1. OPENING BY THE MAYOR

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

Mayor Mike Little stated that:

- All persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by the proposed bylaws will be afforded a reasonable opportunity to be heard and to present written submissions;
- Council will use the established speakers list. At the end of the speakers list, the Chair may call on speakers from the audience;
- Each speaker will have five minutes to address Council for a first time and should begin remarks to Council by stating their name;
- After everyone who wishes to speak has spoken once, speakers will then be allowed one additional five minute presentation;
- If a written submission has been submitted there is no need to read it as it will have already been seen by Council. It can be summarized, ensuring that the comments are pertaining to these bylaws under consideration at this hearing;
- All members of the audience are asked to be respectful of one another as diverse opinions are expressed. Council wishes to hear everyone’s views in an open and impartial forum;
- Everyone at the Hearing will be provided an opportunity to speak. If necessary, the Hearing will continue on a second night;
- Any additional presentations will only be allowed at the discretion of the Chair;
• Council is here to listen to the public, not to debate the merits of the bylaws;
• At the conclusion of the public input Council may request further information from staff, which may or may not require an extension of the hearing, or Council may close the hearing, after which Council should not receive further new information from the public;
• The binder containing documents and submissions related to the bylaw is available on the side table to be viewed; and,
• The Public Hearing is being streamed live over the internet and recorded in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

2. INTRODUCTION OF BYLAWS BY CLERK

Mr. James Gordon, Manager – Administrative Services, introduced the proposed bylaws, stating that Bylaw 8397 proposes to amend the District’s Official Community Plan land use designation of the subject site from Institutional to Parks Open Space and Natural Area in the northern portion of the site and to Residential Level 6: Medium Density Apartment in the southern portion of the site. Bylaw 8398 proposes to amend the District’s Zoning Bylaw by rezoning the subject site from Public Assembly to Neighbourhood Park in the northern portion of the site and to a new Comprehensive Development Zone 128 (CD128) in the southern portion of the site. The CD128 Zone addresses uses, density, height, setbacks, building and site coverage, parking and bicycle regulations, and location regulations.

3. PRESENTATION BY STAFF

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Planner, provided an overview of the proposal, elaborating on the introduction by the Manager – Administrative Services. Mr. Zhang advised that:
• The Delbrook Lands are bound by West Queens Road, Stanley Avenue, West Windsor Road and Mission Creek;
• The subject property is approximately 4.4 acres (17,600m²) and is currently occupied by the former Delbrook Community Centre, a childcare facility, two parking lots and three tennis courts;
• Surrounding neighbours include an apartment building to the southwest and single family homes on all remaining sides;
• When the Delbrook Community Centre moved to its new location, the District conducted an extensive engagement process regarding the future of the Delbrook Lands. The result of the process was a vision for the site that included: a neighbourhood park, childcare, a care facility, and affordable housing;
• On July 22, 2019, Council passed motions directing staff to continue engagement with the public to create a detailed design for the neighbourhood park; initiate design work for a building consisting of one storey of community service (seniors’ respite care) and three storeys of social housing above and to prepare an Official Community Plan amendment bylaw and a Zoning Bylaw amendment bylaw for Council’s consideration consistent with this motion;
• The bylaws divide the site into two portions and within each of these portions, the bylaws propose corresponding OCP and Zoning changes reflective of the proposed mixed uses on the site;
• The northern portion of the site is approximately 3.5 acres and covers 81% of the land;
• The southern portion of the site is currently occupied by the existing south parking lot and is approximately 0.84 acres (36,600 sq. ft.);
• The fundamental intent of these bylaws is to allow for a new Neighbourhood Park on the northern portion, and to allow for a four-storey building on the southern portion, consisting of low to moderate income rental and a seniors’ care facility;
• Tonight’s public hearing is not regarding the design of the park, but specifically regarding the two proposed bylaws;
• These bylaws do not tie the park to any specific design and are necessary to allow the use of a neighbourhood park on these lands;
• Should these bylaws be adopted by Council, further refinement of the park design will continue based on public and Council input, all of which will be referred back to Council by the Parks Department;
• The CD128 Zone has no minimum parking requirements for the residential component of the building;
• At First Reading, Council expressed interest in exploring Transportation Demand Management strategies in order to reduce the parking required and thereby lower construction costs;
• Removing the minimum parking requirement does not mean that all future development at this site must have no parking for residents but that there is flexibility built into the zone so that the amount of residential parking can be determined by Council in collaboration with the future non-profit housing provider and following a public process. These details will be secured through the Development Permit process and a Lease Agreement; and,
• The maximum number of storeys permitted is four, excluding the parking level. The site slopes down to the west. Therefore, it is likely that an underground parking level will be completely buried on the east end but may be partially exposed on west end. This level of detail is subject to future building designs, which will also include a public process and opportunities to comment on the design.

4. REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

4.1. Mr. Don Peters, 600 Block West Queens Road:
   • Spoke in support of the proposed development;
   • Thanked staff for reducing the height of the proposed building; and,
   • Commented that the proposed development satisfies the vision of the Official Community Plan.

4.2. Mr. Jon Carrodus, 1300 Block Oakwood Crescent:
   • Thanked staff for addressing the concerns of District residents; and,
   • Requested the proposed development be built with net zero building code requirements.

4.3. Ms. Nicole Reichardt, 300 Block West 2nd Street:
   • Spoke in support of the proposed development;
   • Requested the proposed development be built with net zero building code requirements; and,
   • Commented on the importance of retaining trees.

4.4. Mr. John Gilmour, 2900 Block Bushnell Place:
   • Spoke in support of the proposed bylaws;
• Spoke to the increased need for seniors’ care facilities on the North Shore;
• Commented that more housing options are needed;
• Suggested that removing the minimum parking requirement may encourage more people to walk;
• Opined that the proposed building is aesthetically pleasing; and,
• Opined that net zero building code requirements may not be appropriate for creating affordable housing options.

4.5. Mr. Peter Teevan, 1900 Block Indian River Drive:
• Thanked Council for rejecting the first proposal;
• Spoke in support of the proposed bylaws;
• Commented on the need for more rental housing;
• Suggested considering social housing options for seniors; and,
• Expressed concern regarding reduced parking requirements.

4.6. Mr. Barry Goodwin, 600 Block Roche Point Drive:
• Spoke in support of the proposed bylaws;
• Encouraged staff to move forward with this development in a timely manner;
• Commented that more affordable housing is needed; and,
• Expressed concern with the affordability of rent.

4.7. Mr. James Gill, 500 Block West Kings Road:
• Spoke in opposition to the proposed project;
• Opined that the proposed development is not consistent with the Official Community Plan; and,
• Suggested that this project be postponed until a thorough review of the Official Community Plan is completed.

4.8. Ms. Linda Travers, 600 Block West Queens Road:
• Expressed concern that the proposal does not comply with the Official Community Plan;
• Thanked staff for reducing the height of the building; and,
• Commented that more affordable seniors housing is needed.

4.9. Mr. Bruce Tennant, 400 Block East 4th Street:
• Spoke in support of the conceptual park design; and,
• Suggested a memorial be installed in remembrance of the Delbrook High School.

4.10. Mr. Keith Collyer, 400 Block West Windsor Road:
• Thanked staff for improving the project by addressing the concerns of the residents;
• Opined that the park will be well used;
• Suggested lowering the building height on the south side of the property;
• Expressed concern with the massing of the building; and,
• Commented that not enough parking stalls are being provided.

4.11. Mr. Renee Gourley, 600 Block St. Ives Crescent:
• Spoke on behalf of the Delbrook Community Association;
• Thanked the District for planning the Delbrook site in its entirety;
• Opined that Park Option 1 is too busy;
• Commented that more family-oriented housing is needed; and,
• Questioned how parking will be mitigated.

4.12. Mr. Roger Goodwin, 4300 Block Quinton Place:
• Commented on the positive effect of interaction between young children and seniors in care.

4.13. Mr. Roger Nicholas, 3200 Block William Avenue:
• Spoke in support of the proposed project;
• Requested four tennis courts be considered; and,
• Commented that not enough parking stalls are being provided.

4.14. Mr. David Bolt, 600 Block West 29th Street:
• Sought clarification regarding the existing building west of the proposed site.

Staff advised that there is an existing building to the west of the proposed site.

4.15. Ms. Barbra McKinley, 3800 Block Norwood Avenue:
• Questioned if a daycare is permitted on this site.

Staff advised that daycare use is permitted in any zone in the District of North Vancouver.

4.16. Mr. Steve Rainboth, District Resident:
• Expressed concern that not enough parking is proposed and will negatively affect the neighbourhood.

4.17. Mr. Corrie Kost, 2800 Block Colwood Drive:
• Spoke in support of pre-zoning, noting that the District owns the land;
• Questioned the proposed height of the building;
• Suggested that people with lower incomes and seniors may walk more; and,
• Commented that parking is expensive.

4.18. Ms. Diana Belhouse, 500 Block Granada Crescent:
• Expressed concern with parking issues stating that an inadequate number of parking stalls are proposed; and,
• Requested a fourth tennis court be considered.

4.19. Mr. James Gill: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME:
• Opined that the proposed height of the building is not appropriate for the area; and,
• Commented on the need for a more well-considered plan for affordable housing in the District.

4.20. Mr. Terry Gould, Kings Road:
• Questioned the proposed height of the building.
4.21. Mr. Renee Gourley: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME:
   • Spoke in support of reduced parking; and,
   • Stated that the proposed bicycle parking is insufficient.

4.22. Mr. Keith Collier: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME:
   • Expressed concern with parking issues stating that an inadequate number of
     parking stalls are proposed.

4.23. Mr. Roger Nicholas: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME:
   • Commented on the need for people to park their scooters and other forms of
     transportation.

4.24. Mr. Corrie Kost: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME:
   • Commented that residents of the North Shore are dependent on their cars.

4.25. Mr. John Gilmour: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME:
   • Commented that lowering the building may reduce the land value;
   • Opined that this is a good location for reduced parking; and,
   • Suggested voting on second and third readings the same night the Public
     Hearing closes.

4.26. Mr. Terry Gould: SPEAKING A SECOND TIME:
   • Expressed concern with the proposed height of the building.

4.27. Mr. Hesam Dehimi, 3200 Block William Avenue:
   • Opined that the height of the proposed building is misleading; and,
   • Spoke in support of the project commenting that more affordable housing
     options are needed.

4.28. Mr. Alan Jamison, District Resident:
   • Expressed concern with parking issues.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that all development permit
requirements for both the neighbourhood park and the four-storey building will be
considered at the development permit stage, which will occur after the bylaws are
adopted and that there will also be an opportunity for further public consultation during
the detailed design phase.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that Council will have the
opportunity to specify the environmental standards of the proposed development.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the unit number, mix and level
of affordability has not yet been determined and will be decided with a future non-profit
housing provider.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the building height is typically
measured from the bottom to the top of the building based on the architectural drawings.
In the absence of a detailed building design, a maximum height can still be set, through
geodetic elevations. In this case, the maximum roof elevation is set at 380’ above sea
level. For context, the roof elevation of the existing apartment building to the west is approximately 365' above sea level and the site slopes down from east to west.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the Parks and Natural Environment Advisory Committee met on September 25, 2019 to review the preferred conceptual plan and it was noted that the committee had no objections to the design of the park.

5. COUNCIL RESOLUTION

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT the October 22, 2019 Public Hearing is closed;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan Bylaw 7900, 2011, Amendment Bylaw 8397, 2019 (Amendment 38)” be returned to Council for further consideration;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1388 (Bylaw 8398)” be returned to Council for further consideration.

CARRIED
(8:29 pm)

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

Confidential Council Clerk
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