affordable housing and a site for senior’s respite care.

Neighbourhood Park
In the first survey, preferred park uses and features were identified by the public which guided the planning of two conceptual park designs that were presented at the Open House.

Conceptual Park drawings Option 1 and Option 2 are shown Appendix C.

- Park Option 1: Focus on accessible and active recreation and sport amenities with multiple path connections and access to the natural areas and creek
- Park Option 2: Focus on unstructured recreation and enhanced ecology with flexible green space

The second survey results showed general support for the conceptual park designs, with a preference for Option 1. Staff will work with the community in the Fall to develop a preferred conceptual park design, which could combine elements of Option 1 and Option 2.

Timing/Approval Process:

Park Design:
Should Council direct staff to proceed, further work and public engagement is required to fully develop the preferred neighbourhood park design.

Affordable Housing & Community Services:
Should Council direct staff to proceed with a specific building height, staff will work across the summer to develop the building plans and partnership agreements for operation of the seniors’ respite care centre and affordable housing.
Rezoning is required for both the neighbourhood park use and the affordable housing use, as the site is currently zoned ‘Institutional’. Council could opt to direct staff to proceed right away with preparing the park and housing rezoning bylaws as this work will be required no matter what the final decision is on building height or park design.

Concurrence:
This report has been developed in ongoing collaboration between Parks, Community Planning, and Communications.

Financial Impacts:
The cost of the neighbourhood public engagement process to date: including development of open house display boards, two direct mail pieces and postage, outdoor signage, and the open house event is $5025.96.

Liability/Risk:
N/A

Social Policy Implications:
Social policy considerations are addressed through the engagement and planning processes.

Environmental Impact:
The preferred options for the affordable housing building and park design will take existing environmental constraints into consideration, including riparian setback areas and slopes, to mitigate any environmental impact to the natural resources on site.

Public Input:

The process for this engagement was at the consult level on the IAP2 spectrum of engagement.
Key Audiences Consulted:
- Adjacent neighbours to the site
- Residents of the greater Delbrook neighbourhood
- Delbrook Community Association
- Parks & Natural Environment Advisory Committee (for park design)
- Delbrook Dialogue participants

Conclusion:
Staff committed to reporting back to Council’s before its summer break on the results of the neighbourhood public engagement program, reported on at a Regular Meeting of Council on April 15, 2019.

Options:
THAT Council direct staff to continue engagement with the public to create a detailed design for the neighbourhood park;

and

THAT Council direct staff to initiate design work for a building, to be situated on the current parking lot at the southeast corner of the site, consisting of one storey of community service (seniors’ respite care) and a specific number of stories of social housing above.

and

THAT Staff be directed to prepare an Official Community Plan amendment bylaw a Zoning Bylaw amendment bylaw for Council’s consideration consistent with this motion.

OR

THAT Council provide staff with alternate direction.
Respectfully submitted,

Shazeen Tejani  
Community Planner

Mairi Welman  
Manager, Strategic Communications

Susan Rogers  
Manager, Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Community Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Engineering</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Agencies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum &amp; Arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX A

Survey #1 respondents by postal code
Survey #1 respondents by postal code (zoomed in)
Survey #2 respondents by postal code

[Map showing survey responses by postal code]
Survey #2 respondents by postal code (zoomed in)
Delbrook Lands Survey 1
Data Analysis

Updated June 10, 2019

Prepared by Lena McCoy
lena.mccoy@nvrc.ca
Summary
Summary

- Sample characteristics:
  - The survey had a total of 202 completed responses.
  - 73% of responses are from individuals outside of the neighbourhood zone (ONZ) (n=147), and 27% of responses are from individuals inside the neighbourhood zone (INZ) (n=55).
  - 63% of responses are from individuals who did not participate in the Delbrook Dialogue held on June 18, 2016 (n=127), and 37% of responses are from individuals who did participate in the Dialogue (n=74).

- Results:
  - Seniors respite care:
    - 88% of responses are in support of seniors respite care on the Delbrook site.
    - There is no statistically significant difference in support for seniors respite care on the Delbrook site between the two response groups.
  - Building floors:
    - 4+ floors is the most frequently supported number of floors. 59 survey respondents selected 4+ floors, followed by 2+ floors (51 respondents), and 3+ floors (45 respondents).
    - There is a statistically significant relationship between support for number of floors and neighbourhood zone.
      - The most frequently supported number of floors for respondents INZ is 2+ floors. 24 respondents living INZ indicated that they support 2+ floors, compared to 27 respondents living ONZ.
      - The most frequently supported number of floors for respondents ONZ is 4+ floors. 50 respondents living ONZ indicated that they support 4+ floors, compared to 9 respondents living INZ.
Summary

Results – continued…

- Park objectives:
  - 86.5% of respondents selected “yes” to “have we hit the mark with our park objectives” (n=160), and 13.5% selected “no” (n=25).
  - There is not a statistically significant difference in agreement for hitting the mark between the two response groups.

- Building inhabitants:
  - The top ranked building inhabitants:
    - Families (30% of responses)
    - Seniors (26% of responses)
    - People with special needs or accessibility challenges (22% of responses)
  - There is not a statistically significant difference in the rank of any building inhabitants between the two response groups.

- Park use:
  - The top ranked park use activities are:
    - Relax (68% of responses)
    - Get exercise and fresh air (14% of responses)
    - Enjoy the creek and natural parkland (7% of responses)
  - There is not a statistically significant difference in the rank of any park use options between the two response groups.
Summary

Results – continued...

• Building character:
  • The top ranked building character selections are:
    • West Coast (62% of responses)
    • Modern (12% of responses)
    • Craftsman (9% of responses)
  • There is not a statistically significant difference in the rank of any building character selection between the two response groups.

• Transportation:
  • The top ranked transportation selections are:
    • Walk (80%)
    • Cycle (10%)
    • Drive (9%)
  • There is a statistically significant relationship between transportation and neighbourhood zone.
    • 100% of respondents living INZ indicated that they would walk (n=53%) compared to 73% of the respondents living ONZ (n=93)
Summary

Results – continued...

- Park features:
  - The park features that respondents rated as most important (lowest mean score) are: washroom (mean score of 1.65), habitat (mean score of 1.73), and accessible (mean score of 1.79).
  - There is a statistically significant relationship between the two response zones for the following park features:
    - Cycling - 26% of respondents INZ indicated that cycling is very important (a score of 1), compared to 50% of respondents ONZ.
    - Spray park - 2% of respondents INZ indicated that spray park is very important (a score of 1), compared to 10% of respondents ONZ.
Sample Characteristics

The survey has a total of 202 completed responses.

- Neighbourhood zone:
  - 73% of responses are from individuals outside of the neighbourhood zone (n=147), and 27% of responses are from individuals inside of the neighbourhood zone (n=55)

- Delbrook Dialogue participation:
  - 63% of responses are from individuals who did not participate in the Delbrook Dialogue held on June 18, 2016 (n=127), and 37% of responses are from individuals who participated in the Dialogue (n=74).
Sample Information
Seniors Respite Care
Results – Seniors Respite Care

88% of responses are in support of seniors respite care on the Delbrook site (n=173) and 11% of responses are not in support (n=23).

There is not a statistically significant difference in support for seniors respite care on the Delbrook site between those inside the neighbourhood zone and those outside the neighbourhood zone.
Building Floors
Results - Building Floors

How many floors of housing above the ground-level parking floor on the west side of the building do you support?
% Total for Inside/Outside Neighbourhood Zone Sample

*Inside Neighbourhood Zone*  *Outside Neighbourhood Zone*

---

2

- 2+  
  - 17%  
  - 20%  
  - 26%

3

- 3+  
  - 17%  
  - 20%

4

- 4+  
  - 17%  
  - 20%  
  - 36%

*The chi-square statistic is 18.893. The P-Value is 0.002. The result is significant at p ≤ 0.05*
Building Inhabitants
Results - Building Inhabitants

Who should live in this building?
First Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with special needs or accessibility challenges</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are homeless</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Inside Neighbourhood Zone | 21 | 16 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| Outside Neighbourhood Zone | 38 | 35 | 35 | 28 | 7 |

Building Inhabitants – First Selection

- The top ranked building inhabitants are:
  1. Families (30% of responses)
  2. Seniors (26% of responses)
  3. People with special needs or accessibility challenges (22% of responses)
  4. Youth (19% responses)
  5. People who are homeless (4% of responses)

- There is not a statistically significant difference in the first selection for building inhabitants between those inside the neighbourhood zone and those outside the neighbourhood zone.
Building Character
Results - Building Character

The top ranked building character selections are:
1. West Coast (62% of responses)
2. Modern (12% of responses)
3. Craftsman (9% of responses)
4. Tudor (8% responses)
5. Edwardian (5% of responses)
6. Mansardic (5% of responses)

There is not a statistically significant difference in the first selection for building character between those inside the neighbourhood zone and those outside the neighbourhood zone.
Park Objectives
Results - Park Objectives

Have we hit the mark with our park objectives?

- 86.5% of respondents selected “yes” to “have we hit the mark with our park objectives” (n=160), and 13.5% selected “no” (n=25).
- There is not a statistically significant difference in agreement for hitting the mark between those inside the neighbourhood zone and those outside the neighbourhood zone.
Results - Park Use

How would you use this park?  
First Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inside Neighbourhood Zone</th>
<th>Outside Neighbourhood Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relax</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get exercise and fresh air</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy the creek and natural parkland</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play tennis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk my dog</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top ranked park use activities are:
1. Relax (68% of responses)
2. Get exercise and fresh air (14%)
3. Enjoy the creek and natural parkland (7%)
4. Socialize (7%)

There is not a statistically significant difference in the first selection for rank of park use between those inside the neighbourhood zone and those outside the neighbourhood zone.
Transportation to Park
Results - Transportation

How would you get to the park? - First Selection
% Total for Inside/Outside Neighbourhood Zone Sample

- Inside Neighbourhood Zone
- Outside Neighbourhood Zone

- Walk: 73%
- Cycle: 14%
- Drive: 13%

*The chi-square statistic is 18.085. The P-Value is 0.000. The result is significant at p ≤ 0.05
Park Features
### Results - Park Features

**Mean Score of Park Features**

1 = Very Important; 4 = Not Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Inside Neighbourhood Zone</th>
<th>Outside Neighbourhood Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Washroom</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Picnic</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Multiuse</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Multi-sport</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Circuit</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Spray Park</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bandstand</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The park features that respondents rated as most important (lowest mean score) are: washroom (mean score of 1.65), habitat (mean score of 1.73), and accessible (mean score of 1.79).
Thank you
Delbrook Lands Survey 2
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Sample Characteristics
Sample Characteristics

The survey has a total of 211 completed responses.

- Neighbourhood zone:
  - 73% of responses are from individuals outside of the neighbourhood zone (n=155), and 27% of responses are from individuals inside of the neighbourhood zone (n=56).
Sample Information

Postal Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th># Responses</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V7N</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7R</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7K</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7J</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5Z</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V0N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VYN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Park Option Preference
Results – Park Option Preference

Which Neighbourhood Park Option do you Prefer?

- 60% of respondents prefer Option 1; 34% favour Option 2
- 62% of respondents outside the neighbourhood zone prefer Option 1; 54% of respondents inside the neighbourhood zone prefer Option 1
- 32% of respondents outside the neighbourhood zone prefer Option 2; 39% of respondents inside the neighbourhood zone prefer Option 2
Housing Option Preference
Results – Housing Option Preference

- 49% of respondents prefer 4 stories; 19% prefer 3 stories; 23% prefer 2 stories
- Outside the neighbourhood zone, 59% prefer 4 stories; 18% prefer 3 stories; 16% prefer 2 stories
- Inside the neighbourhood zone, 23% prefer 4 stories; 21% prefer 3 stories; 45% prefer 2 stories
Open-ended responses: "do you have any other comments about the park options?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grass Amphitheatre is great</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please make this a 'No Dogs Allowed' park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the bike skills section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep those tennis courts. They're used all year round and are only 1 of 2 public courts with lights on the Norths Shore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the bike skills area inclusion in option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to restore the creek and surrounding woods is a great one, and the path and pedestrian bridge will make it enjoyable to visit what is now an overgrown mess of invasive species. Perhaps the Streamkeepers can be consulted and incorporate some educational installations regarding the salmon migration up that creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have trades horticulturists that are already employed with the district have as much input possible. Also, Have them involved in the installation. I'm tired of seeing sub-standard work performed by private contractors when the district already employs Red Seal Landscape Horticulturists that could do a job better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel paths stink! Use natural materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the idea of a fairly unstructured open park with space for a playground, small additional sport court in addition to the tennis courts, and not much parking. It keeps the concept conducive to pedestrian use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be interesting. Not sure I'll be alive to see it though the rate this is going.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended responses: “do you have any other comments about the park options?”

The point is to preserve the lands and not develop them in a manner that will interfere with future needs for public land. Don’t waste the value of the existing buildings for community use.

Option 2 is the better choice, but I don’t think it’s ideal. Where is the drop off and pick up for the daycare?

If the buildings will accommodate seniors, it is important to have easy access to the recreation areas. It is great to have a community garden as many people from single homes moving into apartments would still like to have access to gardening.

I don’t believe we need another park. Within the adjacent area there are the following parks already: William Griffin Park, Eldon Park, McKay Creek Greenbelt, Upper McKay Creek Park, Murdo Frazer Park. The area is rich in park assets and affordable housing would be a better use of the site.

Please make sure there is a basketball hoop and maybe a hockey play area.

I would be happy with either option, but worry that with too much grass space, it will be an area for dogs to go and use as a bathroom. Would like to make sure that dogs are not allowed (at least not off leash)

please keep the tennis courts

I just think it should be kept quite natural, with lots of open play areas and trees for shade

please keep the existing tennis courts with the lights. The lights should be accessible by the players and should turn off after a set time but can be renewed by pushing a button in the court.

Make it as close to nature as possible !!
Open-ended responses: “do you have any other comments about the park options?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not support a community garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am impressed with the park concept drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A combination of affordable housing options with some park features would be ideal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. The park isn't important. Housing is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hope a good irrigation system will be put in to maintain the plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like making the whole space accessible/movable so that many people can use it for many different reasons (playing, walking, relaxing, socializing, connecting with nature...), without all being crowded in the same space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 appears to be well considered. I question who the intended users are for the community garden in option 2, most of the residential buildings in the area include outdoor space for gardens. The larger sport court in Option 1 and the spray park are both compelling amenities that are not available in the area. The fenced playground area for the preschool is also a good addition to Option 1. There are currently no playgrounds in the area aside from those at Larson, Braemar, and Andre-Piolet schools so the playgrounds in both park options would be very good additions. Were these playgrounds to mainly target pre-school ages that aren't served by the existing elementary school playgrounds that may make the most sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many sports facilities on the North Shore already, so I prefer the more unstructured park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't see a huge need for more parks in this area. The Mosquito Creek trail is a block away and has lots of green space. There are tennis courts and a park near the Delbrook baseball fields, and a playground with spray park about a kilometer away at Mahon Park. Keep this low maintenance. Include plants, trees and shrubs that don't need frequent watering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the best option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended responses: “do you have any other comments about the park options?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open-ended responses: “do you have any other comments about the park options?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great to see sport courts. Youth in our community need more options for safe and fun activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the spray park idea. There isn't one close. The focus of the new park should be a modification of Option 2 - Unstructured recreation and enhanced ecology with flexible Green Space. The Park should be an &quot;oasis&quot; for relaxation, introspection and conversation. The new Delbrook Centre more than satisfies the requirements for active recreation and sport while the new park would foster contemplations of the mind and nature's gift to mankind - &quot;The Outdoors, Fresh Air and Sunlight.&quot; Thank you very much for all your fine efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate the creek - a nature walk, sitting area, interactive nature study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option #2 does not go far enough to provide what outdoor amenities the immediate neighbors are looking for. If you build community garden - which would be cool for the new non-market housing complex to enjoy - then move gardens closer to proposed new build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall a good design and good options. North Van, and the District in particular is lacking modern, full-amenity parks. Spray parks and adult/elderly appropriate exercise equipment, plus the varied option for public gatherings, will make for a vibrant, community-building park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both plans look very good. The first one has more options for usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No housing should be a priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to see people with disability and regular drop off passengers ride zone as well in the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended responses: “do you have any other comments about the park options?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensure water can enter into the soils. keep treed areas around the creek 30m and lots of native trees for cool shelter, incorporate picnicking among the trees, interpretive signs as to the names of the trees and the value they add.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think accessibility is important, great you are thinking about that. Free outdoor activity is fantastic. If the exercise equipment could be covered somehow would be great. I can imagine rain and heat can be a deterrent for using it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less park, more housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. In your plans for the park you show two buildings. The two floors of the apartment building should be in the Southeast corner and the respite should be shown in the Southwest corner of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please ensure park plan is submitted at the same time as the building plan. They should be approved together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please ensure park plan is submitted at the same time as the building plan. They should be approved together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little parking for all alternatives. Vehicles will spill over into residential streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please construct a monument or fountain to commemorate the fact that Delbrook High School occupied this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest more parking spaces for park users as many tennis players come from all over the District to use these courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My concern mainly centers around making sure there is enough parking to keep my street from getting clogged. Also want to maintain a neighbourhood feel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Open-ended responses: “do you have any other comments about the park options?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniors respite very important. Low rise is important of housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure to make enough parking spots, more spots!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very pleased to see a combination of park and housing for the Delbrook lands. Keeping green space s critical to ensure the future integrity of our community and enjoyment of the area by residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleased with the options and balance of affordable housing with community parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more land dedicated to housing. We are dealing with an affordable housing crisis not a park crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love option B except I question the need for a viewing platform. what will be seen? Will you cut down trees to see the creek? Let people enjoy the riparian from the park/ people side. We need to protect Mosquito Creek, its already been severely impacted. Great to see the public washroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is going to maintain the proposed washrooms? Insufficient parking in the area. Parking in the residential buildings must not exit onto Queens which is already too busy due to delays on highway #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the building height options are compatible with the OCP (No sensitivity to the neighbourhood). There are many sport amenities nearby, but nothing accessible to the disabled, the elderly, and the very young. These should be the focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please consider a cafÉ or commercial opportunity. Elders + youth from the community could display or play music. Also more comfortable place for elders + those that would appreciate an indoor park. Please sync up with translink and increase bus frequency. The limited service of 246 is challenging. Also expand zone of car share so not all have to have multiple cars. You could offer shuttles during construction period to start introducing new transit means and connect people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council has the opportunity to make good on their promises to make more affordable housing available in the next few years. The potential to access government money from all 3 levels of government coupled with the land makes this project a provincial no-brainer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended responses: “do you have any other comments about the park options?”

Although 19% of the surveyed group chose 4+ floors. Over 65% chose less than 4 floors. Poorly presented information. What about parking? How about we fix the old buildings? Fix them up and use them for community meetings.

Like the idea of family units and few stories. well presented!

”Non market” must be higher than 10-15% below market following West Van’s lead, 30% is better.

Desirable to have survey results disclosed. 1) Range of age respondents 2) Greater detail as to where respondents live.

I like the design of the building. The building should have sufficient parking to avoid it spilling out into the neighbourhood.

Please consider noise level when and planning the park. Park option A presents more noise/ disruptions VS options B. Dial down park option towards more green space + quiet VS a loud space that attracts traffic/ parking requirements.

Give the community the affordable housing and community services we need. Give the Delbrook neighbourhood the park they want. I interpreted that the survey respondents had to reside within 20 meters of the site when seeing the initial survey announcement.

Great job presenting. Go 4th floor mixed! My son needs to live somewhere less than 1M.

What has council done to follow through on the referendum about affordable housing.

Pickleball should be away from tennis courts and peoples homes as it is a noisy sport.
Open-ended responses: "do you have any other comments about the park options?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The land should be made into a recreational area for all ages. No need to use this land for housing as we can use other pieces of land for this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I wish the project to maintain as that already exists. No loss of green and housing minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intersection of Queens and Westview needs to be made safer for pedestrians. With additional people using the park the need increases. People do not stop at the red light when turning right from Queens to Westview. More cross walks across queens would be good too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel the municipality should be in the business of providing housing. Its main priority should be looking after the people already living here. We are being neglected in so many ways. Focus on the taxpayer, not future taxpayers!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentation implies binary choices, You would do well to post blank base templates and allow people to draw/note their ideas in lieu of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm happy to see so much of the project is for the public in general and I'm sure will be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good direction - unclear as to where housing options would be located on lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The consultation was adequately covered by the SFU Delbook Dialogue so I think this latest consultation is unnecessary. However I am pleased that this process envisions development of the whole Delbrook lands rather than just the parking lot area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for consulting the community. Delbrook should be aimed at children, youth, teens and young adults in addition to seniors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended responses: "do you have any other comments about the park options?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The buildings do not have to be demolished to park status while they still have community value. The park should include the lower parking lot area. A building there is not compatible with a park. Sun shadowing as an example. The public stated that no development should be a consideration. Council have not considered dedicating the whole site as a reserved park land for future use, or community groups who would welcome access to existing buildings. If Council were to consider that, there is a need for seniors and other NFP community space. Why are the building options 2+, 3+, or 4+ biased questions implying I want a high rise, but would settle for 2 3 or 4 stories as a minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of bike racks to encourage people to rid there bikes to make sure we are still helping the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEEP TENNIS!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the space as a public amenity - preserves the &quot;optionality&quot; on future public use, converting to housing eliminates any future options for public use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing should be offered to a large range of family incomes. Even people with higher income can't afford housing on the north shore otherwise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase the number of bike racks to encourage people to ride their bikes to ensure we are still helping the environment.
Open-ended responses: “do you have any other comments about the park options?”

Restore the quaint little humpback bridge near the Delbrook Map sign
The amphitheatre would be very useful on a summer evening.
Re Park:
We don’t need any more sports amenities. Delbrook rec Centre, the artificial turf field behind it, the three sports fields across Delbrook are more than enough.
I question the need for a playground. There’s a Tot’s Lot across Delbrook with play equipment. The amphitheatre seems to be on the flat land at the north end. Shouldn’t it use the natural slope for seating?
The bike skills area reminds me of the skate board hollow in Griffin Park. Very popular!
Both options have good features but the community garden would only space for very few gardeners and doesn’t belong in our park.
What about a viewing tower like the one in Harbour Park?

Since this park is 70+ years overdue let’s build a new and modern park, a passive park where residents can relax and simply enjoy many colourful trees and shrubs, roses and rhododendrons, spring bulbs and many more.
Delbrook has lost many mature trees, cut down or wrecked when now much larger homes are built to replace original smaller homes with gardens.
We need paths through the trees with benches for friends to meet and visit together. A garden would be nice nearby.
A place where grandparents can bring their grandchildren for a picnic lunch or supper – a grassy area nearby for the kids to run.
I’d like to see our park like a miniature Stanley park as it was before the aquarium etc. was added let’s think outside the box concentrate on beauty, a very shallow pond with a tinkling fountain the birds love to fly through – let’s be inventive!

Too many things going on. No way do we need more sports courts. We need more open space with grass and lots of picnic tables, and lots of benches. Must have band stand or stage.
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

| I agree that the housing should be for families or for seniors. This location is not appropriate for supportive housing for the homeless and people with drug addiction issues. |
| We all know there is a need for affordable housing and respite care and you/we need to move more quickly to accomplish this need. But why isn’t there a fully developed plan for all those lands (old Delbrook centre and the park/fields across the street)? One can’t make an informed intelligent decision on this small section of land (south parking lot) if we don’t have a clue what is happening to rest of that area. Come on, this has been in limbo for years! Where is the plan for that whole area? We are all tired of this lack of will or inability to get this job done. Someone needs to take responsibility! |
| The affordability should be based on the income of a person or family and subsidized by the government. |
| 72-77 units is a drop in the bucket to satisfying the need for affordable housing. The building height should be capped at the 5 storeys proposed but the footprint increased by reducing the park allocation so that at least 150 units of housing can be provided. |
| The way things look now, we will have homeless people sleeping in the park when we could be providing housing. |
| Rents should be 40% below market, segregated between low income up to 60,000 and mid income up to say 100,000, with remaining 60% at market rents |
| These types of projects will benefit us all and I’m happy to see continued progress and densification proposed here, close to amenities build for the community. |
| The DNV has to stop blocking all efforts to actually build affordable housing |
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

| This wonderful site can only be accessed once. Why forego the opportunity to maximize the benefits it can provide to the community? There will be no shadowing issues, and limited traffic issues. It is adjacent an existing multifamily building. It is on a transit route. Maximize the density and maximize the social benefits. Don't cater to individuals who want to maintain an imaginary demographic profile that they believe comprises their neighborhood. |
| Should be market housing |
| The denser the better. Create places for the workforce that drives to the North Shore everyday to live. This will reduce congestion. |
| Affordable housing is a huge priority! Families and seniors need housing close to amenities and this is a good spot |
| There's not enough of either in our neighborhoods and we need to increase housing density to reduce our harm to the environment. |
| There's desperate need for affordable housing and for respite care on the north shore. The 4 story building makes financial sense and provides more. |
| Affordable housing is crucial in all District neighbourhoods, and so I am pleased that more affordable housing units are in progress in other areas of the District as well, such as Maplewood and Seylynn. While Option 1 doesn't provide a large number of affordable units in this particular location, the two storeys of housing plus respite care facility is the option that would blend best with the neighbourhood around it. This project would also be next door to a multi-unit building that already contains 22 suites, so with the new one at approximately 35 units, we would have potentially have about 60 units in one block. Increased vehicle traffic will be an issue, but manageable at the lower number of units. I would ask that you also give serious consideration to placing the parkade entrance for the new building along Stanley, rather than on Queens, which is already a very busy artery. Since the Queensbrook entrance ramps are already on Queens, having another one next door will make for a lot of congestion near the intersection of Westview/Delbrook. |
| It's important the when you say affordable it is actually significantly below market. (not just 10%) Reality is that DNV and CNV are not affordable for people who work here. |
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

For the area, 4 stories is sufficient height.

Although I believe affordable housing is important and I believe some affordable units is probably beneficial, overall this is not the correct area on the North Shore for affordable housing.

Density is more efficient and encourages more social interaction. Development should be supported with transit and ride hail alternatives to personal cars.

I am very confused.

Families and first responders in neighborhood would be excellent. Also make clear what qualifies people and make sure there are no loopholes.

Having already participated in the Delbrook lands dialogue, I am very disappointed that this conversation is even still ongoing. Affordable housing and community services that is economically viable on land we already own should be a non-issue. I’m sorry that the local community doesn’t see it that way but this location has always had a variety of people coming and going so I fail to see any hardship this will cause them.

DNV Council does not have a mandate to commit limited public lands for affordable housing. The amount of housing that can be provided using this land will have a negligible impact on affordable housing on the North Shore. These lands should be protected for future public use, including school use, and if the buildings need to be taken down due to lack of public need for them, the space should be used as park with minimal structure.

Why is option 3 still on the table? Wasn’t it already voted down? It’s very interesting that the people that don’t live in the neighbourhood want the higher building. Maybe they would vote differently if it was their neighbourhood.

Affordable housing and community services are needed now - I hope the future planning for the project will avoid further delays.

More people, means more sustainable, particularly in an area predominantly single home. Edgemont Village seemed huge on paper and now that it has been completed, it looks fine and before we know it, it will become very familiar. There will be disruption while building, but we have to think of making the District of North Vancouver more affordable for everybody. Key streets can become more populated as the single homes ease into maybe duplexes to accommodate more people. It is a fact of life, we are growing in numbers and we have to accept it.
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

Given that two stories plus respite care is above ground level parking, this option is actually a four story building. I find the manner in which the options were presented was deceitful as the ground level parking was never mentioned as an additional floor. If affordable housing is only economical in multi-story buildings, it should be created in the Town Centres and Village Centres where such structures are appropriate. The majority on the previous Council failed in this regard and the residents of Delbrook neighbourhood are now being threatened with having the character of their neighbourhood eroded in order to pay for those past failures. The OCP policy requires three stories maximum on this site and that is what any structure should be.

The North Shore desperately needs affordable housing for its residents, including families, seniors and persons with disabilities. Four stories helps with the economic viability of the project and still is respectful to the local neighbourhood form and character. I am extremely disappointed in Mayor and Council for not supporting the previous proposal for this site and feel they need to take more action into providing affordable housing for residents. This is not limited to affordable housing, but feel that increasing density and providing more housing options will better meet the needs of a variety of the District's residents.

There are more of all sizes of apartments. This apartment building will serve the community better. Density is the operative word.

In keeping with the community, two stories plus respite is what fits and would be most appreciated in the area. This is the best option for affordable housing on the site.

I think two stories plus respite fits with the area better than the other options. Building 4-5 stories would unfortunately set the new standard of higher and higher density in the area. The area is already too congested with traffic and we are already dealing with overflow parking issues from the Delbrook Community Centre. Staff and patrons constantly park all along queens and the side streets. A large building in the Delbrook lands will result in more parking and traffic issues and isn’t the precedent I want started in the area. Edgemont is the perfect example of what will happen if we start with these large scale developments. One becomes two becomes three.... Construction fatigue is ruining the quality of life on the north shore. Just my opinion.

Economic viability and #units most important
**Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Op en-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delbrook Community Centre area is already very crowded. It is hard to find parking going to the community centre. More crowd will only make that area overloaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If anything, given the number of seniors that need affordable respite, I think any building should be for seniors only and at an affordable rate like they do in Quebec!! Public, CHSLD buildings, Semi-private room 1596$ per month and a private room 1910.40$ per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this building should be for respite, seniors and the handicapped (physically or mentally) not for families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My preference is for a seniors focused project with some family units. I understand the respite facilities may be located elsewhere. I would like this issue resolved urgently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very good help for young family and people with low income I think it is a good investment for the community. We need more affordable housing in order to have young families grow and flourish, support local businesses who hire minimum-wage staff, and to accommodate seniors and people with disabilities in affordable ways and in communities. Rather than a situation that is similar to an institution. Having mixed and diverse communities makes everyone better. We need to capitalize on public lands to bring as much affordable housing as possible into our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors/social and rental housing is preferable, but just get something in there. Currently, rental housing is in very short supply all over the North Shore at any price. It might have to wait until this Chicken Little council is out on its ear, however. They’re such frightened people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The affordable housing picks â€œwinners and losersâ€ and does not follow laws of supply and demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two stories will fit in better with the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4 storey building will fit well with the existing building at the corner of Delbrook and Queens and will provide a more meaningful number of larger units than the two and 3 storey options, hopefully at a reasonable cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As large as the units can be should be the preference. The should have lots of built ins to make the space tidy and functional ie built in cupboards, bookcases, desks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a huge need to provide respite beds for families providing care to frail seniors or individuals with dementia, but there is also an equally desperate need to provide homes to lower income residents. Both of these populations are best serviced by a larger more cost effective building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel it’s important to encourage affordable housing and community services such as respite care. As the primary caregiver to an elderly parent, I know a service such as respite care can provide invaluable help and perhaps allow seniors to stay in their homes longer. Affordable housing is needed for a vibrant community, so that people can live, work, and age in their community. I chose the three-storey option because it is a compromise between what neighbourhood residents want and what others want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not support use of the community lands for this purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for seniors, people with disabilities and families. Please go by the actual definition of senior, as in 65 plus, and not what BC housing uses 45 plus. No supportive housing for drug addictions or supervised drug injection on site. Please select a reputable non profit provider and NOT BC housing which has a track record of no community consultation and putting in drug addicted clients with severe mental health issues into buildings with seniors 65 plus as they have done in surrey and langley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any affordable housings going to reduce the value of detached homes and makes the neighbourhood more busy which is not of my interest as a home owner in this area!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A four storey maximizes the value of the space being contributed by the District tax payers and would be compatible with the multi-storey building already located along its border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like to see the affordable housing given to first responders (police, fire, paramedics and nursing staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing opportunities for first time home owners and younger people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The affordable housing development needs to focus on seniors housing as this will best serve the Delbrook community now and in the future. Many residents have lived in and around Delbrook Avenue (since the 1960’s+) and can no longer take care of themselves and their homes. These seniors should be able to move to affordable housing close to where they have lived for so many years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel 4 stories of house is too high. It doesn’t fit with the neighborhood and would create shadows for the houses in the immediate area. 2-3 stories of housing should be maximum considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Option 2, while not my choice, if it makes the project viable it would be tolerated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me housing on this land is not an option. This should property needs to be community based as it has been for 50 years. We need a park in this area!!! Housing and a respite can be located elsewhere in the community. In fact I do not think the municipal government should be involved in providing land or money for housing. The mandate should be to provide services to the people who live in the district, not future residents. Also basing a decision on a few hundred responses is not good enough. My suggestion- first, make a park then take your time and think about ALL the ramifications of a building on this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as this is the absolute highest, U would vote for it BUT my choice would differ if I lived in the neighbourhood. The ideal is to have any new build be the same as or less than the immediate condo neighbours condo heights. I have no opinion on the right mix for 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms - I would relay on District’s professional opinion on which apartment sizes and heights are ideal, relevant and sustainable. I would be deeply opposed to going any higher than the next door on Queens. I would propose you build lots of extra spots of underground parking to accommodate busy park use. Use the square footage for what’s most important - the park - and NOT lots of outdoor parking. Further - build to accommodate LOTS of bikes. I could see riding my bike to this beautiful park that has outdoor work out equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this is a crisis and we need to treat it like one. please ignore the NIMBYs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

There is currently a housing crisis in North Vancouver. DNV land should be used to maximize the number of affordable housing units and community services. This will benefit the entire community. There is a great need for housing for seniors, family units and a seniors respite centre. We also need worker units that are affordable. DNV and CNV have an aging population so we need the seniors respite centre. To lower the building is inefficient and is not what the larger community needs. Council should listen to the entire community and not just the local residents who already own safe and secure housing.

Build more of everything.

The region is in a housing crisis, our country is about to enter a seniors care crisis, and the planet is in a climate crisis. The only rational approach to all of the above is building as much affordable dense and seniors-focused housing as possible. It is shameful that my community has not done better at this - get to work!

In terms of the mix of bedrooms per unit, the need for housing is so great and broad that any mix is likely appropriate. However, single people need housing too, this isn’t something that should be left up to public debate.

6 story market rental would have been better but this is a decent start

Would prefer 5 or 6 storeys.

Housing need is more important than aesthetic preferences.

Respite need is more important than aesthetic preferences.

I would be that many people concerned about this will not even notice it once built, whether it’s 3 or 6 storeys.
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

This looks like a great project. I live in a 4 storey building myself, and it's lovely as everyone knows each other. I can't imagine why 4 storeys is inappropriate anywhere, we're not talking towers or anything like that.

IMO 4+ stories at that location is still low density. I prefer options with more units suitable for families, and based on amenities in close proximity to Delbrook parking could be kept to a minimum. It would be great if Translink were amenable to increased bus frequency, and higher density would help that.

We desperately need to create more density in the right places in order to create affordable housing, reduce traffic and reduce our carbon footprint.

Seniors definitely need affordable housing as do some families.

I would like to see the housing accommodate primarily seniors and people with mental health issues. Including some families with the park and daycare attached makes sense. I am concerned about the size of the building with respect to having a sense of community in the building. Smaller is better for the residents to connect with each other.

Housing seniors makes the use of the senior respite care a natural progression.

North Vancouver desperately needs as many affordable housing units as possible.

Listen to the community that live in the area. Also for respite, endure comfortable drop off and pick up access. Many older drivers are dropping off loved ones for respite who need proper access and temporary parking.

As much social housing as you can possibly build please it is so very badly needed.

We have community services close by and I like to see people of all ages will be counted to live in the community.

Affordability makes the project to bring diverse community living rather than segregated society.
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build housing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep the utilities with the roof line ie maybe less units on top floor so as to keep it at the 5 stories not 6. Bump the building back (north) on the lot to allow for off street drop off for residents and those attending adult respite. With school in area how can it be determined that the 3 bedrooms will include children not just three people sharing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add health nurse area to this building one stop shop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing the better. It takes forever to build these building and help the people in need now. I believe 4 storey is the best option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project needs to serve the community in the long run and be economically viable. I want my son to be able to have somewhere to live on the north shore. People need places to live. The development is right by the highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If forced to choose any of the above, the lower the better! My choice is for No housing on the site!! Every resident deserves park land. How about a beautiful site with tennis courts and a gorgeous park? We have lots of high rises and low rises being built all over the North Shore but no new actual parks. After fighting traffic and crowds after a long work day, relaxing green space is needed. Many world class European cities don't pack residents into high density condos and still provide plazas and parks for enjoying outdoor space. It used to be said that once a bridge was crossed to the North Shore that blood pressure dropped and everyone relaxed. That no longer happens. Let's try to bring it back!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding more housing without more roads, parks, and amenities just adds to the growing mess that North Vancouver has become. An area that was a spectacular and beautiful place to call home is often a huge parking lot!!! Keep Delbrook green!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young single people won't want to live in this area, transit in the evenings is slow and not much happening. I'd suggest focusing on 2-3 bedrooms for families and 1 bedrooms for seniors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need much more housing in general</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been a taxpayer/homeowner in North Vancouver since 1975, except for an 8-year break living in another jurisdiction. (2 homes in the CNV and two homes in the DNV, each located between 2-6 k of the Delbrook site) The intersection of Delbrook and Queens has long been a crossroads of community activity, including the decades when it was a secondary school. I believe strongly that ALL of us in the community should support the mix of housing that is most economically viable for the greatest number of people needing it. These decisions should not be left preferentially up to those in the immediate vicinity imagining themselves to be living in an invisibly gated community that they control the keys to. I know what it is to live on a bus line, near multi-family units, and near a school with associated traffic. These installations are fixtures of urban (and suburban) existence. An existing building at the Delbrook/Queens intersection already sits at a height of 3-4 storeys, so that height profile has been established. Park lands abound just a few hundred metres away to the west of that same intersection. I was disappointed when the original plan for housing at the Delbrook site, shepherded for months by a non-profit group, was dismissed at the very last minute. Let’s salvage what we can from that proposal and the community values espoused during the consultation process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are enough non market buildings in North Vancouver. It is more important to have a two or three floors of respite and services for seniors since there is no respite in the District with exception of the one in Lynn Valley where even people from West Vancouver come.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our desire for a smaller structure is not NIMBYism. A six storey building is 2-3 stories higher than the neighbouring condos. The OCP limits higher buildings to village centres which this site is not. Our neighbourhood is not opposed to social housing. The 500 block of Windsor Rd. W. already has a Roof Over Their Heads social housing for people with mental health challenges. We are not responsible for the housing crises in the City or District. 31% of all condos sit empty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If the quantity of affordable housing is too little, there will be no funding available - better use of available funds elsewhere.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would be nice to ensure the rent is indeed affordable for young families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I would like to see the building with as few floors as possible + adequate parking. |
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We need a more diverse unit mix that may include studios for younger folks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The above choice (4 floors) is in keeping with the current OCP - it is conditional on transit support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For it as long as it does not exceed 20% of overall development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the question RE # of floors &quot;above grounds level parking&quot; is manipulative/dishonest. 4 +1 now means 6 stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density + add transit/car share to support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are supportive of housing for emergency responders or teachers. Keep some of the housing as a community rental if possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer units address the concerns for building height &amp; parking while still providing adequate housing - a good compromise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need this now! This land is a blessing, use it wisely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Option 1 - increased shade from taller building would make park look dark or shady. 2 floors fits into neighbourhood. Very unsure about affordable housing. Much better to allow the market to determine price. How are people selected? How are chosen people monitored, what if their income goes up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see 4 bedroom units (or 3 + flex) in the housing mix. This is a family neighbourhood. Least 1 bedroom possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

Not a fan of affordable housing as I believe in free market. Who gets to win the affordable lottery? The market is currently working with prices falling due to over building. Sufficient parking critical, not street parking. Anything over 4 total floors is not acceptable. Consider Edgemont village developments.

DNV requires more affordable housing and community services.

Have a mix of ages.

I would like to know the size and plan for respite care. Would this be custodial or on a drop off daily/weekly basis.

4 floors is the best use of space right by the highway.

With the extreme shortage of housing options in DNV, I feel council needs to maximize what it can do with the lands it owns.

We need this space for a community park and other options but we are against affordable housing. No housing in this area as we can have housing in a different area.

Love the green space.

I would want affordable housing units to be accessible to current North Van residents who need more affordable housing. I would like to stay in this area, but I am having trouble keeping up with rent increases. I think the housing should be some form of co-op living. Co-housing, community supporting each other, multi-generational.

Not an option! Do not want housing on this property!

Would prefer seniors housing or housing for north shore workers (firemen, nurses, teachers) Also important not to have parking access off Queens Road.
### Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;plus could equal infinity - not the way to assure neighbours it will be low-rise. I would like to be able to retire in my neighbourhood. I would like my children to be able to afford housing here. We need a mix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three floors is quite sufficient for the neighbourhood. I would be sorry to see it any higher. When the original meetings were held, this was the consensus then too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this is an imperative option to attract service provider, care givers and &quot;next generation&quot; to the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific concerns about affordable housing. However, my concerns are that 1) there be adequate off street parking for residents and 2) access and egress must be from Stanley Av and not Queens Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more families we can help, the better. We have an affordability crisis! We need diverse communities to fill jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None. Why is there no option for no development? It’s not the District’s mandate to create affordable housing. This land should be preserved for future public use. The existing structures should be used for public community benefit and eventually returned to park land as originally envisioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids at Little Rascals should have water park because then families can live in smaller houses with smaller or no yards and go to the park to play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it was dishonest to ask for floor # preferences &quot;on top of ground floor parking&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not in favour on land use change to housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended responses: “please share your thoughts about affordable housing and community services options”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordable housing should be offered to a large range of family incomes. Even people with higher income can’t afford housing on the north shore otherwise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preference for Primarily 2+ BDRM unit mix (20% one BDRM, 50% 2 BDRM, 30% 3 bedroom total 33 – 35 units) Re housing - They don’t belong in our parks. The District needs a study of all available district lands which is suitable for affordable housing and community services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why pick on Delbrook? This whole mess is because some Councillors wanted to make political gains by putting up social housing and the Delbrook lands were available NOW. Why was Delbrook shafted? The has never been done elsewhere in the District. It’s completely unfair – and NOT the best site in any way. As a result we’ve lost significant portion of our park – and gained a parking problem. “In our May 2019 survey residents who live outside the immediate neighbourhood indicated the strongest preference for a building with four storeys plus ground floor respite”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of course they would – they all have many parks. They don’t care what this would do to our neighbourhood so want as many people jammed into this space as possible. Who cares what it will look like? This is the same ugly plan presented by Catalyst and turned down by council! This huge building is completely out of scale with the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is needed is for council to have a plan for affordable housing across the district. This is simply and ill thought out decision for political points with absolutely no consideration of the affect on Delbrook! Actin haste – repent at leisure! This is really unfair to Delbrook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we had to have housing and the respite centre it would be much better to have the respite centre alone in a lower area of the park. This site is not a good one for this housing. The amenities relied on in the Westview centre may be gone when the centre is demolished. Its valuable land and the anchor tenant Safeway was sold again this past year by Sobeys and its likely the whole site may be rebuilt with towers and stores below when construction of the new large grocery store in Edgemont Village is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support only two storeys, no respite care on this site. NO Respite put that somewhere else. There are other sites. 2 storeys max with 2-3 bedroom apts. Developers need to get with the program. It is time the DNV and other municipalities got a hold of the issue with developers, the fact that they are not interested in building BELOW MARKET HOUSING is only because they won’t make as much money!!! It continues to be ludicrous that those outside the area have so much say in the planning of any of the Delbrook lands as they did during the SFU failed process. The planning department has driven this effort for years and will get the results planning wants. This has definitely not been a community engaged effort.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you
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APPENDIX C

Park Option 1: Focus on accessible and active recreation and sport amenities with multiple path connections and access to the natural areas and creek.
Park Option 2: Focus on unstructured recreation and enhanced ecology with flexible green space
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**AUTHOR:** David Stuart, Chief Administrative Officer

**SUBJECT:** Council Directions 2019 - 2022

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT Council adopts *Council Directions 2019 – 2022* as its public statement of priority issues, approaches and initiatives for its term of office, and

Directs staff to incorporate actions associated with the priority directions into the organization’s Corporate Plan and departmental work plans.

**REASON FOR REPORT:**

Since being elected in late 2018, Council has undertaken a process of determining their shared vision and strategic priorities, including identifying critical issues and the approaches that would be required to address them. Coming soon after direct engagement with the community through the 2018 election campaign, Council’s process did not include a formal public engagement component, so discussion of their plan in a public meeting is Council’s opportunity to ensure their priority directions resonate with the community.

**SUMMARY:**

Through a series of workshops, Council has identified four key issues and five approaches and initiatives that will be the focus of their term. The key issues are:

1. Improving Mobility and Transportation
2. Increasing Housing Diversity and Addressing Affordability
3. Supporting a Vibrant Local Economy
4. Taking Action on the Climate Emergency and Protecting the Natural Environment

The approaches and initiatives required to understand and make improvements on these issues are:

1. Robust Community Engagement
2. Official Community Plan Review Project
3. Working Collaboratively and Strengthening Relationships
4. Focusing on our Customers, and
5. Keeping the Organization Resilient

Council’s last workshop in June was to review the draft of Council Directions. The resulting edited document is attached to this report. Since that time, additional comments and observations have been made, which are summarized below.

- Given Council’s declaration of a Climate Emergency, consider further strengthening language around climate actions in the vision and various action statements in the priority areas
- Achieving housing diversity and addressing affordability may require additional language
- Clear, confident direction is the objective of all Council’s statements in the document
- Council’s 2022 Goal Statement sets the tone for the directions and may require some editing in order to address the foregoing points

Council may wish to discuss these comments more fully before adopting the document.

Conclusion
Council has developed an initial roadmap which provides a statement of direction for both the community and the organization, which can be further refined and then measured over the course of Council’s term. Adopting Council Directions 2019-2022 in a public meeting will complete Council’s strategic direction-setting process.

Options:
Council may:
1. Adopt the document as attached to this report
2. Make specific changes and then adopt the document
3. Engage in further discussion and make subsequent amendments to the document in a future regular meeting or workshop

David Stuart
Chief Administrative Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Community Development</td>
<td>Clerk's Office</td>
<td>External Agencies:</td>
<td>Advisory Committees:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>Library Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>NS Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Operations</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Fire Services</td>
<td>Recreation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Council Directions

2019-2022

District of North Vancouver

Our Commitment to the Community
This plan is our initial road map, setting priority directions as the Council elected in October, 2018. We bring different perspectives, strengths and areas of interest. Some of us have been Council members for a number of years, and some of us are arriving with fresh eyes, experiences and different understandings of the work of the municipality. We all know that we have committed to serve in a time when the community is feeling the impacts of change related to global issues like climate change, regional growth, and a level of local renewal and redevelopment not seen in the recent past. In this context and at this early point in our term, it is challenging, and possibly unrealistic, to come together around a clear and compelling vision of the next four years.

However, we agree on on the importance of prioritizing action on these issues facing the community: improving mobility and transportation; addressing the climate emergency; bridging gaps in housing availability and affordability for current and future residents, and supporting a balanced and vibrant economy.
We also share a belief that how these issues are addressed matters. Some of us fear that community trust in Council has been eroded and must be rebuilt.

We wish to engage more, and differently, with the community. Robust, authentic engagement will be a hallmark of our term. An early effort will be to convey to the community that we hear their concerns and recognize that past decisions have created challenges and the need for action.

We know, for example, that transportation and mobility are top of mind and that residents are feeling the impacts of change. A series of discussion papers on the pillars of the OCP will ground a dialogue with the community to create broader awareness of decisions previously made, deeper understanding of all facets of the OCP, and to prioritize next steps in its implementation.

Seventy-nine percent of electors told us they support further study on future reunification with the City of North Vancouver, an issue that will have to be discussed by the new Councils of both municipalities.

The Council and staff that make up the District organization share a passion to serve the whole community. While our roles differ, we succeed by working together. As we work with each other, staff and the community, we expect that our perspectives and priorities, and therefore this plan, may evolve.

The directions and initiatives outlined here are our commitment to work collaboratively and with focus to make real progress on the issues most important to the community.

Process

At the end of 2018, KPMG was retained to facilitate the process of determining Council’s vision and strategic priorities for 2019-2022.

Following individual interviews with each member of Council and the Executive team, an initial set of community-facing priorities was identified. These were supplemented by a smaller number organization-facing, or operational, priorities. In a series of working sessions, all of these priorities were analyzed, discussed and then finalized as the most important issues Council wishes to tackle over their four-year term.

The process also identified critical initiatives that would be required to start addressing these issues. As importantly, Council also explicitly considered their preferred approaches for interacting with the community in pursuit of these outcomes.

Together, these key issues, initiatives and approaches describe the priority directions of the 2019-2022 term as determined by Council today.

Coming so soon after the 2018 election campaign, in which all Council members engaged directly with the community, the plan development process did not include a formal public engagement component, so review of the document in a public meeting will be Council’s opportunity to confirm that their priorities resonate with the community.
The Official Community Plan expresses the community’s vision of The District of North Vancouver as ‘Inspired by nature, enriched by people.’

Specific qualities and characteristics describe this vision more completely. Vibrant neighbourhoods are framed by mountains, streams and shorelines. People of all ages, cultures and incomes live in safe and healthy environments with housing and employment choices, making the community active and inclusive. Though we are prioritizing a deeper dialogue on all facets of the OCP in light of its implementation so far, we continue to view the OCP vision and goals as a solid foundation for long-term planning.

Our strategic planning discussions-centred on community identity and included exploration of concepts such as: social happiness, health, inclusivity, accessibility and livability. Questioning whether community identity was static or changing also underscored the challenge inherent in setting directions and making decisions for the benefit of both today’s citizens and the future generations who will sustain this community.

We also discussed the benefits and trade-offs associated with taking small steps towards goals over a long period of time versus bold steps to spark real movement on key issues identified here.

We believe the District of North Vancouver is defined by its surroundings and made strong by the people who live and work here. We are committed to sharing and sustaining our community that is loved by citizens who live, work and play here. By 2022, our commitment to engagement and to building relationships with others will result in increased transit investment for the North Shore, including rapid transit and affordable social housing being built on District-owned lands. We will be recognized for our culture of creativity, trust and openness, and customer-centred service. We will see an evolution in Lynn Valley, Lynn Creek, Lions Gate and Edgemont town and village centres that brings people of diverse ages, backgrounds and incomes to our community. Investment in pedestrian, cycling and transit connections will be prominent in our financial plan. We will have reduced our environmental footprint by implementing integrated stormwater management plans, reducing waste and by spearheading projects to reduce GHG emissions. Our decisions will be made on the basis of evidence, data and broad input. We will listen to all voices through all channels and the impact of that input and the reasons for our decisions will be clear. We will work together with the Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations to determine what reconciliation means in our community.
Values and Commitments

“We provide leadership and exemplary service that supports our community’s needs today and aspirations for tomorrow.”

A shared purpose exists between Council and staff and that is a passion to serve people and our community. The priority directions set by Council and described below are shared by staff. Although Council and staff play different roles, all work to support each other in advancing the priorities and share a commitments to always work with integrity, creativity and transparency in service to the public.

PRIORITY DIRECTIONS

These are most important issues we will pursue. In doing so, we have agreed on approaches that make sense to us at this time and on initiatives that will help us understand and make improvements on these issues.

Our key issues are:

1. Improving Mobility and Transportation
2. Increasing Housing Diversity and Addressing Affordability
3. Supporting a Vibrant Economy and Jobs-Housing Balance
4. Taking Action on Climate Change

Approaches and Initiatives:

1. Robust Community Engagement
2. Official Community Plan Review Project
3. Working Collaboratively and Strengthening Relationships
4. Focusing on our Customers
5. Keeping the Organization Resilient
ACTIONING OUR PRIORITIES

We will work together with staff to advance the priorities set out in this plan. While we play different roles in support of our shared goals and mandate, we know that our entire organization takes pride in their work and is passionate about public service. As elected representatives, our role is to act in the broadest public interest by prioritizing issues, setting direction and establishing policy to guide the organization in its actions.

We understand that staff’s role is to implement these directions and policies, through appropriate actions that reflect our decisions, comply with legislation, meet professional standards and adhere to best practices. As such, the next step in this process is to realize these priorities and actions through the District’s Corporate Plan. The Corporate Plan takes our priority directions and translates them into shorter term objectives and actions, which staff then deliver through departmental work plans.

Together we view these plan as roadmaps that are responsive and adaptive based on changing circumstances and new information, to move the District closer to the shared vision of the community.
Improving Mobility and Transportation

Why is this important?
There is broad community concern about the state of the transportation system. While much of this centres on the issue of vehicle capacity across Burrard Inlet, congestion is also experienced when moving east and west across the North Shore through various jurisdictions. While we work at creating more concentrated development in centres, can we also reduce reliance on the car and increase opportunities to choose transit, cycling or walking as alternatives?

Currently, major improvements to the Highway 1 interchanges are underway but alone will not provide long-term relief. Phibbs Exchange improvements, and more frequent transit, including B-Line and SeaBus service, have been approved, yet are considered by many to be a small step in the direction of providing real transit options for work and recreational travel. In recognition of the need to take a regional approach to solutions, the Integrated North Shore Transportation Planning Project (INSTPP) brought together representatives from all levels of government on the North Shore as well as TransLink and the Port Authority.

This collaborative approach to transportation planning created a unique opportunity for all partner agencies to produce unified recommendations to improve how people and goods move around the North Shore and across the Burrard Inlet. We support many of these recommendations and believe this work could provide the impetus for further advocacy on the part of local government and this Council.
WHAT WE WANT TO ACHIEVE

The OCP vision is for increased numbers of trips to be via transit, cycling or walking, within and between town and village centres. Starting today and looking to the future, we want to work towards outcomes that reduce traffic congestion and increase sustainable transportation alternatives, and to do so in collaboration with North Shore, regional and provincial partners.

THE ACTIONS WE ARE GOING TO TAKE

At this juncture, there is a unique role for us, as Council, to be vocal advocates for transportation and mobility on the North Shore. This can begin with the implementation of some INSTPP recommendations. However, during our term, we also intend to vigorously advance the case for rapid transit to the North Shore.

A range of additional actions to support our transportation and mobility vision will be included in the organization’s Corporate Plan, including:

- Increasing safe bike and pedestrian routes
- Increasing transit options
- Working regionally to improve systems at all levels
- Thinking creatively to challenge traditional standards and imagine new mobility solutions

Why is this important?

A healthy community has a diverse spectrum of housing types to accommodate residents of all ages, incomes, abilities and household make-up. A lack of housing choice impacts affordability levels, which can contribute to economic imbalance within the community and to worsening transportation and local business sustainability, as employees are forced to travel between their jobs and homes they can afford. All this is recognized in the OCP, which has a key objective to increase housing choices to meet the diverse needs of residents of all ages and incomes. Multi-family and rental housing has been increased through revitalization and mixed use development in the designated town and village centres, but not without disruption to current residents.
This has raised questions ranging from timing of projects to reduce construction impact, to how to retain older, less expensive housing, to what we mean by affordable and social housing and to how it should be provided. The Rental and Affordable Housing Strategy, adopted in November 2016, focuses the OCP’s broad objective into six goals aimed at filling the gaps in housing supply for low and moderate income households in the District, where housing remains predominantly single family and owner-occupied. Although senior levels of government have re-entered the housing field with funding and initiatives to support affordability, there is heavy regional competition for this funding, as other municipalities also work to better define and meet their housing needs.

While we have reached consensus that more affordable and more rental housing is needed, we have important decisions to make as a Council about:

- How to describe affordability and social housing
- Whether to target specific populations and demographics
- Where affordable housing should be located
- How to leverage District land, and which land specifically, to attract funders and incent developers to provide affordable housing
- Whether to use development tools like density bonus or community amenity contributions to produce more of the housing we lack

Agreeing on definitions and targeted objectives is necessary to enable further decisions about specific projects in specific locations, whether on District land or in private developments.

**WHAT WE WANT TO ACHIEVE**

We recognize the challenges inherent in trying to sustain the attributes that make the District a special place to live, work and enjoy, while making decisions for a healthy and resilient future. People here today, in all life stages and circumstances, along with future citizens who will contribute to the community, need places to live. The most important housing outcomes for us are to increase the diversity of housing options in the District and to make decisions that balance future housing needs with current needs.

**THE ACTIONS WE ARE GOING TO TAKE**

Our critical task at this time is to achieve consensus and set direction on specific priority projects that deliver rental housing for low and moderate income earners, and those in need of social housing, such as persons with disabilities, youth, seniors, and the homeless.

A range of actions to support our decision making in this regard will take precedence in the Corporate Plan, including, for example:

- Increasing the number of social and affordable housing units to fill gaps in the low to moderate income end of the housing continuum
- Increasing housing diversity
- Assessing District land available and its suitability for various housing forms
- Balancing environmental and housing needs
Supporting a Vibrant Economy and Jobs-Housing Balance

Why is this important?
A diverse and resilient local economy is a key element of a healthy community and of the vision expressed in the OCP. It is enabled by clear land use policies and by fostering the attributes of a desirable community where businesses, and the people who work in them, want to be. This requires planning appropriate and compatible economic activity in various areas. It also needs a diverse supply of housing that is linked to jobs, recreation and other daily activities through good roads, transit, cycling and walking.

The long term goal is for a sustainable jobs-housing balance in the District. However, recent experience is that increasing numbers of people are coming to and through North Vancouver from elsewhere to work, exacerbating traffic congestion. Changes in community structure and business decisions impacting valuation and assessments are resulting in challenges for some local businesses. At the same time, the increasing demand for recreational and tourism services in this growing region has both positive effects on economic vitality and negative impacts on local neighbourhoods.

WHAT WE WANT TO ACHIEVE
We are committed to the long term objective of a vibrant local economy that includes resident local businesses, commercial, light industrial and major port activity. Key outcomes for us in this term include addressing property assessment inequities, ensuring our land use plans and policies allow businesses to stay and grow in the District and working with local operators and other partners to allow the region’s citizens and visitors to responsibly enjoy the natural and tourist attractions in our neighbourhoods.

THE ACTIONS WE ARE GOING TO TAKE
We have a key role to play as leaders in a collaborative process with stakeholders, other municipalities and the Province to address fundamental issues with the property assessment system, which are threatening the economic viability of both businesses and local governments. The Corporate Plan will also include work for the organization to:

- Measure recreational and tourism use of roadways, infrastructure and amenities and the impact on mobility and livability
- Work with partners and find innovative ways to manage access to parks and tourism attractions, prioritizing safety and minimizing local area impacts
- Assess the impact of plans and policies on retaining and attracting employment opportunities
- Increase business friendliness in processes and services
Taking Action on Climate Change

Why is this important?
The environment has long shaped the identity of this community and its residents. Natural areas, which make up 70% of the District's overall land base, also contain ecosystems that provide functions necessary for our health and that of a wide variety of plants and animals. The OCP, which is an Integrated Sustainable Community Plan, envisions a future where the air is clear, water is clean, waste is minimal and the quality of life valued today is sustained for future generations. It also provides objectives for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, achieving an efficient urban structure, managing ecosystems, adapting to the impacts of climate change, and building resilience to prepare for and respond to natural hazard and other emergencies.

The District adopted its Climate Change Adaptation Strategy in 2017. Integrating science and best practice and guided by a national program focused on building adaptive and resilient communities, the Strategy will help the District build and respond to the social, economic, and environmental impacts of climate change.
WHAT WE WANT TO ACHIEVE

We are committed to integrating environmental considerations into all of the District’s decisions and practices. We recognize that many efforts sustained over time are necessary for meeting our environmental and climate goals. At the same time, we also see the climate emergency we face and know we have an important role in creating awareness and a sense of urgency. Outcomes important to us include: increased resilience through emergency planning, preparedness initiatives, and infrastructure planning; increased community awareness and community-based actions, and the creation of action plans with our neighbours and partners, such as a sea level rise action plan. We can be a leader in climate change adaptation by 2022.

THE ACTIONS WE ARE GOING TO TAKE

Leadership on environmental protection and climate action is essential to inspire and enable staff to do their best work. Supporting innovation and science-based policies and decisions is critical.

The Corporate Plan will include actions advance implementation of the Climate Change Adaptation Strategy and make necessary changes in District operations, policies and regulations. For example:

- Development of a North Shore Resilience Strategy using the UN Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
- Initiate projects that raise awareness about climate change and reducing GHG emissions, for example, the e-bike share and other new mobility initiatives
- Work together and learn from others, including the Tsleil-Waututh and Squamish Nations to update and create new policies required to address climate action
- Update liquid and solid waste programs
- Implement Integrated Stormwater Management Plans
Why is this important?
At all levels, public discourse between and among citizens, elected bodies and institutions is undergoing radical change. Social media and other tools have broadened access to information and opinion, with both positive and negative results. The 2018 election campaign provided recent and very direct engagement between candidates elected to office and the community, and led to the conclusion, for some, that community trust in Council’s decision-making processes had eroded and needs to be restored. Community expectations and preferences for ongoing engagement need to be better understood outside of the election context and continually refreshed as needs and tools evolve. New tools and analytics are available which can enhance engagement, dialogue and informed decision making.

WHAT WE WANT TO ACHIEVE
We are determined to create an environment of trust and a habit of engagement during our term of office. This starts with understanding how the community wishes to participate and be heard in decision making and then providing those channels for input and communication. It means demonstrating how and why decisions were made and acknowledging the impacts of these decisions. There is an opportunity for deep engagement with the community on fundamental questions of community identity and livability. At the same time, we can employ tools and practices to make quick and inclusive check-ins on current topics a habit.

THE ACTIONS WE ARE GOING TO TAKE
We have provided a mandate to the organization to broaden engagement, to focus on approaches that are convenient for our citizens, to be proactive and consistent in our language and materials and to always be clear in the commitment we are making with each engagement.

To achieve our desired outcomes, the Corporate Plan includes initial actions such as:

- Establishing a baseline on community issues, needs and preferences through a statistically representative survey
- Identifying engagement topics most critical to the community
- Continuing to employ and develop online tools for engaging with the community
- Further developing and employing data collection tools to inform decision making and improve reporting
Official Community Plan Review Project

Why is this important?
An Official Community Plan (OCP) expresses a community's vision of its long term future and provides a plan for how to achieve that future, through land use, social, environmental, economic, transportation and other policies. The District's OCP, like others, is also an Integrated Sustainable Community Plan. It balances the interests of current residents and of people who will be the community of the future, as well as local and regional perspectives. Given this scope and planning horizon, it is to be expected that periodic review of progress and effectiveness is required, particularly in a period of significant change.

Reflecting input heard over the course of the last municipal election campaign and elsewhere, there is a perceived level of frustration with construction activity and traffic congestion and a sense of "development fatigue" within the community. There are questions as to whether, or to what extent, these impacts relate to implementation of the OCP itself, and what role factors such as single family construction activity, regional projects and shifting commuting patterns may play in contributing to the community's experience. Deeper understanding and awareness of changes underway and on the horizon are pre-requisites to further discussions with the community about prioritizing elements of the OCP.

WHAT WE WANT TO ACHIEVE
We want to affirm community support for the OCP and determine what goals should be prioritized and how they might be achieved. Outcomes related to this broad aspiration include: ensuring the community is aware of OCP-related projects already approved and underway; engaging with the community on key OCP topics; a determination of whether OCP amendments are required to keep it relevant and to develop, implement and report on action plans that advance OCP goals.

THE ACTIONS WE ARE GOING TO TAKE
Early in 2019, we will determine the scope and timeline of the OCP study. Priority actions in the Corporate Plan will include:
- Development of white papers regarding specific strategic areas of the OCP, as determined by Council, which consider historic impacts, new pressures, emerging priorities and the interdependence of issues
- Conducting a statistically relevant and demographically representative survey of residents to augment the white paper analysis
- Development of action plans, and OCP amendments as necessary, to advance priorities determined through the review
Why is this important?
The toughest challenges facing communities at any scale—climate change, transportation, affordability, economic and social issues—cannot be tackled by any one entity acting alone. There is growing recognition that these and other challenges require collaboration between governments at all levels, the not-for-profit sector, private sector and community-based organizations. The mechanisms required to advance solutions can be complex as multiple, sometimes competing, interests are at play. Building and sustaining relationships across operational and political lines for the long term, and actively collaborating on initiatives of shared interest, increases chances for innovative solutions, funding and broader positive benefit for the community.

WHAT WE WANT TO ACHIEVE
We are ready to lead with a “North Shore perspective” to achieve transportation, economic and service goals for the whole of the North Shore region. We want to build and strengthen relationships with Tsleil-Waututh and Squamish Nations to move beyond development servicing, single-issue and transactional approaches of the past.

GOING TO TAKE
The Corporate Plan will translate our perspectives to the operational level with priority actions such as:

- Continuing work to implement various INSTPP recommendations and other shared priorities through a collaborative structure that includes all levels of government on the North Shore, TransLink and the Port
- Working with all North Shore partners and through NSEM to create a North Shore wide resiliency strategy that addresses natural hazard and climate adaptation strategies
- Identifying specific actions and initiatives that strengthen the relationships between Councils and staff of the District, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations and help achieve shared community goals

THE ACTIONS WE ARE
4 Focus on our Customers

Why is this important?
Council and all members of the District organization share a passion for serving people and this community. The needs and expectations of the community are diverse and continue to evolve. The District provides such essential services as parks, water and waste collection, that meet peoples’ daily needs and impact their quality of life ‘closest to home.’

WHAT WE WANT TO ACHIEVE
We want to attain a clear and current understanding of service expectations across all segments of the community, including implications for community livability. Making communication and transactions with the District easy for citizens and businesses is a key goal. Providing excellent service to all customers is of utmost importance to us, as individual expectations and broad community needs are balanced.

THE ACTIONS WE ARE GOING TO TAKE
We are prioritizing engagement to understand the needs and expectations of the community, along with actions to enable the service options and communication channels preferred by residents and businesses.

As such the Corporate Plan will include these priorities for staff to focus on:

- Conducting a statistically representative survey of all District citizens to identify service priorities, satisfaction and preferences for interacting with the District
- Implementing of a digital strategy to transform online services, engagement and information aligned with residents’ needs and preferences
- Providing staff with training and tools that will enhance skills needed to continually improve customer experiences
Why is this important?

Financial sustainability is critical to the community's vision for a healthy future. The District has long followed financial management best practices and is a leader in municipal asset management, but as demands and obligations on local governments increase, maintaining a comprehensive, responsive long term financial plan is vital.

As customers' expectations continue to evolve, our skills, technologies and practices must as well. The District must support the talent needed to lead and respond to change. Employees who see the connection between their work and the community's goals are most likely to experience a rewarding work life and deliver outstanding service. Fostering a healthy and dynamic workplace is a key success factor in a changing environment.

WHAT WE WANT TO ACHIEVE

We are committed to our role as financial stewards for the District and as leaders who create the conditions that allow employees to do their best work. A key outcome of our term will be to adapt the long term financial plan to act on our priority directions while ensuring financial resilience. Part of this will be to work towards taxation fairness, particularly with regard to industrial port properties. Another element will be to determine how District land and revenues will be used to promote greater affordability. Our clear direction will serve as a foundation for program and resource planning for the entire organization.

THE ACTIONS WE ARE GOING TO TAKE

Within our term, we will make decisions about the use of District land to achieve housing diversity and affordability and consider the role of other mechanisms, such as community amenity and other development revenue in that pursuit. Committing to specific priorities now will allow staff to align their work to strategic purposes and to meet the community's needs with confidence, professionalism and accountability.

To support our leadership in setting strategic direction, the Corporate Plan will include actions such as:

- Refining the long term financial plan to align with strategic priorities and changing conditions
- Reviewing the role and impact of Community Amenity Contributions in our funding models
- Advocating for equity in Metro Vancouver, TransLink and Provincial funding models
- Updating succession and training strategies
- Enhancing internal communications and engagement practices
REVIEW AND REPORTING

Council Directions 2019-2022 was developed early on in our mandate, in a climate in which the electors signalled an apparent desire for a change in direction.

There is still much to learn from the community to better understand these signals, while we bring our individual experiences and unique perspectives to the table. We recognize that this first statement of our priorities and directions is a general one. Our intention is to assess the need for adjustments and amendments to these priority directions through a collaborative, semi-annual review by the leadership team, informed by public input.

Formal reporting on these commitments will be through the Annual Report, which describes progress on our objectives and on the organizational work described in the Corporate Plan. Recent technological advances hold the possibility for continual, 'dashboard' style reporting, once sufficient data is generated to make this approach meaningful.

SUMMARY: OUR COMMITMENT TO YOU

We believe that by working towards these key issues our Council will advance the priorities that are most important to our residents and build a healthy, livable community. By pursuing our approaches and initiatives we aim to continue a dialogue with our community to become trustworthy and responsive stewards of our local government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue</th>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>What Success Looks Like:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVING MOBILITY &amp; TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>Deliver outcomes that reduce traffic congestion and increase sustainable transportation alternatives</td>
<td>Advocate for rapid transit to the north shore; increase number of safe bicycle and pedestrian routes; increase transit options</td>
<td>Pursuing the options we have available to reduce congestion and increase alternatives while vigorously championing our residents' needs in dialogue with regional partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREASING HOUSING DIVERSITY &amp; ADDRESSING AFFORDABILITY</td>
<td>Increase the diversity of housing options and balance future and current housing needs</td>
<td>Set direction on priority projects for rental housing and social housing; identify District land available for housing</td>
<td>Building consensus and taking action to bring more rental and social housing to the District, increase housing diversity, and balance housing and environmental needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>What Success Looks Like:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPORTING A VIBRANT ECONOMY AND JOBS-HOUSING BALANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retaining and growing the full spectrum of businesses within the District while building towards a complete community of jobs and housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure businesses can stay and grow in the District</td>
<td>Assess the impact of plans and policies on retaining and attracting employment opportunities; increase business friendliness in processes and services; advocate with others for provincial policy tax fairness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance natural and tourist attractions' economic impact with community impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAKING ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take the lead on environmental and climate change issues and increase the resilience of the District's populated and natural areas</td>
<td>Develop a North Shore resilience strategy</td>
<td>Climate and environmental considerations are integrated into all of the District's decisions and practices and we are recognized as a leader in climate change action by 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Approaches and Initiatives

1. **ROBUST ENGAGEMENT**
   
   Trust with the community is a priority of this Council, and robust engagement and dialogue with residents is its cornerstone. Through engagement that is convenient and inclusive for residents, we will understand the interests of the community when creating policy.

2. **OCP PROJECT**
   
   Our Official Community Plan (OCP) is the District's foundational community vision, and it is imperative that it continues to represent the aspirations of our residents. We will assess the impacts of progressing on this vision so far and ensure that the document aligns with both what the community wants to achieve and how we achieve it.

3. **STRENGTHENING RELATIONSHIPS**
   
   While we will strongly advocate for the District in regional discussions, we recognize that partnerships are crucial to success. We will strengthen these partner relationships on a variety of issues to get better results for our residents.

4. **FOCUS ON CUSTOMERS**
   
   Residents expect the highest levels of customer service from Council and staff. We will continually improve processes and communication to improve the customer experience.

5. **KEEP THE ORGANIZATION RESILIENT**
   
   Long-term financial and organizational resilience will ensure resources are available to meet the District's goals. We will ensure that the District has effective programs to support our employees look for new and creative opportunities to leverage District resources to meet our goals.
The District of North Vancouver

REPORT TO COUNCIL

July 16, 2019
File: 13.6440.50/000.000

AUTHOR: Shazeen Tejani

SUBJECT: Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the “Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy” (Attachment A) be approved;

AND THAT staff be directed to begin the application intake process for non-medical retail cannabis businesses on a first-come-first-served basis, as applications are forwarded to the District from the Provincial Liquor & Cannabis Regulation Branch;

AND THAT staff be directed to draft bylaw amendments to the Zoning Bylaw 3210, Business Licence Bylaw 4567, Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, and the Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458 to create the ability for approvals of cannabis retailing, manufacturing and warehousing.

REASON FOR REPORT:
The purpose of this report is to seek Council’s approval for a Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy to assist in regulating the retail sale of cannabis in the District. The growing, harvesting, storage, packaging, dispensing, or sale of cannabis (marihuana) is currently prohibited in the District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw. On October 17, 2018, non-medical cannabis became legal in Canada through the Federal Cannabis Act.

BACKGROUND:
On June 11, 2018, Council directed staff to proceed with public engagement on cannabis regulation in the District with regard to draft amendments to the Zoning Bylaw 3210; Business Licence Bylaw 4567, Fees & Charges Bylaw 6481; Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458; and, Smoking Regulation Bylaw 7792.

On October 29, 2018 Council adopted an amendment to Smoking Regulation Bylaw 7792 to ensure that smoking of cannabis would be regulated the same way as cigarettes, cigars, or other lighted smoking equipment.
Between July and September 2018, a series of public engagement events were held with the public and stakeholders on the proposed land use, business licence, and consumption regulations of non-medical cannabis. During a Council Workshop on March 11, 2019 staff, with input received from the public engagement process, recommended the following approach:

- Consider the sale or dispensing of non-medical cannabis on a case-by-case basis;
- Limit the number of non-medical cannabis retail stores to one per Town and Village Centre. Other stores may be considered on a case by case basis;
- Continue to prohibit the sale or dispensing of cannabis except for where Council approves a rezoning (text amendment) and a business licence is issued for a non-medical cannabis retail store;
- Develop a policy to include locational and other evaluation criteria;
  - The locational criteria would limit cannabis retail stores to zones which currently permit the retail sale of liquor (CD4, CD21, CD45, CD47, Lot B at 1515 Barrow, CD68, CD80, C1L, C2, C9, C10, CD90, CD 94, but not the Public House C6 zone);
  - Ensure a minimum 200 metre buffer around elementary and high schools;
- Limit operating hours to 9am to 9pm daily;
- Prohibit accessory production and warehousing uses in non-medical cannabis retail stores; and
- Prohibit non-medical cannabis retail use in production and warehousing zones.

During the workshop, Council expressed support for staff to prepare a policy to aid in regulating the sale and distribution of cannabis.

EXISTING POLICY:
The growing, harvesting, storage, packaging, dispensing, or sale of cannabis (marihuana) is currently prohibited in the District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw Part 403A.

ANALYSIS:

Planning Process
Based on the feedback received by Council, the public, and external stakeholders, staff have developed a proposed policy for regulating the retail sale of non-medical cannabis in the District (Attachment A). The policy describes the locational guidelines, additional evaluation criteria, process for acquiring a non-medical cannabis licence, public consultation requirements, and the conditions of rezoning. The provisions contained within the policy are in-keeping with the recommendations proposed to Council at the March 11th Workshop.
Proposed Application Intake Process
A review of best practices across the region has revealed challenges with two general application intake methods related to processing retail cannabis businesses. The two general intake methods identified were: 1) applications processed by the order received through a municipal portal; and 2) a merit-based approach to processing applications. In municipalities where applications were received through the municipal online portal, some portals were unable to handle a high volume of applications at once. In the latter merit-based approach, there were reported challenges in creating a fair, equitable, and transparent evaluation process.

Staff recommend reviewing non-medical retail cannabis applications using a first-come-first-served model, based on the date and time the application is forwarded to the District by the Provincial Liquor & Cannabis Regulation Branch (LCRB). Applications will be accepted only after Council’s approval of the attached policy. This proposed intake process is intended to help maintain a straightforward and equitable process and ensure that applications received have been screened by the Province first.

Process for Acquiring a Non-Medical Cannabis Business Licence
Under the proposed policy, all non-medical retail cannabis businesses in the District would be required to undergo a site-specific rezoning process (text amendment) before the retail sale of non-medical cannabis would be permitted. The proposed process would include opportunities for public consultation, in accordance with District policies, bylaws and the Local Government Act.

The following is a brief summary of the application process:

1. Proponent submits an application to the Provincial Liquor & Cannabis Regulation Branch (LCRB) for a retail cannabis store licence.

2. The LCRB completes an evaluation, security screening and financial integrity check, then forwards the application to the District for consideration.

3. The applicant applies to the District for a rezoning (zoning bylaw text amendment) to add retail cannabis sales as a permitted use to the subject property only.

4. The District reviews the rezoning application against the criteria outlined in the proposed Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy and undertakes public consultation in accordance with existing municipal and Provincial policies and bylaws. This will include notice to nearby neighbours, the posting of a notice on the site, and a public hearing.

5. Staff provide a zoning amendment bylaw (text amendment) and report, including a summary of the public consultation, to Council for their consideration.

6. If Council provides first reading to the zoning amendment bylaw, the bylaw is referred to a Public Hearing, unless Council waives the requirement for a Hearing.
7. If the zoning amendment bylaw is adopted and a Development Permit is issue, the District will notify the LCRB of the District’s positive recommendation of the application.

8. The applicant applies for a business licence (hours would be limited from 9am to 9pm).

9. Upon issuance of a Provincial licence for a non-medical cannabis retail store, the District may issue a business licence.

10. Any additional permit applications as required by the District are completed, such as building permit and/or sign permit applications.

Accompanying Bylaw Amendments
If Council approves the Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy, amendments to a number of municipal bylaws would be required in order to implement the policy. The bylaws that would require amendment are:

- Zoning Bylaw 3210 (to define and allow retail cannabis, to allow for warehousing, and to regulate accessory uses).

- Business Licence Bylaw 4567 (to include non-medical cannabis as an allowable licenced business and to regulate nuisances).

- Fees & Charges Bylaw 6481 (to include a fee for a non-medical cannabis business licence of $5,000).

- Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458 (to add ticketable offences for breach of other bylaws, including the sale of edible cannabis or operating outside of permitted hours).

Staff proposed to bring forward amendments to the above bylaws in conjunction with the first application received.

Once an application is received by the District from the LCRB and a rezoning application from the applicant is received, it would be processed in accordance with the attached Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy. If Council approves the rezoning (text amendment), only then would it be permitted at the site-specific location.

Cannabis Commercial Production, Warehousing and Distribution
The BC Liquor & Cannabis Distribution Branch is responsible for the distribution of cannabis from licensed producers to both public and private retail locations. The Federal government is responsible for the regulation of production. Based on consultation with public and retail stakeholders, preference was stated for permitting the commercial production, warehousing and distribution of non-medical cannabis in zones where warehousing or a warehouse use is allowed. These zones are generally located in the District’s industrial lands including in: Lynn Creek Town Centre, Lynnmour South, Maplewood, and Norgate. As noted above, amendments to the Zoning Bylaw 3210 are proposed be brought forward in conjunction with
the first application, to specifically include cannabis production, warehousing, and distribution within the appropriate zones.

**Timing/Approval Process:**
Non-medical cannabis became legal in Canada on October 17, 2018. The Provincial LCRB is now accepting online applications for non-medical cannabis retail store licences. The process to review and update the District's cannabis regulations began prior to legalization in June, 2018, as shown below:

![Figure 1: Planning Process for Non-Medical Cannabis Regulation](image)

Staff are now seeking approval for the proposed Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy. If approved, rezoning and other related applications will be processed in accordance with the policy.

**Financial Impacts:**
Based on the estimated cost of enforcing and regulating businesses associated with the retail sale of cannabis, staff propose amending the Business Licence Bylaw 4567 to include an annual business licence fee of $5,000. These costs are intended to cover the District's costs related to establishing, administering, and enforcing business license regulations.

**Conclusion:**
The possession and consumption of non-medical cannabis products became legal in Canada on October 17, 2018. The proposed Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy will provide locational guidelines and other evaluation and approval requirements. The policy is intended to assist Council in considering rezoning applications for new non-medical retail cannabis businesses in the District.

**Options:**

THAT the "Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy" (Attachment A) be approved;

AND THAT staff be directed begin the application intake process for non-medical retail cannabis businesses on a first-come-first-served basis, as applications are forwarded to the District from the Provincial Liquor & Cannabis Regulation Branch;

AND THAT staff be directed to draft bylaw amendments to the Zoning Bylaw 3210, Business Licence Bylaw 4567, Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, and the Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458 to create an ability for approvals of cannabis production, warehousing and retailing (Staff recommendation).
OR

THAT no further action be taken at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

Shazeen Tejan
Community Planner

Attachment 1: Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Community Development</td>
<td>Clerk’s Office</td>
<td>External Agencies:</td>
<td>Advisory Committees:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>Library Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>NS Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Operations</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Fire Services</td>
<td>Recreation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

CORPORATE POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Non-medical Retail Cannabis Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Development and Social Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY

It is the policy of Council that the approval of a retail cannabis business in the District of North Vancouver may only be considered through a rezoning application that meets the guidelines, criteria and processing requirements set out in this policy.

Policy approved on:
Policy amended on:

PROCEDURE

The following procedure is used to implement this policy but does not form part of the policy. This procedure may be amended from time to time at the discretion of the Chief Administrative Officer.

DEFINITIONS

"Council" means the Council for the District of North Vancouver.

"District" means the District of North Vancouver.

"Liquor & Cannabis Regulation Branch" means the Provincial branch which regulates British Columbia's liquor industries and private retail non-medical cannabis industries (formerly Liquor Control and Licensing Branch).

"Retail Cannabis Business" means a licensed establishment that is authorized to sell cannabis for non-medical use.

REASON FOR POLICY

To provide locational and evaluation criteria to guide decisions on permitting the retail sale of non-medical cannabis in the District.
PREAMBLE

The District has taken the approach of considering retail cannabis businesses through an individual rezoning process considered on a case-by-case basis. Applications for a retail cannabis business should comply with the locational guidelines and other criteria contained in this policy and will be subject to public consultation requirements of the District's Development Procedures Bylaw and the statutory provisions of the Local Government Act.

APPLICATION

1. This policy applies to applications for rezoning to operate a retail cannabis business in the District of North Vancouver.

2. Administration of this policy is handled through the processing of rezoning applications and preparation of bylaws for Council consideration. Compliance with this policy does not guarantee development approval from Council.

3. Applicants who apply to the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch (LCRB) for any retail cannabis business licence must submit a rezoning application to the District after the application is referred to the municipality for input by the LCRB. Rezoning applications will only be considered after the date of approval of this policy.

LOCATIONAL GUIDELINES

The following locational guidelines will be used to assess the suitability of a site for a retail cannabis business when an application for rezoning for such a use has been submitted to the District:

A retail cannabis business may be located on a site that:

1. Is currently zoned to permit a liquor store use;

2. Is located at least 200 metres from any elementary or high school property;

3. Does not exceed a maximum of one (1) business per each of the following key growth centres identified in the Official Community Plan*:

   a. Maplewood Village Centre;
   b. Lions Gate Village Centre and Marine Drive Corridor;
   c. Lynn Valley Town Centre;
   d. Lynn Creek Town Centre.
*Additional businesses outside of Town and Village Centres may be given consideration on a case-by-case basis, subject to a review of the merits of the application.

4. Complies with all of the requirements of the Provincial Cannabis Licensing Regulation.

OTHER EVALUATION CRITERIA

In addition to the above locational guidelines, the following criteria will be considered in evaluating a rezoning application for a retail cannabis business use:

1. Access for vehicles, including potential traffic impacts and parking availability;

2. Access for pedestrians and cyclists, including proximity to public transit;

3. A proposed interior layout that does not accommodate product sampling;

4. A proposed exterior design that is sensitive to the design and character of the respective Town and Village Centre in which it is located and is consistent with all applicable guidelines that regulate the exterior appearance of all residential and commercial properties within that Centre to the extent possible that it complies with the Provincial Cannabis Control and Licensing Act;

5. Design of signage that is in accordance with the District of North Vancouver Sign Bylaw;

6. Operating hours that do not exceed 9am – 9pm;

7. Store security requirements that meet the Provincial Cannabis Retail Store Licence Terms and Conditions Handbook.

NON-MEDICAL CANNABIS APPROVAL PROCESS

All retail cannabis businesses must undergo a site-specific rezoning process before the retail sale of non-medical cannabis is permitted. This will include opportunities for public consultation.

All applicants interested in establishing a retail cannabis business shall submit the following applications:

1. An application to the Provincial Liquor & Cannabis Regulation Branch (LCRB) for a cannabis retail store license prior to submitting an application for rezoning to the District;

2. An application to the District for a rezoning of the parcel to permit a retail cannabis business, once the application has been referred from the Provincial Liquor &
Cannabis Regulation Branch to the District for input. Applications for rezoning will be processed using a first-come-first-served model based on the date and time the application was forwarded to the District from the LCRB.

3. An application to the District for a development permit as required by the District;

4. An application for a District business licence, upon successful adoption of a rezoning bylaw and a positive recommendation from the District to the LCRB; and

5. Additional permit applications as required by the District, including but not limited to a building permit and/or sign permit applications.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

1. Rezoning to permit a retail cannabis business will require public consultation as specified in District bylaws and policies (e.g. Development Procedures Bylaw) and statutory procedures set out in the Local Government Act (e.g. Public Hearing).

2. A summary of the public consultation will be included in a Report to Council for the rezoning application.

CONDITIONS OF REZONING

Council may require that one or more of the following conditions must be met prior to the adoption of a rezoning bylaw for a retail cannabis business:

1. The applicant may be required to submit details regarding on-site signage.

2. The applicant may be required to submit details on how potential odour that may be emitted from the premises will be controlled. A Section 219 covenant, or other means, may be used to secure any required odour mitigation measures.

3. The warehousing of cannabis as an accessory use shall not be permitted.

4. Any other conditions as may be required by Council.

SMOKING REGULATIONS SIGNAGE

1. A minimum of two signs shall be posted within the interior of the building and a minimum of one sign on the exterior of the building, with all signs having dimensions of at least 12" x 18". The signage shall detail the restrictions for smoking within 6 metres of any openings to the building, including doors and windows that open and any air intake, as outlined in section 6(a) of the Smoking Regulation Bylaw.
COUNCIL DISCRETION

While this policy is intended to establish a framework which would apply to all rezoning applications for retail cannabis uses, Council maintains full discretion to allow or reject any application for a retail cannabis use and may, in its sole discretion, exempt applications from all or any part of this policy.

AUTHORITY TO ACT

Provincial legislation, including the Community Charter, Local Government Act, and the Cannabis Control and Licensing Act, authorizes the District to regulate locational aspects of retail cannabis businesses and to establish procedures to assess and approve such businesses.
THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
July 11, 2019

AUTHOR: Mayor Mike Little

SUBJECT: AED Request and Options

REASON FOR REPORT:
The Woodlands Sunshine Cascade Ratepayers Association have expressed an interest in partnering with the District in order to fund up to five AEDs to be installed near Fire Service Lanes located in their neighbourhood.

This report provides information regarding the provision of AEDs in public and private spaces, partnership provision models for these devices throughout BC, and considerations for Council.

SUMMARY:
The Sunshine, Cascade and Woodland Rate Payers have expressed an interest in partnering with the District in order to fund AEDs to be installed near Fire Service Lanes located in their neighbourhood. As these residents live in a remote area, emergency service response times are on average longer than in urban areas. They believe that the installation of these machines would be helpful to their residents in the event of cardiac arrest.

AEDs are not required in public or private spaces, however, many public, non-profit or charitable agencies will fundraise or allocate budget to provide these devices in areas such as schools, hockey arenas, and other public facilities. AEDs range in price, from $1400 to over $2000 depending on model and accessories.

In the District of North Vancouver, AEDs are available in recreation facilities, secondary schools, several libraries, as well as a number of other public spaces and private businesses. The District of North Vancouver does not currently provide funding to any private citizen or specific neighbourhood areas for AEDs to be installed.

BACKGROUND:
Currently, the District of North Vancouver does not provide any direct funding for AEDs in either public or private spaces.

There are no formal government-funded programs or agencies tasked with providing AEDs in either public or private spaces throughout British Columbia. AEDs are most often provided through charitable organizations, fundraisers, or allocated within organizational budgets if deemed necessary. Municipalities that provide AEDs do so in their public facilities such as libraries, recreation centres, and other community hubs.
Through fundraising efforts in partnership with a charitable society, AEDs are available in recreation centres throughout North and West Vancouver. The North Vancouver School District recently allocated a portion of their budget to place one AED in each of their secondary schools. According to the Public Access to Defibrillation Program, AEDs are also available in North Vancouver libraries as well as, in several other public spaces and businesses.

In the event that Council chooses to approve the funding of this request, decisions regarding purchasing, placement, training, and maintenance would be at the discretion of the Woodlands Sunshine Cascade Ratepayers Association. Depending on the chosen supplier of these devices, the supplier may provide training and maintenance. DNV Fire and Rescue Services can also provide support.

BACKGROUND ON AEDS:
AEDs are used to potentially re-start or correct the heart rhythm of someone who is in cardiac arrest or having a heart attack. AEDs are most effective when applied within 4 to 5 minutes following a cardiac event.

AEDs are easy to use and also very safe to use, although it is helpful to have some form of CPR or first-aid training. These devices automatically read and analyse the heart’s electrical rhythm, and determine whether or not a shock is required. It is almost impossible to make a medical situation worse when using an AED.

All AEDs are approved for use in Canada, however they have different features. There are several suppliers of AEDs throughout British Columbia, and all AED manufacturers must be licensed through Health Canada’s Medical Devices Licensing. These suppliers will often provide training, installation, and maintenance of the devices. The supplier will also have information on battery life-span and system, warranty, storage options, local technical support availability, and respond to other questions regarding features of the device. The cost of an AED typically ranges between $1,400 to above $2,000 depending on model and accessories, such as storage.

There are currently 830 AEDs placed in both public and private spaces throughout British Columbia, as registered with the BC Public Access to Defibrillation Program.

CONSIDERATIONS:

Financial Impacts:
As AED placement is not provincially mandated, it is common practice across British Columbia for non-profits, charities, and community groups to fundraise for the installation of AEDs in public and private facilities.

This is the first request for AED funding from a neighbourhood group to the District of North Vancouver. Should Council wish to contribute to the initiative by the group, a funding source would need to be identified.

Liability/Risk:
There is little risk in working with the Woodlands Sunshine Cascade Ratepayers Association to educate and support them through the purchasing process for AEDs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for community engagement with DNV Fire and Rescue Services who are available to support and provide training with these devices.

However, providing public funds for this request is a departure from the common municipal funding approach, which is to encourage interested community groups to work with non-profits or charitable associations to fundraise in areas outside of municipal buildings and facilities.

OPTIONS:
1. Encourage the Woodlands Sunshine Cascade Ratepayers Association to work with a non-profit organization, such as Heart and Stroke BC, to fundraise in order to purchase AEDs to be installed near or at their Fire Lanes, while also providing education and other support through District of North Vancouver Fire and Rescue Services.

2. Establish a fund of up to $3,000 that is replenished annually and available over a period of time. Also, develop an accompanying program for groups such as the Woodlands Sunshine Cascade Ratepayers Association to apply to this fund. Eligibility would be based on factors such as whether or not the group applying has confirmed additional funding support from a charitable organization, and apparent need based on remoteness of location.

3. Provide the Woodlands Sunshine Cascade Ratepayers Association with funding to purchase five AEDs (approximately $11,000) to be installed near Fire Service Lanes located in their neighbourhood; and determine governance and funding source if Option 2 is selected.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Little
Mayor

REVIEWED WITH:

☐ Community Planning ☐ Clerk’s Office ☐ External Agencies:
☐ Development Planning ☐ Communications ☐ Library Board
☐ Development Engineering ☐ Finance ☐ NS Health
☐ Utilities ☐ Fire Services ☐ RCMP
☐ Engineering Operations ☐ ITS ☐ NVRC
☐ Parks ☐ Solicitor ☐ Museum & Arch.
☐ Environment ☐ GIS ☐ Other:
☐ Facilities ☐ Real Estate
☐ Human Resources ☐ Bylaw Services
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The District of North Vancouver

REPORT TO COUNCIL

July 11, 2019
File: 08.3060.10/007.19

AUTHOR: Darren Veres, Development Planner

SUBJECT: North Shore Winter Club (1325 Keith Road) - Preliminary Rezoning Application

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council provide direction to staff regarding the consideration of this Preliminary Application for rezoning.

REASON FOR REPORT

Darwin Properties has recently submitted a Preliminary Application (Attachment A) on behalf of the North Shore Winter Club (NSWC) to redevelop the site of their existing recreation facility at 1325 Keith Road. The proposal is for a mixed-use development consisting of five buildings ranging in height from two to 32 storeys and includes 465 m² (5,000 sq ft) of commercial space and 2,323 m² (25,004 sq ft) of public assembly space for the North Shore Unitarian Church (NSUC). The proposal would require rezoning and an OCP amendment.

The proposal, if supported, would require the NSWC to relocate to a new site which may require a separate rezoning application.

In light of Council’s recent direction to undertake a targeted review of the Official Community Plan (OCP), staff are seeking direction from Council with respect to next steps for this application. The following four alternative options are presented for Council’s consideration:
SUBJECT: North Shore Winter Club (1325 Keith Road) - Preliminary Rezoning Application

July 11, 2019

1. **Proceed** – “THAT Staff be directed to continue processing the applicant’s preliminary application”;
2. **Revise** – “THAT Council is not supportive of the preliminary application as proposed, and requests that the applicant revise their preliminary application”;
3. **Reject** – “THAT Council is not supportive of the preliminary application and that the application be rejected”; or
4. **Defer** – “THAT Council’s consideration of the application be deferred until after the targeted review of the Official Community Plan”.

**BACKGROUND**

North Shore Winter Club
The NSWC is a private non-profit family athletics and events venue located off Lynnmouth Avenue and East Keith Road in Lynn Creek Town Centre (see adjacent site map).

The club has approximately 2,200 members and provides programs such as hockey, aquatics, tennis, childcare, fitness and wellness. The current facility is approximately 20,900m$^2$ (225,000 sq ft) and includes three ice rinks, eleven tennis courts, two squash courts, two racquetball courts, two outdoor pools, a fitness centre, and group fitness studios. In addition to athletics, the facility also provides a café, lounge and event spaces, and room rentals.

Materials submitted with the application explain that the club’s facilities are nearing end-of-life and would require approximately $50 million of renovations to refurbish the facility. Instead of
renovating the existing facility, the club has concluded that a potential transaction with the Tsleil-Waututh Nation and Darwin Properties to redevelop the existing site and rebuild a new facility on a different location is the best option for the society moving forward. According to application materials, the NSWC have a Land Exchange Agreement with the Tsleil-Waututh Nation and Darwin Properties to relocate the club to 2420 Dollarton Highway, the site of the former International College Site. However, the proposed recreation use is not consistent with either the existing I4 zoning of the proposed new site or the OCP’s “Light Industrial Commercial Mixed Use Innovation District” (LICMU) land use designation. As a result, an OCP amendment and rezoning would be required to accommodate the NSWC facility on the former International College Site.

The proposed new facility would be approximately 27,130 m² (292,025 sq ft) in size and consist of the following uses:

- Fitness Facility – 1,556 m² (16,749 sq ft)
- Aquatic Facility – 1,884 m² (20,279 sq ft)
  - Indoor Lane Pool
  - Leisure Pool
  - Pool Deck
  - Hot Tub
- Arena and Ice Sports Facility – 9,069 m² (97,618 sq ft)
  - 2 Full-size Arenas
  - Separate Training Rink
- Racquet Sport Facility – 7,310 m² (78,684 sq ft)
  - 10 indoor tennis courts
  - 4 outdoor courts
  - 1 doubles squash court
  - 1 singles squash court
- General Purpose Spaces – 558 m² (6,006 sq ft)
- Restaurant and Lounge – 704 m² (7,578 sq ft)
- Banquet Facilities – 953 m² (10,258 sq ft)

In a letter from Darwin Properties, dated June 18th, 2019 (Attachment B), the applicant explains that the “mechanism whereby the club could afford to build a new permanent facility would be
via a rezoning of their current land in order to generate the funds required via a land sales/exchange with Darwin Properties.”

ANALYSIS

Site and Surrounding Area
The existing NSWC site is 2.28 ha (5.64 acres) in size and is located in the northwest portion of Lynn Creek Town Centre. The site is bordered by Bridgman Park and Lynn Creek to the east and south, the 16-storey “Carlton at the Club” seniors’ market ownership building to the north, and by Lynnmouth Avenue and the City of North Vancouver to the west.

Land Use Designation
The subject site is designated “Commercial” in the OCP. Areas with this designation are intended predominantly for a variety of commercial and service-type uses where residential uses are not generally permitted. Development in this designation is permitted up to approximately 1.0 FSR. The proposal for mixed-use development, at approximately 3.6 FSR, is not consistent with the “Commercial” land use designation and would require an OCP amendment.

Lynn Creek Town Centre
The Lower Lynn Town Centre Implementation Plan was approved by Council in 2013 and does not anticipate any change in land use for the subject site from the existing NWSC use.

Zoning
The site is currently zoned Comprehensive Development Zone 7 (CD7) in the District’s Zoning Bylaw. The CD7 Zone was prepared specifically to accommodate the NSWC, the Montessori Elementary School, and the “Carlton at the Club” residential building on the adjacent parcel. The proposal is not consistent with the CD7 zoning and would require rezoning to a new CD zone.
PROPOSAL

The proposal is for a mixed-use development consisting of five buildings in a range of low-rise and high-rise built forms:

- A 6-storey residential building with 175 market rental units;
- A 6-storey mixed-use building with 100 seniors-oriented or market rental units and 465 m$^2$ (5,000 sq ft) commercial space;
- A 32-storey residential building with 345 market ownership units;
- A 29-storey residential building with 310 market ownership units;
- A 2-storey, 2,323 m$^2$ (25,004 sq ft.) public assembly building for the North Shore Unitarian Church

The following table outlines the total floor space, number of units, and parking spaces for each of the proposed buildings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-Storey Residential Building (Market Rental)</td>
<td>13,935 m$^2$ (150,000 sq ft)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Storey Residential Mixed-Use Building (Seniors or Rental)</td>
<td>7,897 m$^2$ (85,000 sq ft)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-Storey Residential Building (Market Ownership)</td>
<td>31,58 m$^2$ (340,000 sq ft)</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Storey Residential Building (Market Ownership)</td>
<td>28,335 m$^2$ (305,000 sq ft)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Storey Public Assembly Building (Public Assembly)</td>
<td>2,323 m$^2$ (25,000 sq ft)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>465 m$^2$ (5,000 sq ft)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84,542 m$^2$ (910,000 sq ft)</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site plan is configured around a private internal road and landscaped area as shown on the adjacent site plan. The two 6-storey low-rise buildings are located along Lynmouth Avenue (see North-South Section on following page) and the two high-rise buildings are located along the southern edge of the property adjacent to Bridgman Park.

Access to the site is provided via Lynmouth Avenue at the east side of the site. The proposal includes a central public amenity park and green space connections running through the site with all buildings fronting green space. The green space will support pathways and watercourses connecting to Bridgman Park, linking the new development to the Town Centre via a future pedestrian bridge across Lynn Creek.
Parking
The applicant is proposing to provide a total of 1,133 parking spaces for all of the buildings. This provision results in approximately 0.82 stalls per unit. All parking is provided in underground parking structures as shown on the North-South Section which are accessed from the internal private road. A full transportation and parking analysis has not been provided with the Preliminary Application package. The proposal has not defined the specifics of bicycle parking at this preliminary stage.

Unitarian Church Facility
Darwin is proposing to construct a new building for the North Shore Unitarian Church to relocate from their current location on Mathers Avenue in West Vancouver (see Attachment C). The new “North Shore Unitarian Community Centre” is envisioned to be a “multi-purpose community-oriented facility” and would include the following uses:

- 250 – 300 seat assembly hall/auditorium
- Daycare with outdoor play area
- Meeting rooms, classrooms, and other spaces
- Large lobby space for informal gathering

Consultation
Should the project proceed, consultation would be undertaken with the public, the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, the City of North Vancouver, and others.
CONCLUSION:

The information in this report was prepared to provide information to Council early in the application review process and to seek Council’s direction on how to proceed with the project review.

Options:

In light of Council's recent direction to undertake a targeted review of the Official Community Plan (OCP), staff are seeking direction from Council with respect to next steps for this application. The following four alternative options are presented for Council's consideration:

1. **Proceed** – "THAT Staff be directed to continue processing the applicant’s preliminary application";
2. **Revise** – "THAT Council is not supportive of the preliminary application as proposed, and requests that the applicant revise their preliminary application";
3. **Reject** – "THAT Council is not supportive of the preliminary application and that the application be rejected"; or
4. **Defer** – "THAT Council’s consideration of the application be deferred until after the targeted review of the Official Community Plan”.

Respectfully submitted,

Darren Veres
Development Planner

Attachments:

A. Preliminary Application Drawing Package
B. Darwin Application Rationale Letter – Dated June 18, 2019
C. North Shore Unitarian Church Letter – Dated June 7, 2019
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The existing North Shore Winter Club (NSWC) occupies a 2.28 hectare or 5.64 acre (246,500 sf) site at the southeast corner of Keith Road East and Lynnmouth Avenue. First established in 1958, the NSWC is a private non-profit family athletics and events venue integral to the District of North Vancouver and families living throughout the North Shore. Growing in phases over the years, it occupies most of the southern portion of the L-shaped property. Access is exclusively off Lynnmouth Avenue, with the eastern and southern facades backing onto Bridge-
man Park, which borders the west bank of Lynn Creek, framed on the east by Seylynn Park. Many of the
NSWC facilities are nearing the end of their practical life, and in May 2017, the NSWC announced intent to relocate to new yet-to-be-constructed facilities on the North Shore, an objective that would seek to address the future needs of the Club and its membership, and the community at large. Realizing this ambition will be contingent on the Rezoning of the current property and acceptance of a redevelopment vision beneficial to the community.

To the northeast of the NSWC facilities is the 'Carleton at the Club', a 16-storey 182-suite condominium build-
ing constructed in 1992, occupying a separate land parcel that was originally part of the NSWC lands. The building is restricted to a 50+ demographic. Residents overlook Bridgman Park on the east, and enjoy panoramic views in all directions from upper floors. As with the NSWC, access is also off Lynnmouth Avenue, secured via two Right-of-Ways crossing the northerly portion of the NSWC lands. This portion of the site is currently a surface parking lot above a below-grade parkade used by NSWC members and their guests. Carleton at the Club has its own below-grade parkade, accessed via a separate ramp beneath the building. Between the north property line and Keith Road East is a buffer of mature trees. Northwards across the road, the uphill lands are bounded by Mountain Highway and Highway 1. They are currently comprised of aging residential homes with potential for redevelopment.

Lynnmouth Avenue forms the boundary between the District of North Vancouver and The City of North Vancouver. To the west within the City are low-rise commercial and service businesses, housed in a collection of characterless industrial buildings, with a minimal sense of community. Lynnmouth Avenue itself terminates abruptly at the southern end, offering no turn-around bulb, despite the opportunity for as a whole the subject parcel is a pocket within the District that is largely invisible to most residents, reinforced currently by the presence of a single residential tower and a private club, the latter of which displays blank façades towards the community amenity of Bridgeman Park. The OCP designation is Commercial with a maximum permitted FSR of 1.0, with uses intended to be a mix of commercial and service, which residential use generally precluded. Current Zoning is Comprehensive Development Zone (CD7) permitting the current NSWC, its integral Montessori Elementary School, and Carleton at the Club. Any redevelopment in compliance with the OCP will effectively expand the current urban character within the City, to the west of Lynnmouth Avenue, while effectively isolating Carleton at the Club.

continued on page 4
The broader context of Lower Lynn Town Centre to the east and southeast of the site is currently undergoing significant densification and redevelopment as it evolves from an aging area of single-family homes and low-rise commercial to mature as a vibrant and contemporary urban centre. This transformation is well underway; first to establish a visionary direction was Seylynn Village by Denna Homes, a phased development that was initiated in 2012 following a 6-year Rezoning process. It is comprised of the 24 storey 'Beacon', the 28 storey 'Compass' (both market housing now completed), and the 6 storey 'Horizon', which provides needed non-market rental suites. Completing Seylynn Village will be the under-construction 32-storey 'Apex'. Intergulf’s ‘Hunter’ development across Lynn Creek to the southeast of the site offers similar density and urban variety. It is under construction following a successful Rezoning granted in May 2018. When completed in 2021, it will offer market condos within two 27 and 16 storey towers linked by a 4-storey townhome podium. To the east of ‘Hunter’, Intergulf is currently in the approvals process for a 25 storey tower development, which as proposed will offer a mix of market and rental suites, and a limited amount of commercial space. All three projects exemplify the goals and objectives within the planning that has occurred to redefine Lower Lynn Town Centre as a community of the future.

The proposed redevelopment on the NSWC site seeks to echo and enhance much of the careful planning of the broader context, to realize a sensitive transformation of a unique and valuable, yet at present virtually invisible site. A vibrant neighbourhood centre is envisioned as a western ‘bookend’ to the parkland surrounding Lynn Creek, connected to the emerging Lower Lynn Town Centre by a network of creek-side trails and a proposed new bridge. The bridge would fulfill a District objective to help unify the Town Centre, and link the new community as an integral component of the broader urban and District context. A varied range of housing is imagined, enhanced by various amenities and a community centre, and arranged within a variety of sensitively considered building forms centred on a public greenspace. More than 900 market and rental residential units are proposed, within a mixed-use development of 3.5 FSR. The opportunity is rare and rich with potential to demonstrate exemplary vision.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

1. Keith Road Looking South (Carleton at the Club on Left)

2. Intersection of Lynnmouth Avenue & Keith Road Looking Southeast
EXISTING CONDITIONS continued

View of Winter Club from Bridgman Park

Interface of Winter Club with Bridgman Park
DESIGN RATIONALE

The North Shore Winter Club site is situated in the northeastern corner of the emerging Lower Lynn Town Centre, yet feels separate and distant owing to current circumstance. Separated from the Town Centre by Lynn Creek and the lush natural greenbelt provided by Seylynn and Bridgman Parks, the property fronts Lynnmouth Avenue on the western boundary between the City and District of North Vancouver. From an urban design perspective, the existing Club facilities are focused inwards, presenting blank east and south facades to the adjacent parkland. Equally isolated and remote from the broader community is the immediately-adjacent 16-storey seniors-oriented condominium tower, ‘Carleton at the Club’, accessed entirely via two vehicular right-of-ways which cross surface parking on the NSWC property.

It is a site that is presently entirely insular, responding to none of the surrounding context cues except for the east-facing ground-level amenity spaces of the condominium building, which nestle effectively into the edges of Bridgman Park. Consideration of possible redevelopment scenarios introduces the potential to establish a unique and vibrant identity on a site currently remote within its urban setting. An appropriate vision must look beyond the creation of a new community nucleus, by acknowledging the property’s important situation within the District’s wider urban context. As such, the proposed mixed-use scenario aims to realize the site’s potential through the introduction of increased residential density and complimentary community amenities, within an expanded vision for the OCP’s western precinct of Lower Lynn Town Centre.

The proposed concept maintains the 2 existing access right-of-ways, and introduces a new looped street layout to service all contemplated buildings. Given that the ‘Club’ portion will be absent from ‘Carleton at the Club’, the vision seeks to integrate the existing building in a situation which could potentially be rebranded ‘Carleton at the Park’. Not only will the idyllic frontage on Bridgeman Park be maintained and enhanced for the entirety of the site, but the thesis envisions a park-like space running north-south for the length of the site, providing a central publicly-accessible sun-lit village-green on which all of the 5 new buildings (labelled Parcels A through E) and the Carleton itself will front. The new green space will support pathways and watercourses connecting to Bridgeman Park, linking the new development to the Town Centre via a bridge across Lynn Creek. The overall ground plane will be a continuous landscaped realm.

Further enhancing the cohesion of the new neighbourhood will be a new centrally-located vehicular piazza, which will serve as the forecourt of a 26,000 sf North Shore Unitarian Centre on Parcel A. This is envisioned to be a multi-purpose facility that will function as the hub of community life for a wide range of functions and activities, creating a vibrant people-place at the heart of the neighbourhood. With the lowest massing of all new buildings, this 2-storey facility is placed centrally to back onto Bridgman Park while minimizing impact on the adjacent Carleton building, and maximizing the penetration of east-west sunlight across the site. Offering programming focused to serve the needs of the greater North Shore Community, the area of this ‘Public Assembly’ facility is exempted from the FSR value.

Careful consideration has been taken in the placement of two proposed residential towers on parcels B and C. At 32 and 29 storeys respectively, and separated by more than 150 feet, the towers have been placed to minimize impact on the outlook from the Carleton, permitting view penetration between them and sunlight penetration into the site from the south. The tallest tower, on parcel B, is equivalent in height to the tallest approved tower of the partially completed 3-tower Seylynn Village, and will extend the skyline to complete an expanded northwest quadrant of the

continued on page 12
DESIGN RATIONALE  continued

Town Centre. The tower forms are modulated and sculpted to soften massing and create architectural interest on the skyline. Further, they transition down and outwards in podium forms ranging between 6 and 12 storeys, accommodating many suites which will front onto and nestle into the mature trees of Bridgman Park. The roofs of the podiums on both parcels will provide landscaped terraces and green roofs, to support a wave of foliage cresting over the buildings visually linking the public park with the central green space. Both parcels will provide in combination approximately 650 market condominiums, and include separately-accessed below-grade parkades.

The west facing podium of Parcel C is 6 storeys on Lynnmouth Avenue. This height is maintained along the entire Lynnmouth Avenue frontage on parcels D and E. A U-shaped 6-storey rental building is proposed on Parcel D, framed between the main road, 2 site access roads and the central park space. It will provide up to 175 market rental suites, many of them 2 and 3 bedrooms to offer much-needed local housing. This building is set low and terraced to the east, to minimize view impact on the Carleton and maximize sunlight penetration into the site. A sufficiently-sized parkade to service the needs of the occupants and visitor parking for the entire site will be provided.

A 6-storey building is also proposed on Parcel E, fronting the tree-buffered intersection of Lynnmouth Avenue and Keith Road East. It will provide up to 100 suites of seniors-oriented and/or market rental housing additional to the Parcel D building. Configured in an L-shape, it forms a small courtyard to compliment the "front yard" of the Carleton, offering common southeast-oriented patio space, and potentially maintaining the parking ramp to the existing below-grade parking structure. This may serve as a base for the new building to fulfill a sustainability-oriented objective. It is intended that a small community-oriented coffee shop will be accommodated within the ground floor of the Parcel E building.

The overall thesis has been conceived with consideration for phased realization and sustainable longevity, and an assumption that each parcel should represent a cohesive individual component of the greater vision. Should total construction time be spread out over years, the concept is intended to represent a completed whole at any given time, despite the possible delayed realization of any given parcel. This is a key (and often ignored) component in the success of any given master plan. A main objective for the project is that an important portion of the District's greater urban landscape will be re-discovered, re-imagined, and fully realized as a series of individually-considered parcels, while adding more than 900 suites to various sectors of the residential market. Each building component will be self-sufficient, with the sum total establishing an environment whose value will prove to be greater than the sum of its parts. Most significantly, an invisible portion of the District will emerge as an important and vibrant northwest bookend of the Lower Lynn Town Centre, embracing, integrating and celebrating the parklands flanking Lynn Creek, while simultaneously introducing a green core to the heart of the concept.
SECTION AA
SUMMARY
PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES

DEVELOPMENT
- Maximize value to enable NSWC relocation
- Compliment unique park setting with a unique development
- Target complete demographic range, including young adults and families

COMMUNITY
- Establish focused amenity enhanced neighbourhood
- Provide housing and program diversity
- Realize an inclusive community with range of housing typologies, sizes, affordability and tenure.
- Variety of amenities to include cafe and multi-programmed NSUC to complete sense of community
- Activate isolated site through integration with urban context and adjacent parkland

HEALTH & WELLNESS
- Enhanced comfort of residents through 'pride of place'
- Whole neighbourhood connected to Lower Lynn Town Centre
- Project components embraced by and woven into surrounding parkland and walking trails
- Link to road, cycling, and pedestrian networks and paths
- Celebrate legacy of NSWC through community amenities
- Reinforce that community embraces and nurtures residents of every age

ART & CULTURE
- Art in evidence as a parameter of design
- Public art to admire, celebrate and attract
- Connect with artistic endeavours community wide, including film industry
- NSUC to offer venues and programs for art shows, performances, poetry readings and other multi-generational cultural endeavours

BIODIVERSITY
- Create a green oasis within community through the re-greening of the site
- Establish rooftop green zones to encourage wildlife habitat and community gardens
- Green base plans to wash across site and blend with surrounding park space
- Increase in soft greenspace
- Integrate watercourses to green space for balanced natural conditions

MOBILITY
- Site layout to encourage footpath connectivity within and beyond site
- Integrate networking with MoTs Keith/Seymour/Lynn connectivity improvements (complete by 2021)
- Collaborate with Translink to achieve improved transit service locally
- Connectivity to improved Phibbs Exchange
- Provide opportunities for cycling routes
- Provide charging stations for electric vehicles
- Amenities to be barrier-free

SUSTAINABILITY
- Create and maintain a socially sustainable 'living' community by accommodating all age groups in every stage of life
- Realize responsible buildings through adherence to applicable energy management policies where possible and appropriate (B.C. Step Code 3 / LEED or equivalent)
- Encourage synergies between buildings, site, setting, and context in response to multiple environmental factors
- Landscaped rooftop terraces and community garden opportunities
- Responsible management of all infrastructure and systems, including integration of high-performance building systems, pro-active storm water management, and envelope design/orientation
- Thematic response to creek side setting including habitat sensitivity and enhancement

RESILIENCY
- Repair and reclamatio of site to be conceived and realized as a long-term self-sustaining community, a solution for the present, with anticipation for the future.
- Reduce isolation and integrate with broader community and park context, to reinforce resiliency and well-being on a daily basis.
- Create a community unified, embraced and enhanced by a connection to the natural environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL</th>
<th>BUILDING TYPE</th>
<th>GROSS AREA (SF)</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL GROSS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED FSR</th>
<th>SITE COVERAGE (SF)</th>
<th>EST. FOOTPRINT / SITE COVERAGE (SF)</th>
<th># STOREYS</th>
<th>TOTAL SUITES (ESTIMATED)</th>
<th>DPRY BLYAW 5114 (PARLING)</th>
<th>DPRV ADMIN &amp; OPPS POLICY &quot;ALTERNATIVE VEHICLE PARKING RATES&quot;</th>
<th>PROPOSED PARKING**</th>
<th>PARKING PER LEVEL (ROUGH ESTIMATE EBQ)</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Unitarian Worship and Community Center</td>
<td>25,000*&lt;br&gt; (Not within Total Area)</td>
<td>25,000*&lt;br&gt; (Not within Total Area)</td>
<td>25,000*&lt;br&gt; (Not within Total Area)</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>(1 per 125 sq ft of Public Assembly)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50 Stats</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Strata-Titled Market Condo Tower + Podium</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>(1 per unit + 1 per 500 sq ft of Unit Space)</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>90 Stats</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Strata-Titled Market Condo Tower + Podium</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>(1 per unit + 1 per 300 sq ft of Unit Space)</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>70 Stats</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Lowrise Rental ***</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>(1 per unit + 1 per 300 sq ft of Unit Space)</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340 Stats</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Seniors (or Rental)</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>(0.33 per sq ft of Unit Space)</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340 Stats</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Commercial Ground Level Café</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(1 per 40 sq ft of Public Assembly)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 Stats</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**<br> 1,133 | 863,000 | 3.50<br>

Notes:<br>1. All figures are preliminary estimates and subject to refinement. Statistics for the existing 28-storey Carlton at the Club building, which occupies a separate land parcel, are not included.<br>2. Main Level of Parcel E is assumed to accommodate a 5,000 sf commercial/coffee shop, which is not included in the total residential gross area, but is added to the total gross area and FSR.<br>3. Proposed parking rates are rough preliminary estimates only, and assume individual parking spaces per parcel. Figures will adjust contingent on layout, to be determined during more advanced design.<br>4. Suite totals noted are hypothetical only and will adjust during advanced design. To achieve values noted, an estimated 83% building efficiency is assumed, divided by average areas of 820 sf/suite for market units and 700 sf/suite for rental or seniors units. Increased building efficiency may achieve higher suite count; larger suite areas will diminish suite count.<br>5. DPRV ADMIN & OPPS POLICY "ALTERNATIVE VEHICLE PARKING RATES" may not apply to this project.<br>6. Parcel D building is assumed to be seniors-assisted living use and therefore not requiring balconies, an additional 7,000 sf or 0.03 FSR may be achievable, subject to further analysis.<br>7. Footprint Area calculations are provided for reference only and are subject to refinement during more advanced design. As per values indicated, total site coverage is approximately 40%.

---

*Figures do not include the Worship Centre Area which is equivalent to 0.18 FSR (Proposed Exemption)"
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1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The North Shore Winter Club is nearing the end of its useful life and will be facing significant costs in code and accessibility upgrades associated with bringing the buildings up to a reasonable working standard. Together with its development partner, Darwin Properties, the NSWC will look to rezone and redevelop their existing lands to facilitate the construction of a new club located on Dollarton Highway.

In January 2018, Darwin Properties launched a representative opinion survey to gather input and evaluate public opinion on the potential re-development of the property. The public engagement process for the re-development of the North Shore Winter Club Lands was intended to be fair, transparent and inclusive and its purpose was to:

- Provide opportunities for current members of the North Shore Winter Club and interested members of the general public to comment and provide input on the early conceptual design, prior to submittal of a formal Preliminary Rezoning Application.

The Proposed Development

The proposed redevelopment is comprised of three towers ranging in height from 26 to 32 storeys each with a 6-storey podium and three 6-storey mid-rise buildings.

Project Details:

- The proposed redevelopment is part of an area designated as one of four key centers in the District of North Vancouver’s Official Community Plan
- Development density proposed is consistent with approved projects east of Lynn Creek and would not exceed the current OCP designation of 3.5 FSR upon successful rezoning
- Consistent with the DNV’s Lower Lynn Town Centre Implementation Plan, this redevelopment will revitalize the existing residential neighborhood and encourage a mix of new housing types and tenures
- Family-oriented housing with a wide range of unit types and sizes
- Establish connections with the western part of the Town Centre area to the larger planning context. The areas east and west of Lynn Creek are envisioned to be connected via a DNV planned pedestrian bridge
- The redevelopment of the NSWC Lands will facilitate additional improvements to Bridgman Park, as well as new public and private green spaces and trail networks that are linked to the existing network of access routes and trails in the larger community

Those members of the public interested in more information on the NSWC Lands were directed to the project’s website at NSWCLands.ca. It was recommended that the public learn more about the project at its website before starting the public engagement survey.

This report provides the following summary:

- Event details including a description of the Open House and information presented
- An overview of the feedback received through the Online survey and Open House comment forms; and
- Copies of engagement notification materials, presentation materials and social media reports, and photographs are contained in the appendix.

2. PUBLIC EVENTS

Two Open Houses were held, one for members and the other for the general public.

2.1 Member Open House

A series of Open House presentation boards provided an overview for members about the project. Members were welcomed to the Open House and Oliver Webbe, President, Darwin Properties was introduced. He provided a short presentation about the project, followed by a Q&A

Open House Event Details

Date: January 30, 2018
Time: 7:00pm – 8:00pm
Location: 1325 Keith Road, North Vancouver (North Shore Winter Club)
Notification: Membership Invitation
Open House: 64 members attended
Comment Forms: 29 received

Darwin Project Team in Attendance

Oliver Webbe, President
David Jacobson, Executive Vice-President
Andrew McMillan, Development Manager
Geoff Sugar, Development Coordinator
Daniel Webbe, Property Manager

2.2 Public Open House

A series of Open House presentation boards provided an overview of the project. Members of the Darwin team were on hand to interact with the public, explain process and concept elements and answer any questions by attendees.

Event Details

Date: February 1, 2018
Time: 5:30pm – 8:00pm
Location: 1325 Keith Road, North Vancouver (North Shore Winter Club)
Notification:
- Canada Post mail drop of flyer to approximately 1, 650 homes
- See Appendix 4.2

Attendees: 103 citizens attended the Open House
NORTH SHORE WINTER CLUB
Representative Opinion Survey Report
March 6, 2018

Comment Forms: 52 were received at the Open House. See Appendix 4.3

Darwin Project Team in Attendance
Oliver Webbe, President
David Jacobson, Executive Vice-President
Dana Samis, Marketing & Communications Manager
Andrew McMillan, Development Manager
Kaylen Crosse, Development Manager
Geoff Sugar, Development Coordinator
Alan Nijjar, Chief Financial Officer
Anthony Cho, Project Accountant

Presentation Materials
The fifteen (15) presentation boards shown at the Open House are contained in Appendix 4.4 on pages 24 – 31.

3. WHAT WE HEARD

The total responses from three sources (Online Survey, Member Open House, Public Open House) indicate that:

- 624 individuals are somewhat or very supportive
- 182 individuals are somewhat or not supportive
- 97 individuals were either neutral with a #3 ranking, or did not indicate whether they were supportive or not in their comments.

The 1-5 star rating system asked respondents to indicate their level of support for the proposed redevelopment. Screenshots are contained in Appendix 4.5 on page 37. Generally, most respondents indicated a postal code within the District of North Vancouver. Some respondents were from the City of North Vancouver, West Vancouver and other Metro Vancouver areas.

In addition, 80 respondents that were either strongly or somewhat supportive did not provide postal codes; and 45 respondents that were somewhat or strongly opposed did not supply postal codes.

MÉTRO VANCOUVER RÉSPONDANTS
Online Survey Rankings

A total of 818 responses were received online.

- Very Supportive – 530 (65%) Ranked the proposal as 5 stars
- Somewhat Supportive – 56 (7%) Ranked the proposal as 4 stars
- Neutral – 32 (4%) Ranked the proposal as 3 stars
- Somewhat Not Supportive – 44 (5%) Ranked the proposal as 2 stars
- Not Supportive – 95 (12%) Ranked the proposal as 1 star or in their comments indicated that they were strongly opposed
- No Indication – 61 (8%) Did not indicate a ranking or make a comment that indicated support or opposition

Note: There were several comments that indicated that the online survey tool was not functioning and only allowed 3 stars to be ranked which may account for at least three of the 32 neutral ratings.

NSWC Open House Comment Forms

A total of 29 comment forms were received at the Members Open House. Of which members were:

- Very Supportive – 27 (93%) Ranked the proposal as 5 stars
- Somewhat Supportive – 2 (7%) Ranked the proposal as 4 stars
- Neutral – 0 (0%) Ranked the proposal as 3 stars
- Somewhat Not Supportive – 0 (0%) Ranked the proposal as 2 stars
- Not Supportive – 0 (0%) Ranked the proposal as 1 star

Public Open House Comment Forms

A total of 52 comment forms were received at the Public Open House. Of which the public were:

- Very Supportive – 6 (12%) Ranked the proposal as 5 stars
- Somewhat Supportive – 2 (4%) Ranked the proposal as 4 stars
- Neutral – 1 (2%) Ranked the proposal as 3 stars
- Somewhat Not Supportive – 7 (14%) Ranked the proposal as 2 stars
- Not Supportive – 36 (70%) Ranked the proposal as 1 star

3.1 Feedback

There is a very strong supportive North Shore Winter Club group of members that live primarily in the District of North Vancouver. The feedback from the Member and Public Open House comment forms and the Online Survey included, but was not limited to:

- Supportive of redeveloping the site and moving the NSWC to new location to generate new recreational infrastructure at no-cost to taxpayers or members. Some acknowledge traffic congestion issues. However, others acknowledge that the location is good for density because it is close to the highway, adjacent to other developments with similar density.
- Not-Supportive: These individuals had concerns about overall traffic congestion, and higher concentrations of density and height in this area, and the lack of overall infrastructure and the availability of affordable housing options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES CODED BY CATEGORY</th>
<th>COUNT # SORTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicated clear support for project</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Traffic &amp; Parking Concerns</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Support and Density Concerns</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighboring Building (Carlton) Residents: Views, Density, Traffic, Noise Impacts</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Specific Comments &amp; Suggestions</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing – Affordability and Other Comments</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed or Concerned about Project</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWC Recreational Facility Comments</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Concerns and Comments</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Orientated Concerns</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- View studies were requested by seven Carlton residents who provided their phone numbers.
- The detailed comments from both the Open House and the Online Survey are included in Appendix 4.1
- Copies of the Open House Comment Form are in Appendix 4.2 on page 22 and the Online Survey are in Appendix 4.5 on pages 32-36.
4. APPENDIX

4.1 APPENDIX - CLUSTERED COMMENTS & DATA CODING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT CODE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>COUNT # SORTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of the Project</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Traffic &amp; Parking Concerns</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Support and Density Concerns</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Residents: Views, Density, Traffic, Noise Impacts</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Specific Comments &amp; Suggestions</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing – Affordability and Other Comments</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed or Concerned about Project</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Recreational Facility Comments</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Concerns and Comments</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Orientated Concerns</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONLINE SURVEY AND OPEN HOUSE COMMENTS

DEVELOPMENT SPECIFIC COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

- I support redeveloping the site for residential, but am strongly opposed to the building siting and massing proposed. The virtual wall of 3 towers and the parallel alignment of 3 mid-rise buildings are terrible urban design. In addition, all the shadows from the towers fall on the park, seriously detracting from its amenity value.
- Please improve access to Main street from the new facility.
- The provision of new housing, gathering spaces, and work & retail options while enhancing green space close to transit is just what we need for future town sites in the DNV.
- I would like to recommend focal points like water features, public art, bike rental access be a part of a vibrant new community. The neighbourhood is very stale.
- This project would seem to help set the stage for suitable lower Lynn development & close to transit.
- This is a great use of the land.
- I don’t like the existing position of the towers on the early plan. Or the location of the community centre.
- More green space.
- I think this is in very well with the town centre for lower Mt. Hay.
- This is one of the more interesting redevelopment proposals for the North Shore I have seen in the last few years. I think it will fit in very well with the plans for the community. I look forward to hearing more about the housing options.
- Definitely required.
- Unitarian church will be accessible by bus for me.
- I think we should try and hold on to some land - use it as rental to keep cash flow coming in to NSW.
- this process is taking too long.
- As a north shore resident, I am supportive of new affordable developments. However, traffic is a growing concern across the north shore and adding more people will only make the issue worse. I think that the City and developers need to be talking holistically about moving people E-W across the north shore rather than project to project. I believe it’s a responsibility of the developer to not only minimize impact to the project area but to strive to make it better than it was before.
- I am also very happy to see the attention to green space. The north shore has a sense of nature and environment that needs to be celebrated and maintained. Having areas that make people want to get outdoors and be active is essential.
- I am looking forward to Darwin’s proposals which I believe will greatly enhance the entire area.
- Towers should be sited along lynnmouth ave. rather than close to the creek and park, to avoid shading and crowding of park area.
- Very sensitive to community needs.
- I am excited by the possibility of park improvements and more bike/footpaths. Also, connectivity between Westlynn and future shops/services on Lower Mountain Hwy.
- I think that its great what Darwin is doing for this Community.
- North Star Montessori school currently leases space at the Winter Club. Finding school space for this modest little school is challenging. I would love to see the school incorporated into the new Winter Club development. This would increase my support for the project.
- Until developers start contributing to a transportation fund I will not support major developments like this.
- It is absolutely ridiculous that the north shore is becoming so over developed; the traffic controls are not built to withstand this type of development. The city is crazy to keep letting you guys develop along marine drive and near the second narrows. Try building the infrastructure to deal with these types of things before you just shoot up towers hoping that it will be okay, and the towers are going up over at the old ears site. thats going to do wonders for traffic on that side of the shore as well. stop destroying north shore staples like the NSWC lands.
- Darwin is probably the most North Shore focussed developers, with an eye to creating a great community for North Shore residents and not just a quick buck. I can’t think of a better company to be partnered with in this exciting opportunity for north Vancouver.
- The uniqueness of North Vancouver is being destroyed in the name of revitalisation. The North Shore has always been vital but it is now unsalable. Developers have gentrified the area and a cross-section of society will be lost. Shame on you developers.
- I would like to see daycare included in the site.
- The combination of residential and community buildings so close to a major transit hub and the newly developed Lynn Creek town centre is an exciting prospect. Access to things like a theatre space and daycare spaces through the Unitarian Centre would be a great asset to this emerging newhood that are not available in other sites in this area.
- Are there enough parking if there is community centre facilities? The three high rise buildings are significantly blocking the south view of our residents on the south side of the building. Switch the low rise to the back and the high rise to the front.
- Hopefully large outdoor spaces provided in condo unit.
- I serve as minister of the North Shore Unitarian Centre. The congregation’s vision to provide a dynamic and multipurpose space that meets the needs of the wider community is more forward thinking than any church I have served. Addressing the growing urban concern of isolation and loneliness, as well as a site for much needed daycare spaces, are just the beginning of how this centre will serve North Vancouver.
- Aggressive.
- To be honest, I see a lot of what Darwin is getting but nothing as to what the NSWC is getting.
- It will be nice to see that area converted into a small nice community.
GENERAL HOUSING RELATED AND SUPPORTIVE COMMENTS

• the area needs an upgrade and using this space for housing is a logical choice as north van is a desirable place to live but requires more affordable housing price points
• There is no affordable housing options
• We need more housing in the north shore
• Make the prices affordable
• The planning on the north shore has been atrocious for years. It sure would be nice if kids born and raised here could afford to stay and live here. Sadly that is not the case
• Too much housing on North shore and no infrastructure
• Redevelopment of the area would provide needed additional housing options on the North Shore
• This is a great way to get the housing options we desperately need in North Vancouver while having a creative solution for the NSWC to relocate into a state of the art facility
• I hope there will be as much provision as possible for affordable housing
• WE NEED MORE HOUSING ON THE NORTH SHORE!!!!
• great concept, nice design. North Van needs more affordable housing. This is a great idea
• Great concept, I imagine most of this will be market priced, which is damaging community and families
• Please make it affordable for young people.
• I live in the neighbourhood and see this development as good change and needed to help the north shore residents have more opportunities for housing
• We need more housing
• Yes the land mass is there, but is there really a need for this type of housing, still unaffordable to 80% of the population
• We don’t need more housing. We need infrastructure to deal with the horrible population problem that we have here on the North Shore
• At least one of these buildings needs to be a purpose built rental only building
• Need more housing
• I am very supportive of additional affordable housing for seniors in this area
• We Need More Housing on the North Shore
• My grown children would like be able to buy in this community. North Van needs more housing supply, especially condos. The Lynn Creek area plan looks exciting and this would be an excellent expansion of it
• I tried to choose 5 stars but this somewhat strange software did not confirm it. My comment about the development is that I hope there will be plenty of affordable (non-luxury) rental units included
• I am concerned with this only because of the issue of affordability. More density is said to lower cost, but that doesn’t seem to be the trend. Concerned that this will add to the traffic issues but not address issues of affordability
• Great idea. NEED MORE HOUSING!
• Great location for housing alternatives
• I’m concerned about affordable housing and I hope these won’t be more “luxury” condos.
• A creative proposal that would be a positive contribution to development of the Lower Lynn Town Centre
• I am very supportive of this project. This area needs to be rejuvenated
• This is a good re-purposing of the current NSWC lands and the NSWC will stay on the North Shore.
• Enough with (certain) Council members causing ridiculous delays to projects that are providing much needed supply to an underserved market. Focusing supply within the Lower Lynn Town Centre is exactly what is prescribed in the Council-adopted OCP. The NSWC re-development will be an incredible amenity to the North Shore and Darwin is working with a fantastic Architect to make this happen. The initial plans look great and have my full support
• It sounds like an excellent idea
• This looks to be a good use of the land, with varied dwellings and a community facility, plus access to the park
• Very Supportive
• This is a needed new facility for North Van families
• The proposed redevelopment looks fantastic - we are looking forward to the changes!
• The plan looks well thought out. The new towers don’t interfere or block the existing tower’s views. Density like this is the best use of land in a location that doesn’t negatively impact residential neighbourhoods
• Looks great
• The design is perfect for the area and tremendous utilization of the land
• I fully support this development. It will substantially improve the area and provide much needed family housing
• This proposal is awesome
• I fully support this development
• We and so many of our friends and neighbours support this development. We also support the construction of a new larger recreation facility for NSWC for members and guests to enjoy in the Maplewood Flats area. The area needs more housing alternatives to single family dwellings, and our rec centres cannot handle the demand (unless Ron Andrews, Karen Magnusson and Ice Sports are doubled in size. Thank you
• This proposal is good for everyone.
• very supportive, we want this development to proceed
• fully support
• I am in support of including the Unitarian Centre. More public transport must be put in place
• Fabulous looking project. I hope it’s approved
• My family and I very much support the vision and redevelopment of a new NSWC and support the form and density being proposed on the existing site of the NSWC
• Am in full support of this new development
• Good location. Great project. Not sure if our 5 star rating was actually registered
• I think it looks good...
• Looks good, I would be interested in downsizing to this location
• I like the proposal. We are in desperate need of housing on the North Shore and the addition of a non-denominational church is a bonus. If the church is providing some public use space (such as a theatre, meeting rooms) that will serve this new community area well. Any improvements to our public park lands is always welcome
• This is a great plan! Please proceed
• I support this project as it will not only help facilitate and upgrade to the NSWC facilities on the North Shore but it will also provide a substantive amount of housing in close proximity to the highway infrastructure. I like the plan as the development is close to amenities shopping and other
• I think this would be a great addition to the North Shore.
• I am very supportive of this plan to move forward
NORTH SHORE WINTER CLUB
Representative Opinion Survey Report
March 6, 2018

- I am very supportive of both the NSWC redevelopment and the establishment of new NSWC facilities to the benefit of the District of North Vancouver. Both developments will increase the desirability of DNV
- Fully support rezoning
- Looks great, would definitely consider investing in this area. About time it was cleaned up!
- I fully support the redevelopment plan as it is currently proposed
- I am fully supportive of the NSWC redevelopment and relocation.
- I look forward to this project being realized
- This is good for residents of DNV. A new, stable NSWC good for DNV. More high density, lower cost housing is needed
- Very impressed by the plan.
- Awesome Community idea hope that this comes together Darwin seems to bring a lot to the community
- Looks like a great plan considering the current ongoing building going up and that it has great transportation links or as good as it gets on the North Shore
- I strongly support proposed development
- I feel this re-development would be very beneficial to the North Shore Community
- This an excellent development for this land - perfect, accessible, diverse and looking to the future of the North Shore. I fully support it.
- Good use of land near similar developments low impact on neighbors and views
- I support this development based on location, access to public services and transit and the new Unitarian Church
- This seems like an excellent plan that will benefit the NV District and the surrounding community
- I fully support growth on the north shore and this development which will provide much needed housing
- Looks like a good plan
- Fully supportive
- As someone who lives in the same neighborhood as the existing winter club I fully support the plans for re-zoning/redevelopment and feel they are in line with development that is taking place in the area
- I think this is a worthwhile proposal
- I'm very happy with the site
- Looks like a fabulous project
- Wonderful plans very exciting
- Let's continue to communicate and move this great opportunity forward
- Will be great to have a community facility in this area. It is needed. Also, this location seems excellent for apartment housing - near Bridgemen Park, near Park & Tilford, good hiking trails along Lynn Creek. And I'm glad to hear there will be a pedestrian bridge across Lynn Creek
- Looks awesome!
- Great proposal...I'm all for it.
- Absolutely fantastic use of this land
- Very much in favour of the concept
- I am very supportive of this project. It's good to see Darwin developing these lands
- I was unable to indicate my support via the star system. I am wildly in favour of the site and the plan. Love the location/access to transit. Go for it!
- I like the design and the fact that the residences are close to the park

TRAFFIC, PARKING AND INFRASTRUCTURE CONCERNS
- Traffic is a big problem in this area now, let alone after more highrises go in. I think the density is too much. The density will have a negative impact on the surrounding park area from overuse
- Please do not make the traffic congestion any worse. The road project already happening is crazy enough.
- I have huge concerns regarding traffic and parking
- I would increase my level of support to very supportive if I was convinced that the local municipal governments and the provincial government had a plan to significantly improve traffic flow in this area
- My biggest concern is the traffic nightmare that will occur with that many additional people living in that area
- Traffic concerns
- We have a severe traffic problem now....This will make it unmanageable!
- That area is already so congested with traffic, that by adding all of those high rises, I can only imagine how horrendous traffic will be. I know they are changing the traffic infrastructure, but it won't be enough
- This will create SO much traffic. We have huge traffic delays now so how will we be able to commute to Vancouver or even Lonsdale Ave.?
- Honestly you should abort this and any more future development plans in North Vancouver until you can solve the traffic and housing issues. Adding over 100 new stories of people and cars to an already over congested overpopulated area and city that geographically cannot handle anymore population!!!
- You are not planners and builders you are destroyers and you have destroyed my city and its community. Stop all the massive rapid and obviously unplanned overdevelopment right now.
The concern is traffic. The big developers need to work with existing businesses to create a charming exciting network of shops, galleries, restaurants, etc. so people walk or bike. Free mini vans should be circulating the area for residents to use when visiting neighbourhood amenities.

It is too big! Traffic is already bad and this will make traffic worse.

Very supportive of development to ease traffic to and from the North Shore with more housing here.

I would like to learn more about parking and traffic flow through development.

I have some concerns re: traffic with such high density... notwithstanding the new interchange.

The most important concern is the many thousands more cars that this proposed development will put on the already gridlocked roads every day! North Vancouver is choked daily with terrible traffic congestion and this project will certainly add to the already huge problem!!

There needs to be a halt on construction in this area until the traffic issues are addressed. Right now the traffic is completely choking off access to those of us that live on the Seymour side of the highway.

I am very concerned about the increased traffic that will result from this plan.

Don't have any above ground parking.

Traffic is seriously reducing quality of life for north shore residents. Who will even want to live on the north shore anymore when they realize it takes 2 hours to get home?

fix the congestion before building more towers!!!!!!

My daughter is a half day student at Pro Arte Dance Centre at 1225 Keith (across the street from NSWC).

I am concerned about increased traffic in the area—people already cut through the parking lot from Keith Road.

My concern is just traffic. How many more cars will be on the road in that already congested area by the bridge.

Too much density already, this will just add to the already brutal traffic in the lower cut/2nd narrows area.

I would like to see the project go ahead. My only concern is the level of access on and off the bridge and the surrounding areas including parking!! and how thousands of new people will impact the commute on and off the north shore. It is already a challenge for traffic and the idea that people will ride their bikes to work or take transit is simply not realistic given the geography and climate and growing number of families on the north shore.

How is the North Shore going to handle the additional traffic from this development?

Traffic / infrastructure management to accommodate the increased density is critical

solution for the traffic

Traffic is always a problem in this area. My concern would be adding to the congestion.

You people are insane acting to the horrific over loaded roads and traffic that we are already dealing with. Now you want to add an outrageous number of more people to the bottle neck area. This is such a money grab for the developers!! How sick you are to say you want to keep the way of life of the North Shore! You are part of the problem! Brutal.

This plan will significantly impact traffic congestion and valuable green space.

Just horrible that you want to congest the North Shore only to fill pockets and not care about the way of life here that all you developers don’t care about. Disgusting. You are the ones driving the long time residents away. Congrats greedy low life’s

Traffic and noise increases are the major concerns

ENOUGH PARKING FOR ALL EVENTS

The traffic around that area is already a nightmare, during morning & evening rush, which starts at 3pm.

How will more people ease the congestion?

Usual ones of density and parking to be addressed adequately

I am concerned regarding parking for the Lynn creek area. It is a popular river beach at all times of the year and there is limited parking access to this area. There was street parking but with the new developments will that still be an option?

I am worried at the influx of populus in the area and the traffic conditions that plague the surround areas during rush hour. Driving on the north shore after 3:30 pm on weekdays is next to impossible nowadays. How can we expect to fix the traffic issue if we just add more people? I agree with a redevelopement of the winter club but not to adding hundreds of units on top of what is already in place.

The amount of vehicles using this area currently makes traffic a nightmare. Adding residential towers to this mix will gridlock the area...not to mention parking. There is not transit to support more residents in the area either. Until there is additional transit and or bridge crossing I cannot support this amount of additional housing/density

It looks like there may not be enough parking for the Unitarian Church facility. This needs to be looked at closely.

Adding this many towers and new residential to the north shore will cause even more traffic on the north shore and make it almost impossible to drive anywhere on the north shore. I will most likely move out of Vancouver if the traffic worsens which these proposed towers will definitely do

The project is too big. Traffic is already too busy. This mega project will add to the congestion and accordingly, is not beneficial to North Vancouver.

To much traffic congestion as is. No more development until this is solved

not enough parking and too much traffic

no more tall towers should be built around here. Traffic is already brutal and will only get worse

Traffic is a huge issue. Ensure lots of underground parking, and more public transit access

Traffic flow is really poor today and I can’t see it improving with this development.

Build more transportation infrastructure before building more housing on the North Shore!!! Traffic has already grown to an absurd level due to more people moving and increasing levels of construction bringing in workers from other parts of the lower mainland.

I have only one question. How are our roads going to accommodate the hundreds of additional cars this development will bring to the area?

There must be adequate parking. Minimum 1 stall for 1 bedrooms, 2 for 2 bedrooms and lots of visitor parking

Really need to deal with the infrastructure first. How are we going to get people in and out of an already congested area

I am blocks away from this location and deal with backups on my street due to traffic daily. There is construction underway to alleviate CURRENT traffic issues that are 30 years in the making and the project is long overdue. This is NOT a license to keep adding more and more density. Anyone thinking rationally and actually having to drive this route would realize that adding thousands more residents in such a small and already congested area makes no sense at all. With the development across the river there will already be a ridiculous increase in traffic! Any suggestion that these new people will simply ride their bike or transit, clearly haven’t spent a day in front of the houses of those of us on the side streets used to bypass traffic. TERRIBLE idea. Wait until the interchange is finished and the village on the other side of the river is done to assess what we can handle before embarking on YET another frenzy
to build and jam people in. These will NOT be affordable units and thus have no impact on anyone trying to remain living in north van if they cannot already

- very concerned about traffic on lynmouth road especially if there was an emergency
- I would be much more supportive if I had some assurance that the necessary infrastructure (roads, hospitals, water supply improvements would be undertaken in conjunction with the expansion of living space in North Vancouver District). Currently any travel east/west and west/east on the North Shore reaches critical mass at specified times of the day and I haven't touched on the North/South South/North issues. Water conservation is not enough to continue to serve our growing population. we need to build bigger reservoirs.
- Infrastructure. Schools, water, public transportation, medical - what will this look like to support the new residents?
- It's ridiculous to build that until the infrastructure is updated to at least handle the current population
- I do not see anything in this proposal about the infrastructure, sewer, water, transit. Adding that many more people the congestion will just get worse
- accessibility by transit is a priority
- We need a third crossing to move traffic on and off the north shore
- Don't allow new construction of buildings until the overpass is complete.
- What infrastructure will be put in place to support all these new homes?
- Need to see a plan for transit for all these people as the roads have no room for the current population
- I feel that this plan is overly ambitious. The Edgemont plan makes way more sense to me. I along with many people feel that the infrastructure in hospitals, transit is not in place to accommodate this size of development
- I hope there will be improved bus service to go with it
- Concerned about transit from West Vancouver

DENSITY (Supportive and Against)

- Great place for more density close to the highway!!!
- Too much density. Traffic is already a nightmare in that area
- getting too crowded
- I am concerned about the 26 storey buildings and the density in an area where traffic is already bad
- This appears to be consistent with the OCP and should help provide the needed density for a cluster of amenities within walking distance of where I live.
- I am appalled. We are transforming North Vancouver to LA. The density is not supported by infrastructure (roads, traffic, parking).
- No tall towers
- Why do you need such high towers? They completely block the views of the low rises and increase the traffic density in that area which is already congested
- Height should be reduced to be more in line with the area plan
- It is a great location for density, near the highway, a park and a mall
- Too many tall buildings are either under construction or planned for the area. The new highway improvements will never be able to keep up with the increased population. The traffic, which is terrible on most days now, will become completely unbearable if this proposed project goes forward. There are too many new units in north van with no new roads, bridges or meaningful transit upgrades!!
- Too much density, too high, not acceptable

Feel that this development is consistent with densification in North Vancouver and creating more available housing on our currently strained availability
- Too Tall, too many people
- This would be an amazing opportunity to develop more density to help with the affordability of buying or renting a home. Please approve these plans! I want to afford to live on the North Shore!
- This looks fantastic, should denser and taller
- And am opposed to very tall buildings here. Please make the towers shorter. I don't think we need this level of housing density on the shore. We don't have the infrastructure to support it.
- 3 towers no maybe 2
- I am a little opposed to the amount of stories for the towers - I prefer the 6-8 stories that the lower buildings have, rather than the tall towers. I know that Seylynn Village towers are right beside, but I think this area of North Van should be more low rise and townhouse densification
- I would fully support this development if it were not for the 29 to 32 storey buildings. Yet again we will destroy the reason many of us moved to the north shore, was to have green space and views. As well as adding too many residents to an already congested area, I don't think this addresses the traffic issue. I know my comments won't matter just like the Seylynn development where many residents voiced their concerns only to be told by the mayor that it was already a done deal. Am guessing this is another simple tick in the box for you to say we engaged and thanks for coming out. Would be great to have a developer try building something smaller and more intimate
- This is a dead end street, traffic will be terrible. Too dense
- Build them higher like you god damn mean it!!!
- I also had issues with building heights on the seylyn development I also have with this. Max of 28 storeys
- This area cannot support the level of density you are proposing. Single lane roads and a tiny elementary school are simply not good enough for MORE high rises in our small community. Additionally, we have been living in construction hell for the past 10 years due to the atrocity that is Seymour Towers, whose developers willfully ignored the wishes of the community) and the "improvements" being made to the Keith Rd area. Developments such as the one you are proposing are making our neighbourhood unlivable, and turning what used to be a close-knit community into a chaotic traffic and construction disaster zone. If you could stop ripping our neighbourhood apart in the name of profit, we'd all very much appreciate it.
- Too much density in an already cramped area
- It's great to see the revitalization of this aging facility, I'm supportive of more density built on the north shore in town center locations
- Sooner than later and bring height and density to the west side of CNV along Marine Dr. let see some 20+ stories area around the old Sears site North and South side of Marine DR
- Too tall
- The development is approximately 25% over built. More open space is needed
- Enough density in this little area. We can barely make our way to our homes in this area, with the traffic problems. We need a moratorium on development in this area until the traffic problem is solved!
- Great location, perfect amount of density
- Love it! More density with new buildings and getting rid of the old stuff!
- Too dense
- Additional density planning MUST include addressing transit/traffic accommodations
- Density too high
Also this development is too high
Towers should be higher and thinner
There is too many units and height on that property. There is not enough infrastructure to support the addition of that many new units. The idea that there is a community benefit is not supported.

RECREATIONAL FACILITY & AMENITIES

We have been members of the Winter Club for over 20 + years. All 3 of our children (2 boys & a girl) played hockey, tennis, figure skating at the Club. It is a great community of North Shore residents and a great place for the kids to develop life long friendship
Where is the winter club pool?
A new location and facility would be a valuable asset for future generations
I love it, plans look amazing, seems like a win win, provided it is a net 0 cost to current NSWC members.
Concerned that useable inside floor space will not house all amenities we hope to be able to provide and the practicality of the multi levels of parking & Centre
Good location for housing and community facility. It's near green space and amenities. Hope day care will be part of the centre
Win win. Without an improved NSWC it collapses without significant cash infusion. The weight on north van recreation would be significant.
I grew up here at the club and I want our kids to grow up at the new (location) club
Very important to keep the Winter club on the north shore east side. If this redevelopment is not approved, there is a risk it will move off of the North Shore. A real loss to the amenities of the North Shore
I have been a member since childhood. I cannot express strongly enough how excited and supportive I am about this project
Looking forward to the new tennis facilities. Would love to have clay courts
Would be an excellent development on both sites
I very much approve the plan primarily for future families. A new facility would encourage and benefit those who will join a new club
Looking forward to the new facility. It is much needed and would bring in more members
I look forward to the amenities that will be provided by a new NSWC. The existing facility has been a tremendous club, however it is in need of significant upgrades that will be provided by a new facility
My son plays hockey for North Van Minor and we visit the North Shore Winter Club often. If the redevelopment generates a new club at no cost to taxpayers this seems like a no brainer
This development concentrates habitation so that public amenities can be rationed provided.
seeing as the property would get developed regardless of the whether the club remains operational, we might as well receive a new club for the trouble. While not a member our family has visited on many occasions. Needs a refresh for sure
Important to improve a reasonable development on this site so the NSWC can remain on the North Shore. To lose it would be a real loss for the North Shore

PROCESS ORIENTATED CONCERNS

This "survey" was very poorly organized and very confusing. I would question whether any results you get are valid
Completely useless survey. Fancy pictures and diagrams, but poorly presented information. It appears all you are doing is jumping through a hoop required in the redevelopment process.
Yeah, where does the feedback go? Where am I supposed to offer my 'stars'? This site is not clear, feedback options are skewed. This is a terrible poll with NO opportunity for input. It is couched in such bland language there is no true concept. There is no discussion about HOW construction will affect the area, other users, and traffic. Darwin, you need to do way better. Disappointing and misleading
You call this a survey?? Or you really don't care at all what we think!!! Only one vague question then forcing the person into a prechosen answer. How is that considered honest feedback?
I found this survey difficult to take. I only got one slide to give a rating on - the East view. Is that all there was?
This procedure was poorly handled to get support. More info was needed prior to this (Open House) meeting. More questions were created and answers not available shows the need for another meeting. Not in favour as is, no chairs or speaker, attendants only deal with one person at a time
We who live at Carlton at the club would appreciate an information meeting like this 1-2 times at Carlton at the club. We are a seniors building most of us cannot walk up 3 flights of stairs to get this information (Open House attendance)

PROJECT: OPPOSED OR CONCERNED COMMENTS

Density and traffic congestion are not reasonable and community amenity is not a tangible outcome from this development. Darwin talks a long mile about being North Shore but profiteering is profiteering does not matter if the developer is based in Maplewood, New York or Hong Kong.
No
This is too much for the area
The project is MUCH too LARGE, the roads are already congested the current alterations to the highways and roads in the area will still not hold all the additional vehicles for this complex as well as the ones in the neighbouring areas. I am all for expansion and updating but the District has certainly NOT thoughts this out. In the event of an emergency, for the last 20 years I have said we would not be able to leave the Shore if we had to.
The schools in the area are overflowing, where are the new students to go, are you expecting only retirees and couples. The recreation facilities are insufficient.
More trees, which provide oxygen will be removed, and further damage to our Eco system present itself
NO
Too much development - way of life in North Vancouver is and continues to ruined by developers - you cut down trees to build concrete blocks - crime will increase - the beauty of the North Shore will diminish with grey buildings - two bridges will not sustain the traffic problems stop building let the current infrastructure try to deal with the traffic and then look at building. If you keep building DNV and say traffic is increasing it's because too many people are living on the NS. If there was a forest fire or other disaster people could not get off the NS two bridges won't handle all the residents trying to flee. It's a money grab not a concern about life, buying homes and way of life. Soon the Grand Boulevard land will be sold for towers and all the forest areas so there will be no more bike trails and walking areas
NORTH SHORE WINTER CLUB
Representative Opinion Survey Report
March 6, 2018

- Traffic concerns on already busy arteries; impact to close by parks/streams; over densification in an area which can't support it; towers are much too tall; not enough amenities for the community given the size of the project.
- We will not support amending the OCP for this FSR of 3.5 on the wrong side of Lynn Creek
- I'll record one star here as I don't support this project
- Concerned about the height of the Towers but mostly about the lack of replacement for the activities centre
- Survey is terrible. Details on project very vague. All this project does is bring more people to an area with insane traffic issues. What community ctr. What will be in it? Who pays for it? Who can access? Details please. Transit, bike, train? This will destroy Bridgeman park. Towers too high. How short is this benefit anyone other than Darmin. Did I mention traffic?
- The project is too large. Too many large projects are being built in North Vancouver at the same time. Traffic is accordingly too busy and the schools are too full. My vote in October will be to slow down development generally
- This project is going to significantly adversely affect our views and thus our enjoyment of our property
- As a local resident already dealing with commuting challenges, on a daily basis, how do you propose to move people about, there is no infrastructure to support this type of major development and no discussions about how this development will impact the residents living on the NS. I completely oppose this type of development
- I thought that I could retire in a quiet neighbourhood but it does not seem it is going to happen
- I am not in favour of the new project
- No
- I think this development will take away from the unique atmosphere we have in our neighbourhood
- I don't trust the District or developers to pursue these densification projects. I have yet to see the detailed guidance that would minimize problems with traffic, housing affordability, and environmental impact. To support this I would need to see much better coordination among all levels of government and much greater consultation with residents.
- No
- Not in Lower Lynn OCP. Traffic not considered in new interchange. Not a good idea.
- Increased traffic will impact our lives and our health. Thousand more cars trying to get on Lynnmouth and Keith Rd will make travel impossible. Second Narrowes bridge cannot handle the traffic of today.
- There are no doctors available and the hospital cannot handle the current population. This survey on Thursday, Feb 1st, did not allow to select the level of support, defaults to 3. I don't support this project and being force to select 3, makes this a fraud.

CARLTON RESIDENT SPECIFIC ISSUES (input from Open House Comment Forms)

- Too dense a project. Cannot even tell me how many suits in these buildings. Try and get onto Lynnmouth with so many cars already lined up. Noise for many years! We just went through that on Keith Rd seems like a huge increase in population without public transit and other infrastructure to support thousands, yes, thousands of new residents in the one square block.
- You can't build your way out of congestion! Very concerned about all the additional traffic, it is already difficult to get in and out of this short road, especially during rush hour. I can't imagine adding another 1500 or more cars.

NORTH SHORE WINTER CLUB
Representative Opinion Survey Report
March 6, 2018

- My concerns are: noise of construction during days and nights, too much traffic before and after building, because E Keith Road doesn't have the capacity of this many people, pollution, effecting the prices of our homes and units...leave us alone!
- I guess you could say we aren't in Kansas anymore" lifestyle negatively affected. Too much traffic. Too much noise (the Carlton does not have triple glazing unlike the new building. Park will be like a city walk too crowded
- This density will impact on our health increasing the pollution, traffic delays
- Big concern is traffic! Your development will add lots of 1000s of cars to our already clogged arteries- please push for skytrain to/ from N shore using the existing train bridge that parallels the 2nd narrows. B line buses get stuck in traffic as well!
- I don't have a computer. Can you update me by mail or flyer.
- I support this project on the grounds that density is generally good. Hopefully the transit network can Interface well with this site (Darwin should engage w translink at an early stage). Also seems to make sense for the winter club to get a new facility out of the deal without paying.
- Adequate traffic flow and parking is important.
- Very against this no need for more high rises
- My concern is about the heavy traffic this development would cause
- Towers too close to Carlton. Penthouses of sub penthouses are negatively affected on certain corners view obliterated and sunlight significantly reduced
- Too busy road and residents, destroy the nature environment, blocking views
- I'm in favour of this project. I think it helps to address the need for more housing on the north shore and accounts for the NSWC to stay on the north shore
- Do not wish to lose our view. Do not want roads through our complex
- Traffic and congestion, noise
- Very good plan. Good consideration to how I live. Live in front of the carlton building
- Too much traffic- way too much destroying the national environment and obstructing view
- Too much noise, traffic and congestion. Infrastructure for residents not in place
- Far too much traffic, congestion, and noise- looks like it will block my view forever
- Very against this - too many people not enough roads
- Parking, traffic to Keith road on Lynnmouth cannot handle the amount of cars for all those apartments
- Traffic and congestion is bad enough, accidents on the bridge as a result, forget it!
- I'd like to see a small 'village' or community space for walking, coffee, meetups etc. I'd also like first dibs on a space in the new development
- There is still no mention of another exit from the North Shore- the traffic does not work now and unless there is another crossing or major tech changes there will just be more congestion with all the extra people living on the NS
- I think a project 1/2 the density would be a reasonable amount of people and auto increase
- Looks like a very good location for housing (convenient to parks, shopping, trails etc).
- Traffic concerns. Homes are being built for families- where are the schools for the children?
- Please do not spoil our neighborhood
- Supportive if you won't block west view from Carlton
- I would like more landscaping and room between the buildings. I am worried about the traffic access to the Carlton
- Too much density- construction time and traffic, noise, view
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• Not impressed with the church erection
• Do not approve of how much traffic this will create to an already jammed area
• Big concern will be thousands more cars will be put on the road which is already gridlocked every day! A skytrain crossing should be build over to Vancouver to help ease some of the terrible congestion

4.2 APPENDIX: COMMENT FORM

Comment Form

Darwin Properties is working with the North Shore Winter Club to redevelop their existing property and is engaging the public to gather feedback. Learn about this proposal at www.winterclub.ca and then complete this comment form.

1. DO YOU SUPPORT THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE EXISTING NORTH SHORE LANDS?
Please indicate your level of support on a scale of 1-5

1 - Very Opposite, 2 - Opposite, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Supportive, 5 - Very Supportive

2. WHAT IS YOUR POSTAL CODE?

3. WHAT IS YOUR AGE?

- 18 and under
- 19 to 25
- 26 to 35
- 36 to 45
- 46 to 55
- 56 and over
- I'd rather not say

4. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

2/5/2016

Thank you for your comments. Comments on this sheet will be delivered to the District of North Vancouver for consideration.

Please note this form will become part of the staff report to District Council on this development proposal and will be publicly available.

Additionally, you may want to mail or email your comments to Darwin Properties. We kindly ask that all comments on this initial phase of public engagement be submitted by February 15, 2016.

Darwin Properties Ltd.
400 - 157 Fraserview Street, North Vancouver, BC V7H 0A6
info@dwarinc.ca
Darwin Properties is asking community residents and stakeholders to contribute input on the proposed redevelopment of the North Shore Winter Club Lands.

**FIRST PUBLIC CONSULTATION OPEN HOUSE**
February 1, 2018  •  5:30-8:00pm
North Shore Winter Club
1325 E Keith Rd, North Vancouver
Visitor parking provided underground

**LEARN MORE AND HAVE YOUR SAY**
To learn more about the redevelopment of these lands, and participate in an online public input survey, please visit:

www.NSWCLands.ca
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF TONIGHT'S MEETING?

- Introduce the redevelopment concept on the North Shore Winter Club lands.
- Gather community feedback on this proposal.

Official Community Plan (OCP)

- Lower Lynn Town Centre Plan has been used to guide the proposed form of development.
- The OCP would need to be amended to allow the rezoning of this property.
Project Benefits and Goals

1. PARK AND GREEN SPACE ENHANCEMENT

2. VARIETY OF HOUSING OPTIONS

3. RETENTION OF THE NORTH SHORE WINTER CLUB ON THE NORTH SHORE

4. NEW PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE OVER LYNN CREEK

5. NORTH SHORE UNITARIAN CENTRE (COMMUNITY BLDG)

View Impacts

Q. HOW WILL MY VIEW BE IMPACTED BY THE REDEVELOPMENT?

• Darwin will conduct individual view studies for anyone who requests it, as part of the rezoning process. These will be posted on the project website (www.NSWCLands.ca).

• Please indicate on the comment form if you wish to have a view study completed, and provide your contact information.

Traffic Impact

Q. HOW WILL REDEVELOPMENT IMPACT TRAFFIC?

• Darwin will complete a comprehensive traffic study in March and results will be posted on the project website (www.NSWCLands.ca).

• The report will study and compare trip/traffic data for the existing NSW use vs that of the proposed redevelopment.
4.5 APPENDIX: METROQUEST ONLINE SURVEY SCREEN CAPTURE

North Shore Winter Club Lands
Darwin Properties is working with the North Shore Winter Club to redevelop their existing property and is engaging the public to gather feedback. Learn about this proposal at www.NSWCLands.ca and then take this survey.

The North Shore Winter Club is exploring options to redevelop their property based on the Lower Lynn Town Centre Plan.

The redevelopment of their existing property will facilitate the construction of a new facility located at 2420 Oldica Highway.
4.6 FACEBOOK SOCIAL MEDIA

Thank you to those that were able to come to our Public Open House for the proposed redevelopment of the North Shore Winter Club Lands. If you missed it, visit www.newclands.ca to learn more and have your say via our survey. www.newclands.ca/survey

North Shore Winter Club Lands | Darwin
Darwin Construction and Development Company
North Vancouver, BC
www.newclands.ca

FACEBOOK REACH SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Reach: 7,018</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>AGE 25 - 34</th>
<th>AGE 35-55</th>
<th>AGE 45-54</th>
<th>AGE 55-64</th>
<th>AGE 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>403 post clicks</td>
<td>86.6% men</td>
<td>25% men</td>
<td>27% men</td>
<td>15% men</td>
<td>11% men</td>
<td>9% men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 likes</td>
<td>13.4% women</td>
<td>2% women</td>
<td>3% women</td>
<td>3% women</td>
<td>2% women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 shares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 APPENDIX: NORTH SHORE NEWSPAPER, February 7, 2018

Mayor’s Message

Demand management, not just another tax

Although the referendum results reflect voters’ overwhelming desire to maintain property taxes at current levels, the increase in property tax revenue is not the only factor influencing our ability to provide services. It is also important to consider how much revenue we are able to generate from other sources.

The City of North Vancouver is one of the few municipalities in the province that has successfully implemented a demand management plan. The plan has been designed to reduce the amount of new development that the city will allow, thereby reducing the need for increased tax revenue. The plan was developed in consultation with residents, businesses, and community leaders, and has been supported by the majority of residents in the city.

The City of North Vancouver is committed to ensuring that the demand management plan is fair and equitable. We are working hard to ensure that the plan is implemented in a way that is consistent with the needs of the city and its residents.

The City of North Vancouver is also committed to ensuring that the demand management plan is transparent. We will provide regular updates on the plan’s progress, and we will work with residents and businesses to ensure that they understand how the plan works.

No provincial funding for track at new Handsworth

School districts to break ground on new Airdrie over spring break

The City of North Vancouver is one of the few municipalities in the province that has successfully implemented a demand management plan. The plan has been designed to reduce the amount of new development that the city will allow, thereby reducing the need for increased tax revenue. The plan was developed in consultation with residents, businesses, and community leaders, and has been supported by the majority of residents in the city.

The City of North Vancouver is committed to ensuring that the demand management plan is fair and equitable. We are working hard to ensure that the plan is implemented in a way that is consistent with the needs of the city and its residents.

The City of North Vancouver is also committed to ensuring that the demand management plan is transparent. We will provide regular updates on the plan’s progress, and we will work with residents and businesses to ensure that they understand how the plan works.
Appendix A.8: Survey Response Maps
June 18, 2019

Jennifer Paton
Planning & Development
District of North Vancouver
355 West Queens Road,
North Vancouver, BC, V7N 4N5

RE: Preliminary Rezoning Application for 1325 E. Keith Road – North Shore Winter Club Lands

Dear Jennifer,

We are pleased to submit for Staff review a Preliminary Rezoning Application for the lands at 1325 E. Keith Road, the current location of the North Shore Winter Club (NSWC). This application may also require an Official Community Plan Amendment.

As you know, Darwin Properties has been working with the Club for the past 3 years under an agreement with their membership to investigate the redevelopment potential of their property, and the subsequent construction of a new Club at another location. The potential location of the new Club has been suggested to be 2420 Dollarton Road, the developed parcel adjacent to Darwin’s proposed North Shore Innovation District. The mechanism whereby the Club could afford to build a new permanent facility would be via a rezoning of their current land in order to generate the funds required via a land sale/exchange with Darwin Properties.

While District Council recently instructed Staff to defer review and bylaw preparation for the North Shore Innovation District proposal, the Club’s urgent priorities remain the same. The Club requires an understanding of the level of District support for the redevelopment of their land, since they have an aging facility in need of constant and costly maintenance, and a membership that demands a fiscally responsible approach to capital projects and future planning. Clarity on the potential of this property is critical to the Club’s future.

It is in this light that Darwin, in partnership with the North Shore Winter Club, wishes to submit for public consideration a proposal that seeks to redevelop this site in a form consistent with the Lynn Creek Town Centre Plan and surrounding approved developments. The form of development and arrangement on site have also been informed by significant feedback gathered from the immediate neighbours as well as the broader community, via a series of focussed meetings, Open Houses and online engagement efforts conducted by Darwin over the past 2 years. The proposal includes a mix of low-rise and high-rise buildings, with a wide range of housing from seniors assisted living, to market rental, to strata condominiums. The proposal also includes a significant community-oriented building – the North Shore Unitarian Centre (NSUC) – at the eastern edge of the site fronting Bridgeman Park. The entire site is treated as an extension of this beautiful creek-side park, with rich landscaping, pathways and open gathering spaces throughout.

We are happy to be working with the Club and believe that this is a very unique opportunity for the Club and the District to work together for the benefit of the larger community. We are looking forward to meeting with Staff to discuss next steps, and are ready to work collaboratively with Staff and the North Shore Winter Club to refine this proposal and present it formally to Council and the public as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Oliver Wehbe
President
DARWIN PROPERTIES LTD
June 7, 2019

Dan Milburn
General Manager, Planning, Properties & Permits
District of North Vancouver
355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5

Re: 1325 E Keith Road - Preliminary Planning Application
North Shore Unitarian Centre (A Hub of Community Life)

Dear Mr. Milburn:

The North Shore Unitarian Church (NSUC), working with its development partner Darwin Properties Ltd, hopes to build and operate a new, multipurpose community-oriented facility (the “Centre”) as part of the overall development plan for 1325 E Keith Road.

Purpose and Vision of the Centre – “A Hub of Community Life”
The proposed Centre is intended to be a hub of community life, and will include the following programming:

- **250 to 300-seat assembly hall/auditorium**
  - To be in demand as a venue for concerts, lectures, and public events far beyond its use on Sunday morning for NSUC services

- **A large and well-equipped daycare** with outdoor play area

- **Meeting rooms, classrooms and other spaces**
  - To be used frequently by nearby residents, community groups and others for workshops, classes, social gatherings, discussion groups, and other worthwhile activities

- **Large lobby or foyer**
  - To be the scene of lively, informal activity, such as lunch time musical events, art exhibits for local artists, poetry readings, open mic evenings, Friday night folk dances, etc.
  - A welcoming place where members of the general public can drop by throughout the week to have coffee or tea, meet friends or just relax

In short, we want the Centre to be a go to place for people from nearby and elsewhere to gather in community, build relationship, and enjoy activities that add meaning and purpose to life.
History and Background
NSUC has served the North Shore for over 50 years. We are a faith community of over 400 people, with approximately 200 registered adult members, 100 children and youth, and 100 adult "friends" who participate regularly but are not registered members. More than two-thirds live on the North Shore, and more than half in North Vancouver. Of the more than half living in North Vancouver, most live in the District.

Over a decade ago, our congregation voted to sell its present property, located on Mathers Ave in West Vancouver, and move elsewhere on the North Shore. The reasons were many:
- Our then almost 40-year old building is seriously deteriorated, obsolete, in constant need of repair, and lacks the elevator and wheelchair-accessible washrooms needed to make it accessible to people with a disability
- The location, on a residential street with no public transit, is hidden from and not easily accessible by the broad community we desire to serve.

In 2012, NSUC entered into a development partnership with Darwin pursuant to which NSUC’s approximately 2-acre Mathers Ave property would be rezoned for multifamily use, a new site on the North Shore would be found on which to locate and build our new facilities, and, when complete, the new land and facilities would be exchanged for our rezoned Mathers property. The rezoning of our Mathers property was successfully accomplished by Darwin in November 2015.

Since 2012, and especially since rezoning was accomplished, NSUC and Darwin have been searching urgently to find a suitable site on the North Shore on which to build our Centre. The search has been hugely difficult due to the extreme high land cost and lack of suitable sites on the North Shore. As the years have gone by, the urgency has become ever greater. Our congregation has grown but our now almost 50-old building is even more inadequate and deteriorated. It will not last much longer without major upgrade and repair that we can’t afford.

1325 Keith Road
Thus when Darwin proposed to NSUC that a suitable site for the Centre might be found within the North Shore Winter Club’s existing property at 1325 Keith Road and Lynnmouth Ave, NSUC was immediately enthusiastic and excited. The location is exactly what we have been looking for – on public transit, just off of a major road, and highly accessible to the whole North Shore community and public we seek to serve. Its additional unique advantages are that it is adjacent to lovely Bridgman Park and just across Lynn Creek from the heart of Lynn Creek Town Centre.

After so many years of effort to realize our dream and vision of building our multipurpose Centre -- A Hub of Community Life -- we hope and request that the District move forward as soon as possible with Darwin’s Preliminary Planning Application to rezone the Winter Club property at 1325 Keith Road.

Sincerely,

NORTH SHORE UNITARIAN CHURCH

Jim Stephenson, President

CC: District of North Vancouver Council
The District of North Vancouver
INFORMATION REPORT TO COUNCIL

July 11, 2019
File: 16.8620.20/054.000

AUTHOR: Steve Ono, P.Eng., Manager, Engineering Services/Deputy GM

SUBJECT: East 29th Street Corridor Safety and Mobility Improvements - Update

REASON FOR REPORT:
To provide Council with updated information about resident feedback regarding safety concerns due to the approved East 29th Street Corridor Safety and Mobility Improvements Plan, particularly with the addition of bike lanes, and provisions in the design to respond to those concerns.

SUMMARY:
East 29th Street from Lonsdale Avenue to Lynn Valley Road is a transit route, classified as a major arterial road and carries upwards of 9,500 vehicles per day. Contrasting with the major arterial level of service, East 29th also provides direct access to many residences which is more similar to a collector road classification. A portion of this corridor is also a designated bike route. Hence, there are several conflicting interests. Between 2008 and 2017, there were 150 motor vehicle crashes recorded by ICBC in this corridor. This project aims to improve road safety for all users of this corridor.

A team of professionals analysed the safety issues and on May 27, 2019, Council approved the East 29th Street Corridor Safety and Mobility Improvements project to enhance road safety for motorists, pedestrians, cyclists and transit users, including separated bike lanes east of Tempe Crescent (eastern intersection). The project includes introduction of left turn lanes, new sidewalk, and crosswalks corridor wide, and bike lanes in the eastern half of the corridor.

The project is currently being constructed as approved by Council May 27, 2019. It will significantly improve safety for bicyclists and is consistent with the District’s climate action goals.

Since approval, correspondence has been received in support of the bike lanes, as well as opposed to the bike lanes mainly due to loss of on-street parking. Staff have been considering the concerns of residents and will continue to work with residents to address their concerns where possible.
While all properties adjacent to the approved bike facilities within the project area have on-site parking available within their lots, the concerns related to loss of on-street parking can be categorised into lack of sufficient parking on-site for multiple vehicles resulting in spillover on-street, lack of convenient space for deliveries, lack of sufficient buffer space between driveway and travel lane, and lack of nearby space for drop-off/pick-up of mobility impaired persons.

Following project completion, the outcomes can be monitored, particularly regarding any need for drop-off/pickup zones. It is possible to add such zones adjacent to bike lanes, but impacts of such additions include boulevard tree/hedge loss, cost, and compromised cyclist safety.

BACKGROUND:
The East 29th Street Corridor Safety and Mobility Improvements are a result of more than two years of community consultation with neighbours, commuters, transit users, cyclists and pedestrians as well as the compilation of data from traffic safety studies and collision statistics for the area. The design approach retains existing curb, gutter and sidewalks in their existing locations where possible, minimising disturbance to boulevards.

An initial concept for the corridor was presented to Council May 6, 2019 proposing interim shared bicycle and motor vehicle lanes to temporarily preserve on street parking from Masefield to Lynn Valley Road along 29th (see Attachment 2). Council directed staff to strengthen the design of bicycle facilities east of Masefield to improve safety for cyclists and for consistency with District climate action goals.

The revised concept was approved by Council May 27, 2019 and added separated bicycle facilities from Masefield to Lynn Valley Road but required the elimination of all on street parking on 29th between Masefield and Fromme Road as well as on the south side of 29th from Fromme to Lynn Valley Road.

Since then, Council has received correspondence from residents concerned about the anticipated loss of on-street parking, as well as correspondence from citizens encouraging Council to continue with the bike lane facilities as approved May 27.

Residents have submitted an inventory they compiled acknowledging that all their properties between Tempe Glen/Royal Avenue and Fromme Road have access to off street parking via driveways fronting 29th Street or rear lane but expressing their concerns about loss of street parking (see Attachment 1).

Previous Council reports dated April 25, 2019 (considered at the Council Meeting May 6, 2019) and May 17, 2019 (considered by Council May 27, 2019) from the Section Manager, Transportation provide complete background.

EXISTING POLICY:
DNV Transportation Plan; DNV Official Community Plan; INSTPP; NV Bicycle Master Plan; North Shore Area Transit Plan; Community Energy & Emissions Plan (in progress); DNV Development Servicing Bylaw
ANALYSIS

Collision Analysis
Justification for left turn lanes along East 29th Street is based on collision analysis and intersection capacity analysis. ICBC 10-year collision data (2008-2017) for the East 29th Street corridor (excluding the Lonsdale Avenue and Lynn Valley Road intersections) revealed a total of 150 crashes. Of these crashes, 30% were listed as rear-end type crashes, while 20% were side-impact crashes. New left turn lanes should substantially mitigate these collision types as turn lanes will provide a safe waiting zone for turning vehicles without obstructing vehicles approaching from the rear. Left turn lanes also enable drivers turning left to wait for safe gaps in oncoming traffic without pressure to accept smaller gaps from obstructed vehicles. Left turn lanes will also provide improved sight lines towards oncoming traffic, further enhancing safety.

Approved Concept
The NV Bike Master Plan identifies East 29th Street east of Tempe Crescent (east) as a key east-west cycling connection from Lynn Valley Town Centre. West of Tempe Crescent the bike route is amended to follow 27th Street to Lonsdale Avenue and west to Jones Avenue bike route which provides connections to the Green Necklace Greenway, Spirit Trail and beyond (see below).

Parking data was collected in 2016 and again in 2019. The 2019 data is generally consistent with data collected in 2016. Currently available on-street parking along the East 29th corridor between Lonsdale Avenue and Lynn Valley Road consists of approx. 200 spaces. The use of the available on street parking varies along the corridor with the highest demand observed at
the two ends near Lonsdale Ave, and near Lynn Valley Road. For the whole corridor, parking demand is approximately 40% occupancy on average. As part of the approved design, approximately 160 on-street parking spaces must be removed, approximately 75% of which may be attributed to accommodating safer bicycling facilities.

Specifically, adding cycling infrastructure within the existing curb to curb space requires removal of on-street parking along sections of the corridor east of Tempe Crescent (east intersection). In high-use areas adjacent to Lynn Valley Road, six on-street parking spaces will be retained. (Figure 1 and Figure 2). Corridor-wide, approximately 25% of the on-street parking loss is due to new left turn lanes, sidewalks, transit stops and pedestrian refuges, with the balance due to new cycling infrastructure.

Figure 1. Approved Concept: Tempe Crescent to William

Figure 2. Approved Concept: William to Lynn Valley Road
The approved cross-section between Masefield Road and Fromme Road features buffered bike lanes cost-effectively within the existing curb space (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Approved Cross-Section Masefield Road to Fromme Road

In response to project construction notification, DNV/CNV have received resident concerns about the project. The concerns have been catalogued and are summarized in Table 1; they are categorized into convenience, process, and safety.
Concerns

On-Street Parking Loss
Side Street Parking Impacts
East 29th as a bike corridor, hill too steep for biking
Public Consultation Process
Stop/rethink Project
Left Turn Bay Concerns
Safe Driveway Access
Speeding
HandyDART Access
William Avenue Traffic Signal

Number of Written Complaints Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Number of Written Complaints Received**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parking Loss</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Street Parking Impacts</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 29th as a bike corridor, hill too steep for biking</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation Process</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop/rethink Project</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn Bay Concerns</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Driveway Access</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HandyDART Access</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Avenue Traffic Signal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note: Number of Complaints refers to households

Table 1. Resident Concerns and Frequency

In response, staff have met with and consulted with residents to better understand their safety concerns and have taken the following actions.

To address concerns about drop-off/pick-up for residents who use HandyDART services staff have coordinated with HandyDART and residents, including on-site meetings and assessment of the conditions. One concern was introduced by HandyDART users residing on the 1100 block of East 29th Street in a multi-unit building. In response, staff have incorporated a continuation of the existing bus stop location beyond the parkade driveway in the design, to allow HandyDART operators to safely load passengers. Figure 4 details the planned location and signage for the dedicated HandyDART loading zone as agreed with the residents. The second concern was raised by the resident at 572 East 29th and staff have been in on-going consultation with the resident. Staff will be incorporating a solution that includes continuation of sidewalk up the West side of Regent Avenue to provide a drop-off/pick-up area for HandyDART as well as the adjacent residents in this area of the neighbourhood. The topography at this location near the crest of 29th Street hill limits safe options due to sight line limitations.
To address safety concerns regarding driveway access, staff have coordinated with the City of North Vancouver and have added a painted buffer zone to the design. This painted buffer provides residents with difficult sightlines space to safely view oncoming traffic before entering the travel lane. Additionally, the painted buffer narrows the vehicle travel lane, helping to passively reduce traffic speeds. Staff will continue to review the details of the buffer zone design on a site-specific basis and consider further extension of the buffer zone in areas where driveway exit sightlines are most challenging to optimise safe egress.

In response to residents inquiring about the possibility of increasing their off-street parking within their front yards, application may be made through the DNV Building Department based on the following information:

- Residents may extend off-street parking in accordance with the RS1-5 Zoning Guide (part of the Zoning Bylaw), which states: when there is a straight-in-entry parking structure or no parking structure a maximum of 40% of the required front yard may be covered with a combined total of structures, surfaces or paved areas designed or functioning to be capable of supporting parking.

- For any extension beyond the aforementioned 40%, the District entertains variance applications through the Development Variance Permit process, or a variance application can be made through the Board of Variance.

To summarise, for those interested, the DVP process provides a means for residents to request consideration for additional parking on their land.

Further to the above-mentioned actions initiated by Staff to date, continued post-construction monitoring will be conducted, particularly with respect to road safety performance. Should the need be warranted, some future options are outlined below, which could be implemented, based on and pending the following assessments:
monitoring data collection,
feasibility and best engineering practices,
the need for providing loading zones/short-term parking,
impacts on road user safety and increased risk to safety of cyclists,
impacts to existing vegetation including trees, hedges,
impacts to boulevard and private property frontages,
consultation with immediately-affected property owners, and
cost.

Post-Construction Options

To address concerns about general loading/unloading zones for residents (particularly mobility impaired) and home-based businesses in the corridor, staff have identified 2 possible future additions: a) loading zone pockets and/or b) loading zones on side streets.

Short loading zone pockets could be constructed along 29th between driveways in a few select locations (see Figure 5). In order to accommodate these pockets, there would be impacts to the boulevard and property frontages, including removal of trees and hedges within the public right-of-way. The cost to construct an individual pocket is estimated at some $50,000. This type of facility requires drivers to pull in and out of traffic and cross the bike lane to access the loading zone, increasing risk of collisions including collisions with cyclists.

Figure 5. Passenger Loading Zone Concept

Side-street loading zones could be created on select side streets, near the intersection of East 29th St. Creating side-street loading zones would require extension of sidewalks, impacting the boulevard and property frontages and decreasing on-street stalls available for longer term parking. Construction costs are estimated at $35,000 per zone. This kind of facility may serve corner properties well, but would not be as convenient for mid-block properties.
These options can be completed at any time in the future as a stand-alone project. Should Council support one or both of these possible measures, staff would work with the directly impacted residents.

PUBLIC RESPONSE:
In response to project notification, the DNV/CNV has now received complaints from approximately 80 households along the corridor specifically unhappy with the loss of on-street parking due to new cycling infrastructure. They have submitted correspondence acknowledging they have access to off-street parking, but still have concerns. The majority of the complaints is in the segment from William to Fromme, but some complaints originate throughout the corridor including from some side streets. In contrast, we have received considerable correspondence via social media, and e-mail expressing support for the bike lanes as well as a letter of project support from HUB (cycling advocacy group), and written support of the project from the Boundary Elementary School PAC Chair. Public input and staff response has been ongoing as discussed in the earlier section titled Approved Concept in this report.

Timing/Approval Process:
The current East 29th Street concept was endorsed by Council on May 27th, 2019. Construction started June 24th, 2019.

Concurrence:
The project team consists of DNV staff from Major Projects, Streets, Engineering Design and Transportation and CNV staff.

Liability/Risk:
Project risks include lack of public acceptance (delay in implementing comfortable bike and pedestrian facilities vs. loss of on-street parking vs climate action commitments); construction scheduling - paving scheduled for 2019 is limited to mill and asphalt overlay activities. If paving work is delayed there is a risk that future road rehabilitation would require costly road reconstruction.

Social Policy Implications:
Improving access to active transportation modes (walking, cycling, and transit) while improving vehicle mobility and safety is consistent with DNV policy. Providing infrastructure supportive of active transportation modes will increase use of such modes and should improve wellness of participants. Buffered bike lanes that are not adjacent to and between on-street parking and moving motor vehicles has been shown to reduce risk of significant injury cycling.

Environmental Impact:
Providing safe and comfortable walking, cycling and transit facilities along the corridor will increase use of alternative travel modes instead of the private car and thus help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
Public Input:
DNV engaged with the public twice during the public consultation process; early during the data gathering phase in fall 2016 and later in February/March 2018 to seek input on improvement options.

Following the May 27th Council decision, staff prepared communications messaging and materials. This involved the following:
- DNV.org/East29th website updates went live June 11th
- Approximately 700 letters were sent to immediately impacted residents on East 29th, delivery in person and via Canada Post on June 12th
- Following letter distribution to immediately impacted residents, a postcard drop to approximately 2,000 neighbourhood residents (who were involved in initial project consultation) was delivered June 17th
- On-street project information signage installed June 18th
- Ongoing construction updates via social media, website, and on-street signage
- Local businesses have also been contacted and consulted on parking needs

Conclusion:
The approved concept for the East 29th Street Corridor Safety and Mobility Improvements project strives to balance the multiple competing interests served by this major arterial street, prioritizing safety and mobility for all users in a cost effective way, consistent with the primary purpose of major arterials. The approved concept mitigates the competing interest of private property access as much as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Ono, P.Eng.
Manager, Engineering Services/Deputy GM
ATTACHMENT 1

Property Access Correspondence From Residents
Hello,

Though properties have front driveway or back lane access, they do not have adequate parking. Adequate being not accessible from a mobility challenge, not accessible due to too narrow, too small and/or poor visibility due to location with slope of 29th Street East (not from vehicles parked on street), not adequate due to not enough spaces for all vehicles of all residents with vehicles that reside at the property, not enough spaces on property for visitors, deliveries, work vehicles, clients, guests, hired workers, care attendants, tenants, etc., not adequate due to not enough space for trailers, RV's, boats, motor bikes, not enough space for on property parking due to small garage filled with bicycles and storage needs, or if only have back lane access and no front driveway but do shift work and do not want to disturb other members of the residence or neighbours by entering and exiting from back lane then on-street parking is required.

Above is a picture taken this morning, June 22, 2019 @ 10:05am. This is from Fromme Rd up to [redacted]. You can see there is not one spot left on either side. Street parking is well used.
Parking for properties along 29th Street East, between Fromme Rd and Tempe Glen Dr/Royal Ave:

1095 29th Street East, south east side @ Fromme Rd. — no front driveway, back lane access — single vehicle back lane
1081 — front driveway that is single lane all the way through to back, back lane access — single vehicle back lane
1069 — front single lane driveway, no back parking but lane access — single vehicle back lane
1055 Stevens Plumbing — no front driveway, back lane access with limited parking — requires on-street parking for business vans, guests, visitors, deliveries, staff — single vehicle back lane
1047 — no front driveway, back lane access — single vehicle back lane
1035 — no front driveway, back lane access accommodates 2 vehicles. A further 3 vehicles park on-street, plus visitors, deliveries, etc — single vehicle back lane
1029 — no front driveway, back lane access — single vehicle back lane
1023 — no front driveway, back lane access but does not accommodate families use of parking or provide parking for guests, visitors, deliveries, parents doing drop-off and pick-up with small children for playdates or when grandparents visit. — single vehicle back lane
1015 — front driveway, family use. Visitors, deliveries park on-street. Back lane access but no back parking — single vehicle back lane.
1007 corner house 29th & St. Christophers — no front driveway, park on side of house along St. Christophers and deal with the congested on-street parking along St. Christophers. So, visitors, guests, deliveries make use of 29th Street East on-street parking.
979 House being built west side of this residence and before 953 — 979 Front driveway, allows for 2 parked cars. Have garage but it is filled with bicycles. No back lane, no back parking. On-street parking used for visitors, guests, deliveries, etc. The house being built beside 979 will have no back lane access and it looks like single lane front drive way. Currently workers park on 29th Street East.
953 House being built east side before 979 — Front driveway that is single lane, so shuffling of 3 vehicles, plus boat, plus utility trailer. Street parking used for shuffling and for visitors, guests, deliveries, etc. No back lane access.
941 — Front driveway access but does not accommodate all vehicles. No back lane access.
929 – Single lane front driveway, no back lane access.

917 – Single lane front driveway but only fits two cars, back-to-back so use of on-street parking utilized for parking and shuffling vehicles. Visitors, guests, contractors, deliveries, etc park on street. No back lane access.

905 – Single lane front driveway. No back lane access.

897 just about corner of 29th & Masefield, side of Masefield house in way – single lane front driveway, no back lane access, use on-street parking for visitors, guests, deliveries, etc. Property that faces Masefield has visitors park along 29th Street East as well.

835 – small vehicle entry from 29th Street East, side of house driveway off of Masefield, no back lane access.

827 corner of 29th & William Ave – front driveway

821 - faces William Ave but designated 29th Street East property – side of house driveway from 29th Street East, no back lane access, uses on-street parking for guests, visitors, deliveries, etc

815 - trail to Boundary Elementary West of property – front driveway, no back lane access

809 - trail to Boundary Elementary East of property – front driveway, no back lane access, utilize street parking for visitors, guests, deliveries, etc

807 – front driveway, no back lane access

805 – front driveway, no back lane access

803 – front driveway, no back lane access

801 – front driveway, no back lane access

793 – no front driveway, back lane access and parking but stairs that can create issues for those with mobility challenges and back parking not for visitors, deliveries, etc. Back lane does not go all the way through either. Entry and exit at Tempe Glen Dr. 793 is where back lane ends.

787 – no front driveway, back lane access but prefers to use on-street parking due to shift work and on-call late nights, on-street parking provides ease and doesn’t disturb rest of family and neighbours. On-street parking used for visitors, guests, deliveries, etc. Also, stairs at back entry and creates issues for those with mobility challenges. Back lane does not
go all the way through either. Entry and exit at Tempe Glen Dr.

779 City of NV – no front driveway, back lane access but one of the residents is nearly 87 yrs and has difficulty with the stairs at the back of her property. Parking on-street creates ease and safety, especially when having to carry in groceries, etc from vehicle. On-street parking used for guests, visitors, soil delivery, general delivery, hired workers, etc. Back lane does not go all the way through either. Entry and exit at Tempe Glen Dr.

775 City of NV – no front driveway, back lane access but stairs as well, which can create mobility challenges and back parking not used for guests, visitors, deliveries, etc Back lane does not go all the way through either. Entry and exit at Tempe Glen Dr.

771 City of NV - no front driveway, back lane access but stairs as well, which can create mobility challenges and back parking not used for guests, visitors, deliveries, etc Back lane does not go all the way through either. Entry and exit at Tempe Glen Dr.

761 City of NV - no front driveway, back lane access but stairs as well, which can create mobility challenges and back parking not used for guests, visitors, deliveries, etc Back lane does not go all the way through either. Entry and exit at Tempe Glen Dr.

757 City of NV, corner of 29th St & Tempe Glen Dr. - no front driveway, back lane access but stairs as well, which can create mobility challenges and back parking not used for guests, visitors, deliveries, etc. Back lane does not go all the way through either. Entry and exit at Tempe Glen Dr.

1062 29th Street East, north east side, @ Fromme Rd. – no front driveway, back lane access. Uses on-street parking for vehicles, guests, visitors, deliveries, etc Narrow back lane. Not enough parking at back.

1050 – no front driveway, back lane access. Uses on-street parking for vehicles, guests, visitors, deliveries, etc Narrow back lane. Not enough parking at back.

1034 – single lane front driveway, back lane access but does not use back lane to access property. Narrow back lane.

1032 – no front driveway, back lane access. Narrow back lane. Not enough parking at back.

1030 – no front driveway, back lane access. Narrow back lane. Not enough parking. On-street parking also used for visitors, such as grandkids, extended family, deliveries, guests, etc.

1022 – small front driveway, one car use, back lane access for one vehicle. Narrow back lane. Last property with back lane access. Utilize on-street parking for personal use, often
due to two large trees on property shared with neighbours. 12 ft. limbs, large pine cones rain down, especially on windy days. One tree leaks sap onto vehicle. Visitors, guests, deliveries, any hired workers utilize street parking. Street parking also utilized due to work hours and not wanting to disturb neighbours with back lane exit and entry.

1014 – single lane, one car use front driveway, no back lane access. On-street parking utilized by tenants, visitors, guests, deliveries, work vehicle that needs to be parked close to home due to previous experience parked farther away and being broken into. On-street parking provides ease with young child.

1006 – single lane, one car use front driveway, no back lane access. Care attendant, extended family, deliveries, visitors, etc make use of on-street parking.

998 – Narrow front driveway. Can park 3 vehicles down side of house but requires daily shuffling so prefers to park on-street for ease. Personal and work vehicles require parking. On-street parking used to accommodate all vehicles at this home, plus for visitors, guests, workers, deliveries, etc. No back lane access.

986 – front single lane driveway, no back lane.

972 - front single lane driveway, no back lane. Visitors, deliveries, etc use on-street parking.

962 - front single lane driveway, no back lane. Visitors, deliveries, etc use on-street parking.

950 - front single lane driveway, no back lane. Visitors, deliveries, etc use on-street parking.

938 - front single lane driveway, no back lane. Visitors, deliveries, etc use on-street parking.

926 - front single lane driveway, no back lane. Visitors, deliveries, etc use on-street parking.

914 Accounting Business – Front driveway that accommodates for 3 spots, used for family and requires shuffling of vehicles. Visitors, guests, deliveries, etc utilize on-street parking. LynchYang Business has 88+ clients that utilize on-street parking. No back lane access.

904 – front driveway, no back lane. Visitors, deliveries, etc use on-street parking.

890 Cedar Mill Daycare – small front driveway that can accommodate only one vehicle at a time. No back lane access. Daycare provides for 10 families. Families utilize on-street parking for drop off and pick up. Visitors, guests, deliveries, clients, etc use on-street parking.

886 – small front driveway, no back lane. Visitors, deliveries, etc use on-street parking.
872 - front single lane driveway, no back lane. Visitors, deliveries, etc use on-street parking.
864 Creative Children Daycare – small front driveway, no back lane. Families utilize on-street parking for drop off and pick up. Visitors, deliveries, etc utilize on-street parking.
858 – front driveway, no back lane.
842 – single lane front driveway, no back lane.
834 – single lane front driveway, no back lane.
830 corner house 29th & William Ave - no front driveway, side driveway off of William Ave, no back lane access.
828 – front single lane driveway, no back lane access.
826 parkland on west side of property
820 – small single lane driveway, no back lane access.
796 – no front driveway, back lane access for parking, accessed from Duchess – unable to accommodate visitor or delivery, etc parking along back lane or at back parking. Limited back parking. One way in and out.
780 – Back parking for up to one vehicle, accessed from Duchess. Unable to accommodate further parking along back lane. Daily use of parking for second vehicle, plus visitors, guests, deliveries, etc. One way in and out.
778 - Back parking for up to one vehicle, accessed from Duchess. Unable to accommodate further parking along back lane. Daily use of parking for second vehicle, plus visitors, guests, deliveries, etc. One way in and out.
772 – narrow single lane front worn-out driveway, no back lane.
762 – front driveway, no back lane – can only accommodate up to 2 vehicles. Utilize street parking.
756 corner house 29th & Royal Ave - no front driveway, no back lane, side of property driveway accessed from Royal Ave
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ATTACHMENT 2

Concepts Rejected and Referred Back to Staff by Council
May 6, 2019
To Improve Bicyclist Safety
FIGURE 5: Segment C - Tempe Crescent (East) to William Avenue

Note: Green bike lanes are for illustrative purposes only, and would not be painted as shown.

FIGURE 6: Segment D – Interim Configuration

*Referred back to staff to improve safety for cyclists due to shared bike/motor vehicle lanes adjacent to on-street parking
**Additional on-street parking stalls potentially retained on an interim basis in this concept approximately 70 between Duchess and Lynn Valley Road