The District of North Vancouver

INFORMATION REPORT TO COUNCIL

September 19, 2019
File: 08.3060.20/025.17

AUTHOR: Darren Veres, Development Planner

SUBJECT: Developer’s Open House: 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

REASON FOR REPORT:

The purpose of this report is to inform Council of an upcoming developer-led open house. This open house has been initiated by the developer and is not part of the District planning application process requirements.

SUMMARY:

Anthem Properties Ltd held a formal Public Information Meeting for the redevelopment of the property located at 904 – 944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates) on October 4, 2017. They recently revised their application and are holding a “community open house” to update the public of their recent changes. Given the nature of the event, District staff will not attend, however, a report summarizing the event will be provided by the applicant and recorded in the project file.

DETAILS:

Date: Saturday, October 5, 2019
Time: 12:00pm – 3:00pm (drop in)
Location: Ron Andrews Rec Centre - The Windsor Room
931 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA:

The site was previously occupied by 114 townhouses which were recently demolished. The site is now vacant and surrounded by construction fencing. The property is approximately 25,340 m² (6.26 acres) in area.

The site is currently designated “Residential Level 5: Low Density Apartment” (RESS) in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The Maplewood Local Plan envisions the site for multi-family residential development, up to a maximum floor space ratio (FSR) of 1.2.

The site is currently zoned “Multi-Family Residential Zone 3” (RM3) and the proposal will require rezoning to a new comprehensive development (CD) zone to accommodate the residential multi-family proposal.

Surrounding properties include single-detached homes to the east, Ron Andrews Recreation Centre to the west, a gas station and single-detached homes to the north on the opposite side of Mount Seymour Parkway, and Windsor Secondary School to the south.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant proposes to subdivide the site into four parcels in order to develop approximately 341 homes in two phases:

- Site 1 — a six-storey strata apartment building with 119 units including 25 units to be offered as part of a “Rent to Own” program;
- Site 2 — seven four-storey strata buildings containing total of 102 stacked-townhouse units including one 3-bedroom townhome allocated to Habitat for Humanity Greater Vancouver;
- Site 3 — six three-storey strata buildings containing a total of 31 conventional townhouse units with at-grade garages; and
- Site 4 — a six-storey rental apartment building with a total of 89 units (33 of which are to be rented at below-market rates) and 87.7 m² (943 sq ft) of commercial space.
Sites 1, 2, and 4 are proposed to be constructed in the first phase of the project while Site 3 will be subject to a separate Development Permit application at a later date (see Phasing Plan).

Each site will have its own parking, to meet the need for residential and visitor parking. At this time, approximately 581 parking spaces are proposed across the project.

**FORMAT OF MEETING:**

The event is formatted as a “community open house” and is intended to give neighbours and members of the public an opportunity to review and comment on recent changes made by the applicant to the proposal. The applicant will prepare a summary of the public input gathered at the event which will be forwarded to Council in the staff report at Council’s consideration of the detailed application. A copy of the meeting notification package is attached.
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION:

Given that this open house has been initiated by the developer and is not part of the District planning application process requirements, the notification package does not adhere with the District’s notification policy or standard practices. Staff did not have an opportunity to review the applicant’s materials in advance of notification.

The notification package includes the following items:

1. A notification postcard sent to 5,966 owners and occupants in the Seymour area (Attachment 1);
2. Two 4’x 8’ notification signs (one on Mount Seymour Parkway facing towards west and the other at the end of Lytton Street – see map below) (Attachment 2) – staff direction for the October 4, 2017 PIM was to place one sign on Lytton Street near intersection with Mount Seymour Parkway and the other on Mount Seymour Parkway near intersection with Lytton Street;
3. 4 banners erected along the construction fencing onsite in three separate locations (Mount Seymour Parkway frontage, on the corner of Mount Seymour Parkway and Lytton Street, and along Lytton Street frontage - see map below) (Attachment 3);
4. A newspaper advertisement placed in one edition of the North Shore News; and
5. A website created at seymourestates.ca.
Darren Veres
Development Planner

Attachments

1. Notification Postcard
2. Notification Signage
3. Construction Fencing Banners
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th>External Agencies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Community Dev.</td>
<td>Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>NS Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Operations</td>
<td>NVRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Museum &amp; Arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Open House

Anthem invites you to attend a Community Open House to view our revised plans to renew the vacant site at 904-944 Lytton Street ("Seymour Estates").

Anthem's proposed project, if approved by Council, will include an exciting Rent to Own program (RTO). The RTO program, the first of its kind in North Vancouver, will provide local, first time buyers who live or work in North Vancouver with the opportunity to transition to home ownership.

A neighbourhood coffee shop and a diverse range of housing opportunities (strata homes, market rental and below market rental housing) are also proposed. To learn more and share your input, please drop by our Community Open House. An expert will also be available to answer questions about the RTO program.

For more information, please visit SeymourEstates.ca

View of proposed development looking south east from Mount Seymour Parkway and Lytton Street
Community Open House

Anthem invites you to attend a Community Open House to view our revised plans to renew the vacant site at 904-944 Lytton Street ("Seymour Estates").

Anthem's proposed project, if approved by Council, will include an exciting Rent to Own program (RTO). The RTO program, the first of its kind in North Vancouver, will provide local, first time buyers who live or work in North Vancouver with the opportunity to transition to home ownership.

A neighbourhood coffee shop and a diverse range of housing opportunities (strata homes, market rental and below market rental housing) are also proposed. To learn more and share your input, please drop by our Community Open House.

An expert will also be available to answer questions about the RTO program.

For more information, please visit SeymourEstates.ca

This event is hosted by the District of North Vancouver

Please Join Us

Date: Saturday, October 5, 2019
Time: 12:00pm - 3:00pm (drop in)
Place: Ron Andrews Rec Centre
Address: 931 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
The District of North Vancouver
INFORMATION REPORT TO COUNCIL

September 20, 2017
File: 08.3060.20/025.17

AUTHOR: Darren Veres, Development Planner

SUBJECT: Public Information Meeting: 904 - 944 Lytton Street ("Seymour Estates")

REASON FOR REPORT:
The purpose of this report is to inform Council of an upcoming Public Information Meeting.

SUMMARY:
Anthem Properties Ltd is hosting a Public Information Meeting for a detailed application for a redevelopment project at 904 – 944 Lytton Street.

The staff report to Council on the detailed application will include a summary of the input received at this Public Information Meeting.

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING DETAILS:
Date: Wednesday, October 4, 2017
Time: 6:00PM
Location: Small Gym
Windsor Secondary School
931 Broadview Drive
SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA:

The site is located at the southeast corner of Mount Seymour Parkway and Lytton Street. It is currently occupied by 114 fractional-interest apartments in 8 buildings that were built in 1969. Surrounding uses include single-family homes to the east and north, Windsor Secondary School to the south, and Ron Andrews Recreation Centre to the west.

Official Community Plan:

The site is designated in the Official Community Plan as Residential Level 5 (RES5) which permits a floor space ratio (FSR) of up to 1.75. The site is currently zoned Residential Multifamily 3 (RM3) and the proposal will require a rezoning to a Comprehensive Development Zone.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is for two six-storey apartment buildings containing 200 units in total, six townhouse buildings each containing 31 units, and seven stacked-townhome buildings containing 102 units for a total of 333 units.

The unit mix is proposed to include:
- 1 Bedroom 41
- 1 Bedroom + Den 18
- 2 Bedroom 77
- 2 Bedroom + Den 48
- 3 Bedroom 117
- 3 Bedroom + Den 6
- 4 Bedroom 24

A total of 43 rental replacement units are being proposed. Thirty five of these units will be market rental and eight of these will be affordable rental in accordance with Canadian and Mortgage Housing Corporation affordability level 2.
Overall density proposed is approximately 1.28 FSR.

Respectfully submitted,

Darren Veres
Development Planner

Attachment A: Notification Flyer

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

Document: 3311007
Notice of a Public Information Meeting in Your Neighbourhood

Anthem Properties is hosting a Public Information Meeting to present a development proposal for 333 multi-family units at 904 – 944 Lytton Street.

This information package is being distributed to owners and occupants within a minimum 100 metres of the proposed development site in accordance with the District of North Vancouver policy.

Meeting Time and Location:

Wednesday, October 4, 2017
6:00-7:30pm
Windsor Secondary School, Small Gym
931 Broadview Drive

Meeting Agenda:

- Doors Open: 6:00pm
- Open House: 6:00-6:30pm
- Presentation and Q+A 6:30-7:30pm

For Further Information Please Contact:

Emily Howard
604-235-3182

Darren Veres
604-990-2487

Anthem Properties
District of North Vancouver, Planning Department
The Proposal:

Anthem Properties is proposing to construct a 333 unit multi-family development at 904 – 944 Lytton Street, at the corner of Lytton and Mount Seymour Parkway.

The proposal is for 133 townhomes, 157 condominiums and 43 rental apartments, which will include a mix of studio, 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom, 3-bedroom and 4-bedroom units.

The site will be accessible from two points off Lytton Street. Parking will be located in three separate underground parking garages with attached, two-car garages for the at-grade townhome units. A total of 507 parking spaces are provided for the residents along with 92 visitor parking spaces.

The proposal includes a redesign of Lytton Street featuring a new road, sidewalks, multi-use paths and major upgrades to the municipal utility services. Anthem would also make a community amenity contribution to the District of North Vancouver.
PROCESS FOR APPLICATIONS REQUIRING REZONING
THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

#1 Proponent submits Preliminary Application which includes opportunity for feedback from the community

#2 Proponent submits Detailed Rezoning Application

#3 Planning co-ordinates review by staff and advisory bodies

#4 Information Report to Council
Planning informs Council on the applicant's intention to hold a Public Information Meeting in the neighbourhood

#5 Public Information Meeting
Meeting is organized and held by the applicant in the neighbourhood

#6 Detailed Staff Report
Detailed report to Council on the project including a summary on the outcome of the Public Information Meeting. Report recommends Council introduce rezoning bylaw and set a Public Hearing date or reject the application.

Council requests Revisions

#7 Public Hearing Held

#8 Bylaw Returned to Council
Council may request clarification on issues raised at the Public Hearing, defeat the Bylaw, or give 2nd and 3rd reading

#9 Council adopts Bylaw or defeats Bylaw

Typical Timeframe

3 - 6 months

Typical Range:
15-20 months*

Should you wish to contact District Council, they can be reached at: council@dnv.org

*Time requirements can vary due to the specifics of individual projects.
To: Darren Veres, Development Planner, District of North Vancouver  
T: 604.990.2487   E: veresd@dnv.org

Emily Howard, Anthem Properties  
T: 604.235.3182   E: ehoward@AnthemProperties.com

From: Catherine Rockandel, IAF Certified Professional Facilitator, Rockandel & Associates  
T: 1-604-898-4614   E: cat@growpartnerships.com

Re: Public Information Meeting Summary for 904 – 944 Lytton Street

Date: October 4, 2017

Event Date: Wednesday, October 4, 2017
Time: 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM
Location: Windsor Secondary School, Small Gym, 931 Broadview, North Vancouver
Attendees: Sixty-four (64) signed in, with seven (7) not signing in
Comment Forms: Provided to Darren Veres, District of North Vancouver Planning

Notification
Flyer Invitation
400 invitation letters delivered to homes to a minimum of 100 metres of the site. The notification flyer also included the one page District of North Vancouver Process for Applications Requiring Rezoning.

In addition notices were emailed to the Presidents of Blueridge Community Association (Eric Andersen) and Seymour Community Association (Lorraine Harvey) for distribution to their members.

The nearby Kiwanis Care Centre was sent several copies of the notice so that they could post them throughout their facility

Site Signs
There were two (2) site signs erected, one on Lytton Street and one on Mt. Seymour Parkway on Sept. 13th notifying the community of the meeting.

Newspaper Advertisement
Advertisements were placed in the North Shore News on September 27 and 29, 2017.

Attendees: A total of seventy-one (71) citizens were in attendance. In addition, the following project team members and District of North Vancouver staff were in attendance.
District of North Vancouver
Darren Veres, Development Planner

Project Team
Property Owner: Anthem Properties
Rob Blackwell, Sr. VP Development
Brent Carlson, Director of Development
Riaan de Beer, Director Development
Brennan Finley, Development Coordinator
Paul Faibish, VP Development
Simon Taylor, Director Development
Emily Howard, Community Relations Manager

Architect:
Thomas Palmer, Architect, Integra Architecture

Landscape Architect:
Michael Patterson, Landscape Architect, Perry and Associates

Transportation Planning:
Dan Ross, Transportation Planner, Bunt & Associates

Facilitator
Catherine Rockandel, Rockandel & Associates

Anthem Properties proposes to rezone the site to permit a 333 unit multi-family development consisting of 133 townhomes, 157 condominiums and 43 rental apartments. Stacked townhomes and apartment units will be constructed over 3 underground parkades, while the ground-oriented townhomes have attached two-car garages.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Q & A (Index: Q: Questions C: Comment A: Answers)

C1 What does FSR stand for?
A1 Floor space ratio is what it stands for. It is a relationship that deals with the area of the site and how much building you can build. For example if you have 100 square feet and have an FSR of 1 you can build 100 square feet. That would be the total area you could build. If you had 1.5, you could build 150 square feet. This total amount for example, can be broken up over 1 or more storeys.

Q2 So it is basically density?
A2 That’s right

Q3 You obviously are trying to attract a lot of younger people with families, you’re increasing the number of units dramatically. We have had schools close in the area. There is one, Seymour Heights School that is left. Can it accommodate a lot more children who could be moving into the area?
Thank you, this question would need to be addressed by the School District.

Wondering if there is anyone here who can address traffic and transit issues. My understanding is that the number of units will be roughly triple what there is now.

As far as the number of units goes, currently there is 114 units on the site in its current format. The FSR is derived under that .75 FSR. What we are proposing at this point in time is 333 units and that is using an FSR including the rentals of 1.28. Under the OCP, if we were to follow and try to submit our rezoning application on that, we would actually be even higher. We would be close to between 450 and 500 units. We could be even trying for 5 times as many. Yes it could be close to triple.

We already know that the second narrows bridge is over used and now we are going to triple the number of vehicles in this particular development. These aren’t the only units that are going to be built. There are lots more people coming in to the area. What are the plans in terms of solving the bottleneck on the second narrows bridge? With so many more people coming in, the transit itself, which is really not very good at the moment, is going to be even more taxed. I am wondering what the plans are to address both of those issues?

Some of you may have seen one of the slides closest to the exit. I think Thomas pointed it out, there is one slide #5. There is a big picture element and a small picture element. We had our previous Open House. We had this slide up and the ministry is pouring about 500 million dollars into elevating the worst bottleneck area on the shore. We had our previous Open House a lot of people were complaining about traffic around the bridge is bad and yes it is. The Ministry is doing two things essentially with this plan. It took me a while to look at it and I saw some of you staring at it long and hard. They are separating out more of the through traffic from the highways and bridge traffic and adding more capacity onto and off the highway to the local roads. This will decrease the amount of merging and weaving and interacting between the local and through traffic. It is not going to solve every problem but will make getting between areas on the North Shore a lot easier. It will make getting to and from the city much easier and on and off that bridge much easier. It is not going to solve every traffic issue further downstream, say in Surrey or in the City or in Burnaby. When this thing is finished it will be less bad getting to and from the bridge and getting to and from other areas of the North Shore. The small picture, yes you are right there will be some more traffic generated by the development that is true. One of the things we want to note is that it is not a green field, there is some traffic coming to and from the existing units. There will be some more vehicles coming in and out especially in the peaks. The analysis we did shows approximately 2 vehicles per minute leaving in the morning and 2 returning per minute in the PM peak hours. Going forward, the District has asked us to consider options to improve signalization. To be honest the effects of this particular development are not going to have a huge impact on the intersection itself. The biggest impacts we have found are the background traffic growth between now and the point in which the District wanted us to look at our horizons years which is 2022 and 2030. We counted cars and built out those numbers.
based on a ratio. In the future we have the option of improving the signalization for all vehicles coming into that intersection at once. It will still be these numbers coming in and out in the peak areas, that is just the way those number of units work out. As far as transit goes, that is always a good question. I don’t know what Translink’s implementation is of its 10 year plan and how it is going to work. I understand there is supposed to be some more transit.

C6 My comment is about Lytton Street. I have real concerns with soccer and the dance studio there. With the flow of traffic on that street when you have people making left hand turns into the apartment complex. You have people going right into Ron Andrews, and you have people going straight to the end. I think there is a real chance for lots of car accidents and lots of traffic backed up on Mount Seymour. Trying to get around the corner and out of that area. The bubble and the dance studio are very dangerous with children running around there. Now you have that many children in this complex crossing Mount Seymour Parkway to go to the local school. I think there is some serious traffic concerns that really need to be addressed. There is a lot of potential for back up and accidents.

A6 One thing that is not included here is some of the civil engineer drawings. The District wants the equivalent of traffic calming, they don’t want to call it traffic calming though, on Lytton itself. There will be build outs into the width of the road way to slow down vehicles, to create parking which will add a buffer and a traffic calming presence on Lytton. Again that wasn’t included on these particular set of drawings but is something the District is insisting upon as part of this whole plan. As far as further to the south towards that dance studio and the end of that open cul-de-sac, that is going to have to be determined. This isn’t going to solve every existing issue. The fact that there will just be more vehicles in and out but they will be coming in and out of the driveways to the North. In addition to the traffic calming measure on Lytton, there will be sidewalks on both sides of the street. Close to some of the highest standards that the District has. There will be sidewalks on both sides of the street, better capacity to cross the street and for vehicles coming in at slower speeds. In addition to that there will be some capacity enhancements at that intersection primarily through some ability to sort of re-coordinate the signals themselves. On the one hand you want to make things slower and safer but on the other hand sometimes people say well we just have to get more cars through. There has to be a balance and that is what we are trying to do.

C7 Thanks for your presentation. One of the big topics of course is transportation density in the Seymour area. Has the developer considered car co-op programs such as Evo? On a larger project that is often something that is considered and reduces the number of cars and improves the affordability for the people who are living in the development, they don’t need a second car. For the District, is there, for staff, a consideration for more affordable and market rental units? There is a tremendous shortage in the District right now and would there be consideration for an increased density to allow for more market rental units both affordable and below market. Another question would be the trade off
on density and the number of units stacked town houses vs. traditional 3 storey. You mentioned the downsizers, people moving out of the houses, often they don’t like 3 storey town houses so stacked could be more popular for people downsizing. In addition would you be able to get more units onto the site to do that. Another question was an offsite daycare considered for the families moving in to this development? Have you considered an off site daycare amenity with Ron Andrews and also with Canlan. They are a tremendous community facility they are so close by and there is a shortage of daycare.

In regards to car share options, yes we are actively looking at that. It is a bit of a challenge in this location. There are two types of car shares out there, one of them you bring the car back to the location where you have taken it from - the other type you drop the car where ever there is an open spot. Car2go is a good example of that type of system. Those kinds of car share companies are not eager to move into what they see as outlying areas because they have a problem with a stacking effect. People moving cars from one direction and not bringing them back. Our best option here is something like Modo or Zip Car. We are pursuing both of those companies right now to see if there is a possibility that they might be interested in doing something on this side. In regards to offsite daycare, I think it is an interesting comment. We have not perused anything like that at this point. I think it is a good comment that you are making.

(D. Veres) Anthem is proposing, I believe, 43 rental and 8 non market at the CMHC level 2 rates at this point. We are in the process of reviewing that proposal to see how it meets the objective of our Affordable Housing Strategy. There is always options I think at this point, to look at potentially adding more in exchange for density as well, as Brent from Anthem mentioned. They are under density at this point so there is some opportunity there. Again that has to be balanced with the forms on the site, the density on the site, what’s acceptable. If you add more units you are affecting the density and it is a tough trade off. I think it is something we would be willing to consider and to look at.

I agree with your comments relative to the density on the site and it’s because it is so much below the official community plan that went through extensive discussion for many years that there could be an opportunity for bringing in more affordable housing into the region. This is so necessary right now. The question that was not answered would be the density tradeoffs number of units, stacked town houses vs. the 3 storey and what the tradeoffs might be there?

When we took over this property in January of this year, there was some existing rentals in place that investors, owners, chose to go out and rent those units out so they are on the secondary market as rentals. We have looked at saying to the District, we will take those rentals that are in place and make those designated, as was said earlier, in perpetuity as rental that is there forever. If you take those 43 units off the 333 that we are proposing, that leaves us 290 units. It is well known that when you develop communities, there are end users and investor users. Quite often what you have is a high percentage of investors who will then rent those out again in the secondary market. The District has a number that they use and it is in excess of 20% of units would be going back
C11 I have similar comments about the traffic issues on Broadview Drive. I sat in my window and our property immediately abuts the park area that will be at the end of the internal road. We front on the pedestrian access through our front yard. As far as traffic goes, there is in excess of 90 – 110 cars every morning coming down the cul-de-sac and
dropping kids off. We don’t expect there will be a larger number of cars but if there is more foot traffic, that is the same concern. With respect to pedestrian access route, is it intended to be 2 ways or 1 way? I ask because the road inside has been stressed and is an internal strata road, a private road. From my perspective, that is the quickest way for me to get to the Ron Andrews or the ice rink rather than having to go all the way down through the school or all the way around. There could be some traffic going that way if we are allowed to trespass on those strata roads. That is a question

A11 Yes it is a public access through the site so with the purple dotted lines, you as a neighbouring resident would be free to walk through there as well.

Q12 My next question is about storm water management, not during construction as I expect that would be taken care of during the Environmental Management Plan. The District of North Vancouver has invested a lot of time and effort and money into rain gardens and similar storm water management features like that. There aren’t any creeks in this particular site but there are some adjacent to it. McCartney Creek is a salmon bearing creek to the East. It would be a shame if we just had typical curb gutter storm drains dumping into McCartney. There will be an increase in surfaces on this site so I am wondering if there are any innovative storm water management features considered. The last question I have is about the construction phasing. We live right there so I am interested in how it is going to be phased. I understand it probably won’t start until late 2018 or early 2019 but will the whole site be demolished at one go? Will it be demolished in phases and built in phases and if so, where are you going start? In our back yard or as far away? Do you have any idea of that now?

A12 Our civil consultant, who is not here tonight, has put together a Storm Water Management Plan, which is part of our submission. That is in front of the District right now to vet through and they will comment accordingly. We will have a mixture of onsite infiltration and attention for storm water management. There will be measures on site where it will filtrate through various means. We have to do that type of thing to get approval with the District. In terms of construction phasing, right now the submission that is in front of the District is for an overall rezoning of the site and a development permit application for half of the site. The top half of this site, if you take a look at this internal strata road to the north that would be the first phase. That would be constructed out from the west moving east along the north quadrant. How we would have to tackle this, because there is, in terms of demolition, it would have to happen at one time. When we take over, we have to put in all the infrastructure for storm water. Put in the water lines, the hydro and everything. The internal loop road has to be built and constructed here and that will help for construction management because when we are doing that we will stage our construction management down here so we can access the site up top. We will not be on Lytton Street. There is a tree buffer that is fortunate, and will be retained of course. Hopefully that will provide some separation for you in the inconvenience and discomfort you will probably go through for a period of time.
The plan is in place right now and it is totally dependent on the District, in their process but we would be looking to start demolition in more or less this time next year. Probably September.

C13 How long in total time for the build?

A13 For the entire site, we are looking at 4-5 years.

C14 I want to bring a safety concern to the attention of both the developer and the District. I am a witness to this every day. There is 860 students enrolled in Windsor Secondary and according to our neighbours there are 100 odd cars. This means there are 600 pedestrians per day. Their primary route is the sidewalk on the east side of Lytton to go both to the gas station, residences and the bus stops. There is no sidewalk on the west side of Lytton Street. I ask you to pay special care and attention because not only do the kids come from about 7:30 – 9 in the morning, they also go up that route at lunch time and coming and going throughout the day. I think you are going to need extra flag people maybe perhaps build a temporary sidewalk on the west side. With that amount of foot traffic, it is going to be a concern and I wanted to bring it to your attention.

C15 My question is also on the subject of traffic. Not vehicular in that sense it is about bicycles. I am pleased that you are preparing for 666 bike spots, wondering is there also spaces for residents to repair their bikes? That would be a nice thing to have. The other thing is, as a long time resident here, I frequent the Ron Andrews pool and happened to come to one of the apartments not too long ago with a neighbour who is almost 90 and we couldn’t find any parking. We didn’t know about any visitor parking and we had to park at Ron Andrews. This shows you the difficulty that seniors have in trying to get to a destination. For myself, I don’t go to Ron Andrews these days because I am mostly on 2 wheels. When I come up from Maplewood, and I know you are planning a lot of big development down there as well, I go up Windridge and I go past the residence and the care home and in through the trails. I come out at Lytton and then I wonder where can I go and I am heading to points east. It is a tough job. You either go down the trail which is big loss, circle around the school. It is very hard to get through here or you go on Seymour Parkway. In the District here in the North Shore, there is a thing called the Spirit Trail. There has been a lot of talk about that but in this part of the North Shore there has been very little action. I am surprised that this hasn’t come up in your plan because if you look at the map for the North Shore for the Spirit Trail, this is one of the routes through that leads into the east. The big problem we face here are the creeks. Bicycles are a solution for the future so I would like to see some effort made.

A15 (D. Veres) In regards to the Spirit Trail question, the Spirit Trail east alignment hasn’t been totally determined. I know at some point in the future there is a desire to have a bridge crossing McCartney Creek and that would like be where the Spirit Trail will connect. It will be somewhere probably south of the school site and likely be an extension of Windridge. At this point it is uncertain. As part of the CAC for this project, it is potential that funds could be directed toward the construction of the trail farther to the east.
On site we will have a bicycle repair room as well for the bike users. It is important in this day and age.

**C16** I am a member of the North Shore Hub, which is a cycling group, and we often have discussions with developers and we try to help out in this problem. We are trying to get better routes for cyclists of all ages. If you look at what has happened in West Van and in the City of North Van and the Spirit Trail, it is a big thing. It has to be a safe route, not just for cyclists but for the kids going to school and not being driven to school.

**A16** I would like to extend the invitation for you to sit down and have a conversation in the next few weeks and talk about bicycling needs and go through what we are providing. See if there is any input that you can give us.

**C17** I am a homeowner in one of the neighbouring lots on Mount Seymour Parkway. I have a couple of comments, especially since it is being recorded for city staff. First of all, I really like the design, I think it is really pleasing and I commend you on what appears to be a really thoughtful and a good-looking project. I hope it continues along this line. I really like the idea of the boulevard off the parkway separating the sidewalk from the street. Every morning I watch as my own children and hundreds of other children are making their way both to and from both Seymour Heights and Windsor. I think moving our population off this really busy street is a really important thing. I suppose I would look at this and say, well if you are doing it in this section why don’t we just run it the whole way down to Broadview and move that section of traffic. It is really where the congestion happens as people come out from Seymour Heights down toward the school. Move that foot traffic of all those students an extra few feet off of the street. This would be a safer manner and I think it is a fantastic idea. I think it will be really pleasing as well from the street. The other comment I have is that the primary issue in our city in these last two years, and yes I am a homeowner but I am concerned about the affordability for the population. I would urge us to look toward creating more affordable housing even if that means in order to make the permit work for the developer it means an increase in density. I think if we can increase the number of affordable suites, that is a good thing. In that case, I would say if higher density is what is required to make that happen, then let’s go in that direction. As a neighbour over all, I commend you on your good work.

**C18** The site really does need renewal and I do recognize the state it is in is not sustainable and needs to be dealt with. I do appreciate that you have respected the parking ratio. I am assuming they are all bundled with the units but it does look like you have the parking ratio where it should be. Other places have tried to push it down and down. I appreciate the improvements you have made to the internal traffic management. The areas where I still have concern is this is going to have a bit of a fortress massing, where you have created some internal space and opened up some view corridors but everything is pushed to the edge so much so that the impact particularly people walking along the south side of the Parkway there, they are going to be in shadow all year round. I understand there is fairly thick tree coverage now but generally I am concerned about the loss of green space on the site. Anybody who has been over there in the last 35 years has recognized that it
is a gem inside. When you go into this place, rolling hills lovely vista inside the site and then everything was built around to build this beautiful space in the middle. Instead of a beautiful space in the middle we have about 4 more buildings right where that big green space used to be on the site. This would have been one for those situations where I could have been convinced to go taller and do the stacked apartments as someone had suggested rather than town houses because the height of the parkway is so high by the time you get to the north edge. The height of the trees around the area, this is an area where you could hide some height in order to spare some green space. I am not a big fan of the massing still although I recognize that you have made some positive changes to the internal traffic. Like the comments I heard about daycare space in here, we all know that that is a huge issue in North Vancouver. I think we have about 1200 kids on daycare wait lists in North Vancouver. That is not acceptable. The bus stop, I really hope that that is a full bus stop that doesn’t obstruct the bike lane or doesn’t obstruct the traffic lanes in any way shape or form. A couple of the bus stops that the District has put in further down the Parkway unnecessarily hang out into the block. It drives me nuts that you would do that, build all this infrastructure just to block it. I have a great deal of concern with the 4-5 year construction build out time. We know that North Vancouver is having a problem with housing trades. People who want to have a patch of grass, constructive creative people are not moving here, they are commuting to here. The problem is you are not only going to add a ton of traffic for the construction of the project but I imagine every single one of them is going to want to park somewhere around the site. When we have events at the fields and dance studio, the neighbourhood gets absolutely full. We need to have a trades parking management plan with this site. It is a 6 ½ acre site so you have to be able to manage the parking of the trades on the property rather than spilling out into the community for a 4 or 5 year period. That would be completely unacceptable and I don’t want to see the sidewalks blocked by construction spill over or lane closures on the Parkway. Eastbound after 2pm in the afternoon and west bound before 9am in the morning, I don’t want to see lane closures in the Parkway to build this because it just fouls up everything in the area.

C19 Thank you for your presentation. Architecturally I really like the design. The different comments that have been offered tonight, listening to some of the suggestions, an earlier question was related to purpose built market rental where there is such a shortage in the District. I agree with the comments that 20% of the strata units could be available for rental. But they are not in perpetuity then I know the owner of the condo is then able or townhouse is able to sell so they are not in perpetuity so that is where I think there should be some flexibility on the part of the District on getting more affordable market and affordable below market units. My understanding is that Anthem has made relocation plans for the existing owners and tenants, which has been really good. On Monday night a homelessness report was presented to the District of North Van Council and in conjunction with that, one of the Councillors brought up the point of making sure that if there are any available rental units at any of the development site, they be made available for some of the at-risk families. I think that is something that the developer
could consider over the next 18-month period. The other question that really hadn’t been answered was the economics because we are at the low point in the interest rate cycle right now. There is a real opportunity to build market rental housing plus also consider the affordability question. The question there was, relative to the price points for the purchasers on town houses, stacked vs. the larger 3 storey units. Would that create more affordable units and possibly better density in getting more because I really liked the idea of having 2, 3, 4 bedroom units and what else can be done with this huge site.

A19 Just touching on the homeless issue. We were made aware of the Council meeting this morning when a North Shore news reporter contacted our office. We have not been contacted by the District, so we don’t know exactly what the District is looking for at the moment. It would be premature for us to comment on that other than to say that our doors are open for a conversation. The questions around the stacked townhouses vs. ground orientated, yes, a stacked town house unit is a more affordable product than a ground orientated townhouse unit. There was a desire early on in this project to create a variety of housing types. That happened in conversation with staff at the District, hence the reason why you see the 3 different housing types. We could go to stacked form on the ground-oriented area but the net result will be an increase in density on the site. Our read of the situation is that there probably is not a lot of support for higher density on the site at the moment.

C20 The density of this project is obviously going to contribute more users to Ron Andrews and I was wondering what the long term plan is for Ron Andrews to accommodate a denser population, especially so close to it with young families as it is proposed? On this hand out that we got in our mailbox, it says Anthem would also make a community amenity contribution to the District of North Vancouver. Can you elaborate on what that contribution might be?

A20 (D.Veres) The District has been in touch with Ron Andrews. We referred the project to them and they provided some input and they are happy to see increased density because it does provide additional users for a lot of their programs and services that they provide. I can’t speak to the long terms plans for Ron Andrews, it is an aging facility I would assume at some point in the future there will be some sort of a re development of that facility needed. The timelines when that would be, I can’t respond to that at this point. Part of the community amenity contribution is a numerical figure that is a calculation that is done with the District. They mandate basically a calculation based on density and then assign a dollar value per square foot and you arrive at number. That is still to be worked out with the District in terms of the overall package and what that would go to is up to the District and us to an extent to try to figure out where those funds would get allocated. It is a monetary contribution that the development community has to make to the District (D. Veres) The community amenity contributions can be used for anything, as I mentioned earlier like the Spirit Trail. To finance public art works, housing, affordable housing,
childcare. There is a whole list of public benefits that can be funded through these contributions.

C21 Do us as tax payers have some way that we can have input as to how the District spends that money?

A21 (D. Veres) That is a great question. Through this process and depending on the type of input that you provide, we will be looking at that. We are listening to you and if there are suggestions, we have heard some tonight that is definitely taken into consideration. Often there will be a list of amenities that have been developed. There are some opportunities for other new projects to be added to the list.

C22 I mentioned in my comments about being able to attract contractors to be able to live in our communities so that they are not always stuck in traffic. When you look at the traffic on the cut, there is a ladder on the back of every single truck going down the road it seems like. Well at least half of them anyway, come down the cut in the afternoon and it is lined out to Burnaby Lakes and in the morning coming to the North Shore. I visited a place where the entire community was built for trades and contractors. They actually took the parking areas and made sure someone could park a full sized crew cab, with gear on the top, so you actually drove in and went down into the parking structure and it had extra height and length so that we can start making more of the units in our community a little more friendly to trades. This is one of the biggest hesitations they have if they can’t securely park their vehicle with all of their tools in it, then it becomes unacceptable for them. Maybe something to consider for the town house spaces is to have a little more height for the parking space and make sure it has adequate height for a utility truck.

C23 I was wondering around how much notice people are going to be getting before we have to move out and if we could be getting updates on that? I know a lot of people mostly renters are trying to stay as long as possible and trying to plan around that.

A23 Our plan for the New Year was to start doing active communications with the existing residents. The way it is laid out right now is that there are both fixed terms leases and month-to-month leases. The fixed term, the latest leases would go until July 15 of 2018. We would follow suit similarly with the month-to-month tenants. Essentially we have to provide you with 3 months notice.
Notice of a Public Information Meeting in Your Neighbourhood

Anthem Properties is hosting a Public Information Meeting to present a development proposal for 333 multi-family units at 904 – 944 Lytton Street.

This information package is being distributed to owners and occupants within a minimum 100 metres of the proposed development site in accordance with the District of North Vancouver policy.

Meeting Time and Location:

Wednesday, October 4, 2017
6:00-7:30pm
Windsor Secondary School, Small Gym
931 Broadview Drive

Meeting Agenda:
Doors Open: 6:00pm
Open House: 6:00-6:30pm
Presentation and Q&A 6:30-7:30pm

For Further Information Please Contact:
Emily Howard
604-235-3182
Anthem Properties

Darren Veres
604-990-2487
District of North Vancouver, Planning Department
Flyer Notification: Page Two

The Proposal:

Anthem Properties is proposing to construct a 333 unit multi-family development at 904 – 944 Lytton Street, at the corner of Lytton and Mount Seymour Parkway.

The proposal is for 133 townhomes, 157 condominiums and 43 rental apartments, which will include a mix of studio, 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom, 3-bedroom and 4-bedroom units.

The site will be accessible from two points off Lytton Street. Parking will be located in three separate underground parking garages with attached, two-car garages for the at-grade townhome units. A total of 507 parking spaces are provided for the residents along with 92 visitor parking spaces.

The proposal includes a redesign of Lytton Street featuring a new road, sidewalks, multi-use paths and major upgrades to the municipal utility services. Anthem would also make a community amenity contribution to the District of North Vancouver.

Project Rendering: 904 – 944 Lytton Street
Public Information Meeting Summary

Anthem Properties – 904 – 944 Lytton Street

October 4, 2017

Newspaper Advertisement

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING

A redevelopment is being proposed for 904–944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver, to construct a multi-family development. You are invited to a meeting to discuss the project.

Date: Wednesday, October 4, 2017
Time: 6:00pm – 7:30pm
Location: Windsor Secondary School Small Gym,
931 Broadview Drive

Anthem Properties proposes to rezone the site to permit a 333 unit multi-family development consisting of 133 townhomes, 157 condominiums and 43 rental apartments. Stacked townhomes and apartment units will be constructed over 3 underground parkades, while the ground-oriented townhomes have attached two-car garages.

Information packages are being distributed to residents within a minimum 100 meters of the site. If you would like to receive a copy or if you would like more information, please contact Darren Veres of the Development Planning Department at 604-990-2487, or Emily Howard of Anthem Properties at 604-235-3182, or bring your questions and comments to the meeting.

*This is not a Public Hearing. DNV Council will receive a report from staff on issues raised at the meeting and will formally consider the proposal at a later date.
Dear Mr. Veres

This comprehensive multi-family project has my full support for the following reasons:

With geographic and topographical constraints, the supply of developable land in the District is extremely scarce, especially for single-family residential and this has resulted in an affordability issue for those wishing live to here. Our sons for example, who have grown up here and want to continue living in their area rather than uproot to more affordable places like Squamish & Abbotsford. This phased development is ideal for both first time buyers and folks like us who'll eventually want to downsize at a future date, basically "age in place" east of the Seymour. The broad range of housing from rental to conventional townhouse units, provides a multitude of residential options including the opportunity to rent at first and perhaps buy at a later date. This would be particularly attractive to new comers who may want to explore the neighbourhood before committing to buy.

The form and character is contextually compatible with similar developments along the Parkway and it's ideally located to take advantage of the neighbouring recreational, institutional and retail/commercial amenities, including the new Northwoods Village complex. It's an efficient use of a large parcel land and with transit at the doorstep, the need for vehicles is lessened.

Hence, with these amenities and the convenience of transit, I welcome housing of this nature. It would be an asset to our community and I look forward to seeing it come to fruition.

Please make my contact information available to the applicant.

Sincerely,
Hi Darren,

Sorry I am a bit late with my comments on the Anthem Properties proposal at 904 – 944 Lytton Street:

Concerns:

Density – I feel that the density is too high. The number of units will essentially triple (from 114 to 333 units) which will also essentially mean that there will be three times as many vehicles on the roads.

Rental units – although it is a step in the right direction that there will be 43 rental units, I feel strongly that the number of rental units, which is not even 13% of the total proposed units, is far too low. The percentage should be much higher than that in order to provide lower-cost housing, which is needed.

Parking – 599 parking stalls is very high and will assume (and almost encourage) every unit to have more than one car. I feel that the number of parking stalls should be reduced in order to attract more people with fewer cars.

Traffic – the traffic issue was not addressed well at the public information meeting in early October. The changes, that will happen on Highway #1, is still nearly five years out, and nobody knows how this may or may not ease the well-known traffic problems in Seymour. Nobody can guarantee that the proposed changes on the highway will benefit the Seymour residents. The proof is in the pudding. There are no indications of planned improvements for the bus service in the Seymour area.

Phasing – although it is good to hear that the whole project will not be built simultaneously, a slower redevelopment would have been appreciated.

Playgrounds – will there be playgrounds for all the kids that can be expected to move in?

Too compact/number of buildings – I think that 15 buildings on this site will be far too compact. Fewer buildings would enable the site to appear less busy and it would generate less traffic both internally and on the public roads.

Height – I find that six storeys is too much for Mount Seymour Parkway which (with one unfortunate exception) only has buildings of four floors in height (which is also recommended and stated in the Seymour Local Plan).

Suggestion:

Coffee shop/corner-store – for a very long time many residents of Seymour (including many from Blueridge/Seymour Heights) would have liked to see a coffee shop in this area. There isn't any
real coffee shop in the area outside of Parkgate. Reducing the number of buildings and adding a coffee shop (and corner-store) with the entrance off Mount Seymour Parkway would add a much-needed commercial amenity to this part of the Seymour area. This would bring the neighbourhood together and also be a definite gathering point for the new residents in the proposed redevelopment. It would appear not too hard to find interested parties to run such a coffee shop.

Thanks for including these comments about the Anthem Properties proposal.

Rgds
PROPOSAL: Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

I would love to see some commercial space under the NW corner apartment building. The neighborhood would benefit from a corner store, coffee shop, and/or sandwich shop so the Windsor High School kids would have a destination other than the gas station and the Blueridge community wouldn't need to get into their cars every time they ran out of milk. It would be nice for the local families to have a place to walk to on nice summer evenings in order to encourage social interaction within the community.

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant:

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:

District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org
PROPOSAL:
Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

Since 2014/2015 I have not been able to keep up with my business due to lengthy traffic delays. I miss 1,2 or 3 hours of work/day. Significantly impacting my income.

I spend typically 1-3 hours/day in my car travelling between North & West Vans - 2-3 years ago I spent 15-30 minutes in my car for the same destinations.

Please upgrade Public Transportation & the roads BEFORE creating more housing!!

Your Name: [Redacted]  Street Address: [Redacted]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: 

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:

District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487

District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org

As I am interested in buying back into the complex but hesitate because a TOWNhome would be out of my price range - well a 1-2/bedroom den style unit be part of the new plan under 600k ??
Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

Since 2015
* Commute: on time a 10-15 drive now takes anywhere from 30-60 minutes - cuts my earning time on a day. (unpredictable - difficult to plan)
* Spending up to 2-3 hours a day in my car when only 2 years ago my commuting time in a day was 1/2 hour or less

I would like to buy back BUT given the current traffic issues - that continue to worsen it seems traffic problems will compound by that time (3-0 yrs) & another road construction project would become necessary

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: [NO]

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org
COMMENT SHEET
The District of North Vancouver

PROPOSAL: Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

Please focus on improving Public Transit and Road/Bike Lane Infrastructure BEFORE adding additional units to the Mt Seymour Parkway Area.

The traffic congestion is currently unacceptable at many times through the day or week, not just at peak hours. Despite current plans to improve traffic flow on the cut into the area—saddly it won’t be enough to accommodate future growth. Thanks.

Your Name [Redacted] Street Address [Redacted]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: [ ]

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org
The District of North Vancouver

Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

Big concern regarding traffic. The North Shore has gotten much worse in the last couple of years. New high rises, new condominium complexes, with no substantial improvements to infrastructure. At times it can take an hour to just move from N. Van. to the Deep Cove area.

Your Name: 
Street Address: 

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: ☐

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:

District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487

District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org
PROPOSAL:  
Anthem Properties  
904 - 944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver  
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project  

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

I am a long time resident of Deep Cove and the traffic on the North Shore and particularly east of Seymour is of great concern to me. It takes a lot more time to get to the hospital even in off-peak hours and on the weekend. I understand this project will add a considerable number of units which will contribute to even greater congestion at the roads. There has to be better planning for roads and transit solution before this project could be acceptable.

Your Name: [Redacted]  
Street Address: [Redacted]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: ☐

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:

District Planner Darren Veres  
Tel: 604 990-2487

District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department  
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5  
Email: veresd@dnv.org
COMMENT SHEET
The District of North Vancouver

PROPOSAL: Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

I have an issue with the current volume of traffic as it stands now. Why would you permit/approve more housing which would increase traffic substantially without first addressing the roads/public transportation infrastructure first?

Fix the roads etc. first - then build as many units as you want!!

Your Name: [redacted]
Street Address: [redacted]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: ☐

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org
# COMMENT SHEET

## The District of North Vancouver

**PROPOSAL:**
Anthem Properties  
904 - 944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver  
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a former owner at Seymour Estates and was hoping to buy back into the new development. A townhouse will be beyond my financial means and I was hoping that there would be affordable 1 BDRM + DEN units in the new development. I am also very concerned about traffic — even now there is a huge traffic backlog almost all of the time on the parkway up and down the cut and this is only going to get worse despite current remedies in progress.

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: [ ] No

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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 604-999-2207.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:

District Planner Darren Veres  
Tel: 604 990-2487  

District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department  
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 1P3  
Email: veresd@dnv.org
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PROPOSAL: Anthem Properties
904 -944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

I understand that this particular project will be adding 300+ units to the neighborhood. The traffic is already at critical level as it stands. It is paramount that the local infrastructure must change before we see an increase in cars in our area.

This project is one of many being rolled out in the next few years. I am very concerned.

Your Name: [Redacted]
Street Address: [Redacted]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: □

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 1N9
Email: veresd@dnv.org
COMMENT SHEET
The District of North Vancouver

PROPOSAL:  Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

I am very concerned about the amount of housing being constructed in North Vancouver particularly in the Seymour area. The Seymour area gets highly impacted by traffic and we are often stranded at home not being able to access the highway or the reverse occurs where we are not able to get home due to high traffic volumes.

Your Name [Blacked Out]
Address [Blacked Out]

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:

District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org

Traffic sucks!
COMMENT SHEET
The District of North Vancouver

PROPOSAL: Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

Traffic concerns in the area. Too much traffic congestion along Parkroy to 2nd narrows; the cut. Improved infrastructure is public transportation is required, but even that in the long term will not alleviate the problem. However as a minimum, these issues need to be addressed in relation to this development. Specifically, additional density in the area generally.

Your Name [REDACTED] Street Address [REDACTED]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: □

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org

RECEIVED
DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
OCT 20 2017
Document: 3341898
PLANNING, PERMITS AND BYLAWS
Darren Veres

From: Emily Howard <ehoward@AnthemProperties.com>
Sent: October 06, 2017 11:26 AM
To: Darren Veres
Cc: Darren Veres
Subject: RE: buildings across from Ron Andrews

Thank you for your comments.

I am sending them to Darren Veres, Development Planner at the District of North Vancouver. The District is collecting and reviewing the public's feedback on Anthem's development proposal at Seymour Estates. Darren will likely add your comments to those received at the public information meeting on Wednesday evening.

Best Regards,

Emily

Emily Howard
Community Relations Manager

Phone 604 689 3040
Direct 604 235 3182

Anthem Properties Group Ltd.
Suite 300 Bentall 5 550 Burrard Street
Vancouver BC Canada V6C 2B5

ehoward@anthemproperties.com
anthemproperties.com

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 6, 2017 10:10 AM
To: Emily Howard <ehoward@AnthemProperties.com>
Subject: buildings across from Ron Andrews

Good Morning Emily,
I was unable to attend the Wed. meeting but I did wish to express my views on your hopes of construction. All I can say is wait, wait, wait. Iy is too soon for such an undertaking there. With 133 living places, our Mt Seymour Pkway will not hold that increase in traffic. Why is it necessary to build so many places? Not only the transportation but also the use of our Recreation Facility across the street. Right now it is pretty busy. I suggest eliminating so many living residences, perhaps making a smalll park for adults and children to use and also speaking with the district as to adding a side road taking the cars down to Riverside and not using the Parkway.
Just some ideas.
Hi Mr. Veres:

I saw the notice in the North Shore News and I am writing because I am a new mom at Seymour Dance, where the traffic is terrible.

The current cul de sac on Lytton prohibits stopping. The current drop off area at Windsor/Soccer Bubble/ Seymour Dance is only a few car lengths long.

I ask that you please consider additional parking and drop off on Lytton, with a pedestrian connection to Windsor/Soccer/Seymour Dance, as part of your redevelopment of the area.

In addition, I would like to see one of the driveways into Windsor designated "In" and another designated "Out", if this could improve traffic flow.

Regards,
Darren, I am not particularly anxious about out the proposed Seymour Estates development and Anthem is a fair developer however, how would I go about pushing for some sort of neighbourhood commercial component to the development? I recently [redacted] and understand planning and the changing needs of communities. I always favoured TOD development and the associated amenities that would go with this. This development is what I would call “TOD Light” but the whole neighbourhood has no services. If we are trying to achieve the goal of people living, working and playing all within walking distance, Blueridge is totally missing the mark. We literally have to drive everywhere. The closest coffee shop for me is a 35 minute walk; for my neighbours at the north end of Blueridge it’s a 45 minute walk.

I haven’t spoken to Brent about this yet but I would guess Anthem would be amenable to adding say 10,000 sq feet of neighbourhood commercial space, not as an amenity, but as an addition to the fsr. What are your thoughts on this?
Dear Sir:

I was dismayed after seeing your invitation to the Antham open house where 599 expensive underground parking spots will be provided. This sends signals to the purchaser/renter that our municipality is continuing to favour the personal car for transport over transit. This was also reinforced by Antham’s comment that frequent transit service is lacking to this location. Lots of parking on site ensures that transit WILL be the least favoured option. I assume given that this development is directly opposite the Ron Andrews rec centre, building with minimal parking is not an option. However, given that 75 spots are for visitor parking, perhaps there is an opportunity for the rec centre to utilize the Antham development during peak parking demand as parking at the pool is never enough?

However, what was really refreshing to see is their proposal to provide 666 individual secure bicycle lock ups (2 per residence) accessible via the underground parking entrance. (We should make this a standard in the district for all new developments!) Residents will have the option of commuting conveniently by bicycle if they desire. This approach should be encouraged in the district as reducing vehicle parking rarely seems to be an option with our continuing "lack of transit". With the advent of ebikes, ditching the car is a viable option. I took the leap 10 years ago and have realized it is my health plan. The District just needs to build out the trail/bike path system so that cycling can be away from vehicle traffic. There potentially could be 700 people from this development out on two wheels! I welcome some company!
Seymour Estates
904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver, BC
Public Information Meeting - Oct 4, 2017 @ Windsor Secondary @ 6pm

Previous Development
- Multi Residential (114 units with 43 that were rented at time of purchase)
- Built in 1969
- Owner's initiative to sell.
- Court sale approved on Sept. 28, 2016
- Sold to Anthem Jan. 16, 2017

Zoning/OCP
- Current Zoning: RM3 0.75 FSR
- OCP (2011): Residential Level 5 1.75 FSR
- Maplewood Local Plan: Windsor Concept (2002) 1.20 FSR
- Proposed Zoning: Comprehensive Development 1.28 FSR

Site
- Area 6.28 acres 272,403 sq.ft.
- Slopes significantly from northwest to southwest
- Proposal includes a 4 parcel subdivision

Proposed Development
- 4 Phased Development – 333 units total
  - Phase 1: 1 Building 6 Stories 120 units
  - Phase 2: 7 Buildings 3-4 Stories 102 units (At-Grade TH and Stacked TH)
  - Phase 3: 6 Buildings 3 Stories 31 units (At-Grade TH)
  - Phase 4: 1 Building 6 Stories 80 units
- Rental Housing: 43 Units with 8 at Affordable Rental Rate (CHMC Level 2)

Parking
- Vehicle: 633 required 599 provided
- Bicycle: 333 required 666 provided
- Condos and Stacked TH have underground parking
- TH have two care garages

Access
- From Lytton Street (two access point to a private loop road)
- Multiple pedestrian connections
- Large Scale 5 Phase Provincial North Shore Traffic Improvement Plan to ease North Shore traffic.

Off-site Works/Upgrades
- Sidewalk and Road upgrades to both sides of Lytton
- Sidewalk and Road upgrades to south side of Mt Seymour Parkway
- Significant sewer upgrades to water, sanitary and storm
- Retain substantial number of significant trees and planting new trees along Lytton and MSP.
Hi Darren,
Nice to meet you this evening.
Thanks for attending the Public Information Meeting and being able to answer the questions this evening. Your input and listening to the questions was important.
I have attached the comment page with a number of my comments and items for consideration.
The project is attractive and provides a variety of housing types and provides more affordable housing options in the Seymour area.
I believe there may be opportunities to add density and achieve DNV planning objectives within the approved OCP.

I look forward to future updates on this project and input at the future public hearing.
The issue of providing temporary shelter for at risk and homeless North Shore residents needs to be addressed prior to the winter cold and wet rainy season starting.

Please let me know if you would like any further input on the development proposal.

Thanks for this opportunity for community input.

Best regards,

This email is intended for the addressee only and is confidential. If this message has been misdirected please respect our privacy by deleting the message without copying or forwarding it and contact this writer. Thank you.
PROPOSAL:
Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

1) Consider a car co-op program with cars provided by Anthem available only to residents.
2) Consider allowing more density in return for below-market rental units or purpose-built market units.
3) Consider an offsite day care using CAC/DEC's.
4) Consider more affordable stacked townhouse units vs 3 story townhouses (for families and seniors)
5) Explore use of vacant units as turnover occurs to be used by at risk families or seniors.

Your Name: [redacted]
Street Address: [redacted]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: [X]

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org

Thanks for the meeting and opportunity to ask questions.
PROPOSAL: Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

- Parking during construction? The roads are already congested in Lytton due to traffic to the high school, pre-school, dance school.

Major concern on how it will impact the current lack of parking that is available.

Can all construction vehicles be kept on site and traffic flow be kept free?

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.
PROPOSAL:  Anthem Properties  
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver  
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

Your drawings and building look lovely but I am concerned by the classification and urge you to provide adequate parking for residents AND visitors. Basically, the very limited street parking and community center parking are already full and well used. Adding hundreds of additional residents to this mix does not help our community.

Check out the access at 8:30 am and you will find scores of people dropping their kids at high school and coming to the community centre. It is already a very busy street.

Your Name: ____________________________________________

Street Address: ____________________________________________

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant:  

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:

District Planner Darren Veres  
Tel: 604 990-2487  
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department  
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5  
Email: veresd@dnv.org

Document: 3341888
PROPOSAL:  
Anthem Properties  
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver  
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

We are excited about the different possibilities that this development could mean for this development.

We need more young families in this neighborhood and some of the lower cost options mean more families can move over here!

Your Name [Redacted]
Street Address [Redacted]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: [X]

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:  
District Planner Darren Veres  
Tel: 604990-2487  
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department  
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5  
Email: veresd@dnv.org
COMMENT SHEET
The District of North Vancouver

PROPOSAL: Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

I am concerned about the parking both during and after construction of this project.

Your Name

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant:

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner or is compelled by a Court or an agent duly authorized under another Act. Further information may be obtained by speaking with the Manager of Administrative Services at 604-990-2207.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October

District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org

Document: 3341898
COMMENT SHEET  
The District of North Vancouver

PROPOSAL:       Anthem Properties  
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver  
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you 
have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets): 

Traffic impact - already maxed out at current levels  
1404 units now being replaced by 333 units - more cars - 
Riverside & Mt Seymour Parkway is a "high" impact intersection 
now - infrastructure overloaded now - Don't need any 
more residents, adding to existing problems 
500+ vehicles and only TWO inlet access - ???? what about 
if an emergency arises - No common community area 
Planned

Your Name __________________ Street Address __________________

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant:  

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to: 

District Planner Darren Veres  
Tel: 604 990-2487  
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department  
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5  
Email: veresd@dnv.org
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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org
PROPOSAL: Anthem Properties
904 -944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

I think this kind of development is great. The parkway needs to be where the density is highest which is what is in this proposal. I hope that within the next 10 years all the single family homes on the Parkway have become apartments & townhouses. This project is very welcome and appears to have a good mix of use and levels of housing. I fully support this development.

Your Name: 
Street Address: 

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: ☐

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org
PROPOSAL: Anthem Properties  
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver  
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

Please consider:

1. Visitor parking - street parking on Lytton is always full - so is Ron Andrews parking lot.

2. Playground at Ron Andrews is always full - please have lots of play space + playground equipment structure for our kids + adults.

3. Please be careful & mindful during construction - Lytton St. is the primary pedestrian route from the parkway to Winsport School - you will need precautions or extra flags people.

Your Name: 
Street Address:

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: ☐

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:

District Planner Darren Veres  
Tel: 604 990-2487  
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department  
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5  
Email: veresd@dnv.org
PROPOSAL:  Anthem Properties
904 -944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you
have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

Huge concern for Windsor
High School students walking
up and down Lytton Street
during construction (4-5 year
building period). These students
walk in am / lunch / pm.

Aprox 300 students just up and down
Lytton. Please provide safe
traffic / sidewalks during construction.

Your Name: [redacted]
Street Address: [redacted]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: [ ]

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org

# Good point was made a/b providing
onsite parking for
construction workers & maintaining
Lytton street safety & traffic-cars/ped.
COMMENT SHEET
The District of North Vancouver

PROPOSAL: Anthem Properties
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

Family Friendly

Your Name: [Blank]
Street Address: [Blank]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: ☑

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:
District Planner Darren Veres
Tel: 604 990-2487
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Email: veresd@dnv.org

Document: 3341898
PROPOSAL:  
Anthem Properties  
904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver  
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

To help us determine neighbourhood opinions, please provide us with any input you have on this project (feel free to attach additional sheets):

My wife and I attended the presentation of the proposed Multi-Family project at 904-944 Lytton Street by Anthem Properties Group Ltd. We liked very much the idea of creating more housing for the increased demand with no foreseeable negative side effects.

The project itself will revamp the whole area, will give options to people with different needs such as first time buyers, renters and people looking to downsize. We liked very much the attention to detail that Anthem brings to the table in regards to safety, parking, accessibility, environment concerns as well as the detail to their finished product. We welcome and support this project.

Your Name: [Redacted]  
Street Address: [Redacted]

Please check this box if you desire your contact information to be available to the applicant: ☐

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 this public consultation process unless its release is authorized by its owner 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.

Please return, by mail or email by Friday, October 20, 2017 to:

District Planner Darren Veres  
Tel: 604 990-2487  
District of North Vancouver - Community Planning Department  
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5  
Email: veresd@dnv.org
Hi Mr Veres,

I'm interested in learning more about the development proposed at 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates). Is the development process still accepting comments from local residents?

Could you please provide me information on what is proposed for Lytton street? The DNV website has renderings that show vehicles parked on Lytton as well as cyclist riding in both directions on the east side of the street.

Is a cycling track proposed for the street? It would be great if you could provide me more information on the proposed changes to Lytton street. Lytton street is a key corridor for cycling since it connects to the trail network to the south and I may have concerns if there is not a protected cycling lane. Is the development process still accepting comments from local residents?

thanks,
Hi Darren,

Thanks for this information. My wife and I do not support this development in its current form. We both commute along Lytton everyday by bicycle and do not support the additional traffic that this development will bring without additional safety features for cyclists and pedestrians. We do not support the street parking that will be allowed along east side of Lytton. Cycling between parked cars and traffic is very dangerous especially with the newly proposed road and parking entrances. The development has plenty of proposed parking and any visitor parking should be accommodate within the property itself and not rely on public space.

Both my wife and I would be supportive of this development if street parking is removed from the east side of Lytton, a separated cycling lane is installed on Lytton and the south side of Seymour Parkway.

Lytton is a major cycling corridor that connects my neighbourhood (Blueridge/Seymour Heights) to trails that connect to Windridge (and future Spirit Trail). Cycling trips in the DNV has increased from 2,000 trips in 2011 to 5,000 trips in 2017 (Translink Trip Diary, 2019) which is a 150% increase. Many of our neighbours also commute by bicycle to work and support safer cycling routes. I am very concerned about the traffic that this development will bring especially so close to a school and community center that already experiences fast traffic making quick turns to and from these facilities. Adding a major residential development here will put school kids at risk and currently does not allow the safe passage of school kids for those who wish to bike to school.

The developer has not captured and recognized the essence of the property in their renderings and the busy traffic that Seymour experiences. The rendering of Lytton and Seymour intersection idealizes the public space and does not recognize its current form and street crossings across a very busy road. The bus stop on Seymour Parkway is currently very busy and often people block the sidewalk given the undersized bus stop waiting area. This development should incorporate an expanded area where people can wait for the bus without impeding pedestrians walking on Seymour Parkway. Similarly the development would be much more palatable if it included a separated bike lane on the south side of Seymour Parkway.

The development should include visible bicycle parking outside of the proposed commercial space (e.g., coffee shop). The residential development should also include secure bicycle parking for cargo bikes for residents.

If you could please forward these comments on to the developer that would be great. I look forward to their response.
Hi

I apologize for the late response.

Yes, the development process is still accepting comments. Thanks for your input. I will ensure your comments are added to the record of the file and taken into consideration in the project review.

Regarding your question, there are currently no bike lanes proposed along Lytton. I believe the image on the website that you are referring to — "Building 15 from Lytton Street" — is actually showing the new private internal road. This private road intersects with Lytton as shown below:

Sorry, the title of the photo is a bit misleading.
The design for Lytton street that we are currently working with is informed by the 2016 Bicycle Master Plan. The Plan does not show any bike facilities along Lytton. It does, however, show an “On-Street Bike Route” along Mount Seymour Parkway which will be maintained as part of the improvements along the Parkway. For more information on the plan, please follow the link below:

https://www.dnv.org/property-and-development/bicycle-master-plan

The new street design for Lytton Street involves one drive lane and a parking lane along both sides of the street. In addition, new curb build-outs are proposed along both sides to provide additional buffer between pedestrians and vehicles, safe space for motorists who have just parked their vehicles, and to engender slower turns and safer speeds into and out of the new Seymour Estates development itself.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Cheers,

Darren

Darren Veres, MCIP, RPP
Development Planner
District of North Vancouver
T : 604.990.2487
E : veresd@dnv.org

From: [redacted]
Sent: September 05, 2019 9:55 AM
To: Darren Veres
Subject: 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

Hi Mr Veres,

I'm interested in learning more about the development proposed at 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates). Is the development process still accepting comments from local residents?

Could you please provide me information on what is proposed for Lytton street? The DNV website has renderings that show vehicles parked on Lytton as well as cyclist riding in both directions on the east side of the street. Is a cycling track proposed for the street? It would be great if you could provide me more information on the proposed changes to Lytton street. Lytton street is a key corridor for cycling since it connects to the trail network to the south and I may have concerns if there is not a protected cycling lane. Is the development process still accepting comments from local residents?

thanks,[redacted]
Darren Veres

From: Darren Veres
Sent: November 28, 2019 8:36 AM
To: Robyn Hay
Subject: FW: 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

FYI Neighbour input regarding Seymour Estates.

There is an email thread below between [REDACTED] and Anthem. Not action needed.

Cheers,

Darren

Darren Veres, MCIP, RPP
Community Planner
District of North Vancouver
T: 604.990.2487
E: veresd@dnv.org

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: November 28, 2019 8:32 AM
To: Emily Howard <ehoward@AnthemProperties.com>
Cc: Darren Veres <VeresD@dnv.org>
Subject: Re: 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

Hi Emily,

It has been very busy at work for me and I haven't had the chance to respond. I think my perspective and questions are fairly straightforward but if you feel would be helpful I can make myself available. I'm available for a call tomorrow btw 7:30-12, 1-3. Alternatively I could find times for a call next week. At the moment Dec 4 and 6 are fairly open.

Regards,

On Thursday, October 31, 2019, 11:21:22 a.m. PDT, Emily Howard <ehoward@anthemproperties.com> wrote:

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for your feedback and additional questions regarding the bike parking. I'm wondering if you may be free for a phone call with me and a colleague so that we can discuss things in more detail? I think this will help us better understand your perspective and concerns, which in turn will allow us to provide a more fulsome response. We are happy to call you at a time convenient to you – if you are interested, please suggest a few dates/times when you are available.
Regarding your request for drawings: we are still working with District staff and finalizing the detailed designs, including those for the bus stop, sidewalk, and road upgrades. Once they are complete and supported by staff they will be publicly available on the District’s website prior to introduction to Council.

I would also suggest you take a look at our project website: https://seymourestates.ca/

The website includes detailed facts and figures relating to our application, including number of car parking stalls, number of homes, type of homes, policy compliance, etc. While we don’t know how many people will eventually reside on the property, there will be 341 homes of varying types and sizes.

Emily Howard
Senior Manager, Community Relations

Anthem Properties Group Ltd.
Suite 1100 Bentall IV Box 49200
1055 Dunsmuir Street
Vancouver BC Canada V7X 1K8

ehoward@anthemproperties.com
anthemproperties.com

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2019 6:06 PM
To: Emily Howard <ehoward@AnthemProperties.com>
Hi Emily,

Thank you for your responses.

Could you please tell me more about the secured bike parking? Will owners only have access to the their own personal 6 by 4 feet bike locker (one per unit)? Or will there be other secured bicycle parking within the buildings? Also will owners also have another storage locker or just the bike locker?

Please note that I have a regular sized bike which is longer than 6 feet with fenders. That means that I wouldn't be able to fit my standard size bike in the proposed bike locker. The size 6 x 4 feet does not seem reasonable and/or usable to store bikes. Rather that have a secure locker to store bikes I suspect most residents will just use this space to store other personal belongings.

To clarify your response to my question about secured parking for cargo bikes, it sounds like you are saying that there will be not accommodation to securely lock a bike longer than 6 feet within this development.

What is the total number of residents expected for this property? How many parking spaces are proposed?

Could you please provide me with drawings of the proposed bus stop improvements?

Also could you please provide me with the proposed upgrades to the sidewalks and road upgrades to both sides of Lytton and the south side of Mt Seymour Parkway?

Thanks,
Hello

Darren Veres from the District of North Vancouver forwarded your email to me. We (Anthem) sincerely appreciate your feedback regarding our application to rezone and redevelop 904-944 Lytton Street (the former Seymour Estates property).

After reviewing your comments, there are a few items I can elaborate on, which I hope will provide some further clarity.

I understand you are concerned about the bus stop on Mount Seymour Parkway (south side of the street) because it is too small and leads to the sidewalk being blocked during busy periods. Anthem's application (if approved) would include a brand new covered bus shelter that will be double the size and further setback from the sidewalk, helping to alleviate the overcrowding.

You have suggested that there should be bike parking located outside of the coffee shop. I’m happy to report that there are 10 publicly accessible bike parking spaces located immediately adjacent to the coffee shop. Regarding cargo bikes, I am admittedly not a cargo bike owner myself, but I believe they come in a variety of styles and sizes depending on the make, and the type and size of the accessories (panniers, racks, and child seats, etc.) can vary quite a bit as well. Anthem’s application includes secure indoor bike parking space for 686 residential bicycles. 110 visitor biking spaces (both indoor and outdoor) are also included, for a total of 796 bike parking spaces. The secure residential bike lockers will be 6 feet long by 4 feet wide and can accommodate two typical bicycles. A resident could, however, use the bike locker for one larger bike should they choose.

The safety of children going to school is something that we know is very important to the community and something we have heard from other neighbours and community stakeholders as well. As part of the rezoning application process we have been asked by the District to provide sidewalk and road upgrades to both sides of Lytton and south side of Mt. Seymour Parkway. Mount Seymour Parkway is a busy, heavily travelled street, and we acknowledge that. These upgrades will help to make things safer for pedestrians (children and adults alike).

Regarding your comments and suggestions pertaining to the street parking on the east side of Lytton Street, and your desire to see new/improved cycling infrastructure on Lytton Street and the south side of Mount Seymour Parkway: while it is very helpful to hear your perspective as a local resident and cyclist, the roads in question are public roads owned by the District, and any changes to the road infrastructure is outside of Anthem's purview. I do see from your earlier correspondence with Darren that he has addressed some of these items. I would have to defer to Darren if you have any further questions or comments regarding the local road and cycling infrastructure on District owned lands.
Thanks again for your feedback and please feel free to contact me in the future if you have additional questions or comments. We also have a project website (which you may have already seen) which provides additional detail: https://seymourestates.ca

Warm Regards,

Emily

Emily Howard
Senior Manager, Community Relations

Anthem
Growing Places

Phone 604 689 3040
Direct 604 235 3182

Anthem Properties Group Ltd.
Suite 1100 Bentall IV Box 49200
1055 Dunsmuir Street
Vancouver BC Canada V7X 1K8

ehoward@anthemproperties.com
anthemproperties.com

From: [Redacted]
Sent: October 05, 2019 7:50 AM
To: Darren Veres <VeresD@dvn.org>
Cc: Ingrid Weisenbach <WeisenbachI@dvn.org>; Kevan Khoshons <KhoshonsK@dvn.org>
Subject: Re: 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

Hi Darren,
Thanks for this information. My wife and I do not support this development in its current form. We both commute along Lytton everyday by bicycle and do not support the additional traffic that this development will bring without additional safety features for cyclists and pedestrians. We do not support the street parking that will be allowed along east side of Lytton. Cycling between parked cars and traffic is very dangerous especially with the newly proposed road and parking entrances. The development has plenty of proposed parking and any visitor parking should be accommodate within the property itself and not rely on public space.

Both my wife and I would be supportive of this development if street parking is removed from the east side of Lytton, a separated cycling lane is installed on Lytton and the south side of Seymour Parkway.

Lytton is a major cycling corridor that connects my neighbourhood (Blueridge/Seymour Heights) to trails that connect to Windridge (and future Spirit Trail). Cycling trips in the DNV has increased from 2,000 trips in 2011 to 5,000 trips in 2017 (Translink Trip Diary, 2019) which is a 150% increase. Many of our neighbours also commute by bicycle to work and support safer cycling routes. I am very concerned about the traffic that this development will bring especially so close to a school and community center that already experiences fast traffic making quick turns to and from these facilities. Adding a major residential development here will put school kids at risk and currently does not allow the safe passage of school kids for those who wish to bike to school.

The developer has not captured and recognized the essence of the property in their renderings and the busy traffic that Seymour experiences. The rendering of Lytton and Seymour intersection idealizes the public space and does not recognize its current form and street crossings across a very busy road. The bus stop on Seymour Parkway is currently very busy and often people block the sidewalk given the undersized bus stop waiting area. This development should incorporate an expanded area where people can wait for the bus without impeding pedestrians walking on Seymour Parkway. Similarly the development would be much more palatable if it included a separated bike lane on the south side of Seymour Parkway.

The development should include visible bicycle parking outside of the proposed commercial space (e.g., coffee shop). The residential development should also include secure bicycle parking for cargo bikes for residents.

If you could please forward these comments on to the developer that would be great. I look forward to their response.

Thanks,

On Monday, September 16, 2019, 12:13:49 p.m. PDT, Darren Veres <VeresD@dnv.org> wrote:
I apologize for the late response.

Yes, the development process is still accepting comments. Thanks for your input. I will ensure your comments are added to the record of the file and taken into consideration in the project review.

Regarding your question, there are currently no bike lanes proposed along Lytton. I believe the image on the website that you are referring to --"Building 15 from Lytton Street"-- is actually showing the new private internal road. This private road intersects with Lytton as shown below:

Sorry, the title of the photo is a bit misleading.
The design for Lytton street that we are currently working with is informed by the 2016 Bicycle Master Plan. The Plan does not show any bike facilities along Lytton. It does, however, show an “On-Street Bike Route” along Mount Seymour Parkway which will be maintained as part of the improvements along the Parkway. For more information on the plan, please follow the link below:

https://www.dnv.org/property-and-development/bicycle-master-plan

The new street design for Lytton Street involves one drive lane and a parking lane along both sides of the street. In addition, new curb build-outs are proposed along both sides to provide additional buffer between pedestrians and vehicles, safe space for motorists who have just parked their vehicles, and to engender slower turns and safer speeds into and out of the new Seymour Estates development itself.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Cheers,

Darren

Darren Veres, MCIP, RPP
Development Planner
District of North Vancouver
T: 604.990.2487
E: veresd@dnv.org
I'm interested in learning more about the development proposed at 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates). Is the development process still accepting comments from local residents?

Could you please provide me information on what is proposed for Lytton street? The DNV website has renderings that show vehicles parked on Lytton as well as cyclist riding in both directions on the east side of the street. Is a cycling track proposed for the street? It would be great if you could provide me more information on the proposed changes to Lytton street. Lytton street is a key corridor for cycling since it connects to the trail network to the south and I may have concerns if there is not a protected cycling lane. Is the development process still accepting comments from local residents?

thanks,
Hi Darren,

Anthem arranged a call with me and answered several of my questions regarding the proposed development at 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates) this afternoon.

We discussed the potential for a bike lane on Lytton. They indicated that they could accommodate a bike lane on Lytton if asked by the District but that since it is not in the 2016 Master Bike Plan one will not be built. They indicated that parking could be removed from one side of Lytton and that their development has ample parking and likely will not rely on street parking. In fact their proposed parking ratio of 1.5 (stalls/unit) is much higher the ratios found are utilized in the region (see http://www.metrovancouver.org/services/regional-planning/PlanningPublications/RegionalParkingStudy-TechnicalReport.pdf)

The 2016 Master Bike Plan is quite outdated and was developed before we fully appreciated congestion concerns on the North Shore, the recent declaration of a Climate Emergency and Translink's Trip Diary (2019) showing a 150% increase in bicycle trips in the DNV between 2011 and 2017.

The Master Bike Plan shows no safe connection for Blueridge/Seymour Heights to connect to the Spirit Trail. I wonder how people in my family and other people in my community are intended to connect to any of the Master Plan designated bike routes. I would think the intent of the Master Bike Plan would be to foster connectivity for all.

My wife broke her leg this spring while biking trying to connect to the Spirit Trail off of Burr Place near Canlan. There is no ramp connecting Burr to the trails so she tried biking up a driveway and her tire slipped and she broke her leg.

There is no safe route for people of all abilities to even get to the designated bike routes labelled on the Master Plan. If people can’t get to them safely, then I wonder what point of having them is. Surely the routes are not just for the elites that don’t mind biking on busy roads to get to them.

Lytton is perfectly positioned to connect the Spirit Trail to all of Blueridge and Seymour Heights. In my mind this street is a key location for a bike route and much needed, especially with nearly 1000 new residents being put on Lytton and the adjacent high school, community center and dance academy.

My understanding of many municipalities in the region is that bike routes are being installed nearly everywhere to connect all communities and not just favour certain ones.

This development could accommodate a bike route which would allow us to start implementing much needed upgrades to our cycling network to keep our residents safe and healthy with less dependence of motor vehicles which contribute to further congestion.

I would be happy to speak to you further about this.
Hi

I apologize for the late response.

Yes, the development process is still accepting comments. Thanks for your input. I will ensure your comments are added to the record of the file and taken into consideration in the project review.

Regarding your question, there are currently no bike lanes proposed along Lytton. I believe the image on the website that you are referring to -- "Building 15 from Lytton Street" -- is actually showing the new private internal road. This private road intersects with Lytton as shown below:
Sorry, the title of the photo is a bit misleading.

The design for Lytton street that we are currently working with is informed by the 2016 Bicycle Master Plan. The Plan does not show any bike facilities along Lytton. It does, however, show an “On-Street Bike Route” along Mount Seymour Parkway which will be maintained as part of the improvements along the Parkway. For more information on the plan, please follow the link below:

https://www.dnv.org/property-and-development/bicycle-master-plan

The new street design for Lytton Street involves one drive lane and a parking lane along both sides of the street. In addition, new curb build-outs are proposed along both sides to provide additional buffer between pedestrians and vehicles, safe space for motorists who have just parked their vehicles, and to engender slower turns and safer speeds into and out of the new Seymour Estates development itself.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Cheers,

Darren

Darren Veres, MCIP, RPP
Development Planner
District of North Vancouver
T: 604.990.2487
E: veresd@dnv.org

From: [Redacted]
Sent: September 05, 2019 9:55 AM
To: Darren Veres
Subject: 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

Hi Mr Veres,

I’m interested in learning more about the development proposed at 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates). Is the development process still accepting comments from local residents?

Could you please provide me information on what is proposed for Lytton street? The DNV website has renderings that show vehicles parked on Lytton as well as cyclist riding in both directions on the east side of the street. Is a cycling track proposed for the street? It would be great if you could provide me more information on the proposed changes to Lytton street. Lytton street is a key corridor for cycling since it connects to the trail network to the south and I may have concerns if there is not a protected cycling lane. Is the development process still accepting comments from local residents?

thanks, [Redacted]
Hi there,

I am a resident of the area that the Seymour Estates will be constructed in and I am writing to express a support for (and interest in) a greater component of ground level retail in the development. The area is underserved from a retail perspective and would benefit from some ground level retail integrated into this design - perhaps a small grocer or some other types of everyday services that residents in the development and area could access and which would also reduce dependences on vehicles for everyday tasks.

Thank you for your consideration,
August 26, 2020

Mayor and Council
District of North Vancouver
355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5

Re: Anthem’s Redevelopment Proposal for Seymour Estates

This letter is to express my personal support for the Seymour Estates redevelopment proposal, as submitted to the District by Anthem Developments.

I would like to provide District Council with the following comments regarding Anthem’s proposed development from my personal perspective as both a community member as well as a former owner of one of the units at Seymour Estates.

It is with great dismay that I see a large piece of property sitting empty for such a long period of time, while people in our community are struggling to find a place to live. I see this as a waste of land resources and a potential hazard to the general public.

As a former owner, I know it offers a fabulous residential location due to its close proximity to public transportation, amenities, and forest trails. I therefore look forward to the day when I can see a lively community build themselves a future on what I considered a great place to live.

As a former project manager, managing social housing development projects throughout the Lower Mainland, I can attest to Anthem’s well thought-out development proposal which addresses several concerns from the community, and satisfies many suggestions and ideas that the community provided during Anthem’s several open house forums. Their final proposal now offers many positive attributes which I comment on below:

Anthem’s Rent-to-Own program will provide young people with an opportunity to get into the housing market on the North Shore – currently an impossible dream for most of the youth who grew up on the North Shore.

With an equal understanding of the need for more affordable housing on the North Shore, and the need for rental accommodation, I greatly appreciate Anthem’s intent to meet the needs of a wider demographic by allocating a portion of their housing to market and non-market rental units. By partnering with local housing agencies, I know their non-market rental units will be managed appropriately to ensure the non-market housing brings housing stability to families at risk.

I appreciate Anthem’s dedication to housing diversity by including 3 and 4-bedroom units in the housing mix to accommodate families in this community, particularly since the Seymour area has traditionally been a family-oriented community.

Further to the family housing concept, I appreciate their proposed outdoor communal green spaces to promote community within the housing development. Anthem’s desire to build community at the cost
of additional profits speaks to their understanding of this community's desire for green gathering spaces.

By allocating several units to adaptable designs and 21 units in particular to fully accessible housing, this development will provide much needed dwelling spaces for people with mobility issues. Our community currently has very few purpose-built accessible units, other than in seniors-type housing, so it is refreshing to see family-type housing offering accessibility for family members.

With traffic being a major issue on the North Shore, I further appreciate their proposed contributions to reducing car dependency by including car-share and electric bike-share programs, bicycle storage, and pedestrian connectivity as part of their development.

Finally, I greatly appreciate the fact that they listened to the community in respects to a long-standing strong desire for a local coffee shop. I know since their original submission, a new coffee shop has finally emerged from the ashes of the old corner store at Emmerson and Mount Seymour Parkway. However, a second coffee shop in the area provides additional convenience and greater options for the people in the Blueridge area, the students and teachers at Windsor Secondary School, parents watching their children play soccer in the rain, and patrons of Ron Andrews Community Centre.

In short, I feel Anthem listened to the community and responded favourably to the community's needs, interests and concerns. It is due to their diligence in understanding and addressing the needs and concerns of the community that I feel this proposal is one I can fully support.

Sincerely,
Dear Mayor and Council:

Please find attached the document for our support for the Seymour Estate Housing Project.

Thank you very much.

Esther and Luis Mogyoros
September 9, 2020

Dr. Luis and Esther Mogyoros

Dear Mayor and Council,

We wish to express our support for the Seymour Estates housing project that is included on the September 14, 2020 Council Meeting agenda. We have been following this project for some time now and are really pleased to see it come forward for your formal consideration.

As residents of the District for over 29 years now, it’s nice to see more housing being contemplated for our community. We raised two (now adult) sons in the community but they have both since moved away to other areas of the Lower Mainland. We hope one day they will have the opportunity to move back – and projects like this is what could make that a reality.

In our view, the proposal for Seymour Estates on Lytton Street would make a really worthwhile addition to the community. It will help address the demand for new housing with no foreseeable negative side effects. The project itself will revamp the whole area, will give options to people with different needs – such as first-time home buyers, renters and people looking to downsize.

At the end of the day, Anthem is a high-quality builder with a well thought out project for this vacant site in our community. We welcome and support this project (and hope you will too!)

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Luis and Esther Mogyoros
Hello Mayor and Council,

Please see attached letter in support of the First Reading of Anthem’s redevelopment project for Seymour Estates, as per item 8.3 on Monday evening’s Council meeting agenda. If you have any questions regarding my letter, please don’t hesitate to contact me directly.

Adele Wilson

North Vancouver, BC
Re:  Anthem’s Redevelopment Proposal for Seymour Estates

This letter is to express my personal support for the Seymour Estates redevelopment proposal, as submitted to the District by Anthem Developments.

I would like to provide District Council with the following comments regarding Anthem’s proposed development from my personal perspective as both a community member as well as a former owner of one of the units at Seymour Estates.

It is with great dismay that I see a large piece of property sitting empty for such a long period of time, while people in our community are struggling to find a place to live. I see this as a waste of land resources and a potential hazard to the general public. As a former owner, I know it offers a fabulous residential location due to its close proximity to public transportation, amenities, and forest trails. I therefore look forward to the day when I can see a lively community build themselves a future on what I considered a great place to live.

As a former project manager, managing social housing development projects throughout the Lower Mainland, I can attest to Anthem’s well thought-out development proposal which addresses several concerns from the community, and satisfies many suggestions and ideas that the community provided during Anthem’s several open house forums. Their final proposal now offers many positive attributes which I comment on below:

Anthem’s Rent-to-Own program will provide young people with an opportunity to get into the housing market on the North Shore – currently an impossible dream for most of the youth who grew up on the North Shore.

With an equal understanding of the need for more affordable housing on the North Shore, and the need for rental accommodation, I greatly appreciate Anthem’s intent to meet the needs of a wider demographic by allocating a portion of their housing to market and non-market rental units. By partnering with local housing agencies, I know their non-market rental units will be managed appropriately to ensure the non-market housing brings housing stability to families at risk.

I appreciate Anthem’s dedication to housing diversity by including 3 and 4-bedroom units in the housing mix to accommodate families in this community, particularly since the Seymour area has traditionally been a family-oriented community.

Further to the family housing concept, I appreciate their proposed outdoor communal green spaces to promote community within the housing development. Anthem’s desire to build community at the cost
of additional profits speaks to their understanding of this community’s desire for green gathering spaces.

By allocating several units to adaptable designs and 21 units in particular to fully accessible housing, this development will provide much needed dwelling spaces for people with mobility issues. Our community currently has very few purpose-built accessible units, other than in seniors-type housing, so it is refreshing to see family-type housing offering accessibility for family members.

With traffic being a major issue on the North Shore, I further appreciate their proposed contributions to reducing car dependency by including car-share and electric bike-share programs, bicycle storage, and pedestrian connectivity as part of their development.

Finally, I greatly appreciate the fact that they listened to the community in respects to a long-standing strong desire for a local coffee shop. I know since their original submission, a new coffee shop has finally immerged from the ashes of the old corner store at Emmerson and Mount Seymour Parkway. However, a second coffee shop in the area provides additional convenience and greater options for the people in the Blueridge area, the students and teachers at Windsor Secondary School, parents watching their children play soccer in the rain, and patrons of Ron Andrews Community Centre.

In short, I feel Anthem listened to the community and responded favourably to the community’s needs, interests and concerns. It is due to their diligence in understanding and addressing the needs and concerns of the community that I feel this proposal is one I can fully support.

Sincerely,

Adele Wilson

North Vancouver, BC
Dear Mayor Little, Councillors and Planning Staff,

I am writing to offer my support for the proposal to renew the property at 904-944 Lytton Street, which is currently sitting vacant.

This new project is exactly the kind of housing I’d like to see added to the neighbourhood because it will help to bring more families and new life into the community. North Van is a great place to live, but there aren’t many (relatively) affordable housing options, which is a barrier to entry for young families and professionals that want to live here. With rent to own and below market rental homes being proposed, this project offers housing options that don’t currently exist in the area. In particular, I am excited about the prospect of the rent to own housing that is being proposed here. This program will help people to enter the housing market that otherwise may not have been able to.

I expect this development would be attractive to people who work on the North Shore but commute from elsewhere or people who grew up in the area but may not be able to afford a single-family home. I think this project will make an excellent addition to the community and I hope that you will vote to advance this project when it comes before you for formal consideration.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Jae Chang

North Vancouver, BC
Dear Mayor and Council,

My name is Lacy Hawley and I’m writing to encourage you to move the application for the Seymour Estates housing project forward to approval at your next Council Meeting. I understand this project is on your September 14 Council Meeting agenda (item 8.3).

I’ve lived on the North Shore for several years now and am no stranger to the difficulties renters face when it comes to affordability and availability. This project looks ideal and would make a really wonderful long-term home for individuals such as myself and my partner.

I’d just like to add that I think the rent to own program associated with this project is phenomenal. Without programs like this, individuals struggling to enter the market are left with very few alternative options and often times end up needing to leave. I’ve not seen an opportunity like this before on the north shore and I think this will provide many first-time home buyers a real helping hand when it comes to affording a home in our City.

I really hope to see this project approved.

Thank you,

Lacy Hawley
Resident
Good afternoon Mayor and Council,

I’d like to offer my written support to the application to renew the Seymour Estates site on Lytton Street, which I understand is up for discussion on Monday evening’s Council Meeting. I was raised within close proximity of the site and continue to live in North Vancouver with my family. I was a graduate of Windsor Secondary School and spent my entire youth/young adulthood in the area. I’m an active member of our neighbourhood and I’m invested in the wellbeing of our community’s future.

The proposal Lytton Street would bring 340+ new and much needed homes to the community. The consistent housing challenges our community faces needs to be addressed. Not everyone has the ability to purchase a single family home and young families need options. In my view, approving this proposal would be a great step in the right direction.

On top of the long list of benefits this project brings, the physical building itself is also attractive and would fit into the surrounding area really nicely. I think the developer have taken great care with regard to this aspect of the proposal, and I really appreciate that.

I’d like to see this project move forward and I look forward to your discussion on Monday evening.

Kindly,
Morgan Iannone
Resident
Hello,

I am writing to express my support for 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver. I live close to the proposed development site. I have friends and family in the neighbourhood.

904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver should be approved for these reasons:
• I want my friends and family to be able to live in North Vancouver, and they won't be able to do that if there aren't enough homes.
• This project will make North Vancouver a more vibrant, exciting neighbourhood.
• We need more social, non-profit and generally affordable housing in our city.
• I like the transportation initiatives proposed to encourage residents to reduce car dependency
• Different tenures in one project will enable different levels of income to all live together.
• I think the Rent to Own program is great
• I support alternatives to single family home ownership
• There is a serious lack of affordable rental housing on the North Shore.
• This project will allow individuals and families to live and work on the North Shore, which currently is very difficult to do.
• This project also allows people, like my young co-worker who wants to start a family, that want to live on the North Shore and work in nearby communities the opportunity to stay within the Lower Mainland.

Sincerely yours,
Lilian Chau
Attention: Mr. Milburn and Planning Staff,

I’d like to lend my written support to Anthem’s proposal to redevelop the property at Lytton and Mt Seymour Parkway, which is on Monday’s Council Agenda. This site has been sitting vacant for far too long.

I understand that the developer is proposing to build a variety of housing typologies and tenures to support the diverse housing needs of current and prospective North Van residents. As a resident of the Seymour area (and father of two) I encourage Council to approve this application which would see this derelict property renewed and revitalized with high quality housing, retail and amenities to serve the neighbourhood.

This project represents a much better use than what is there today – a vacant lot – and the project has been revised over several years to reflect public input. It’s time to get on with it.

Thanks for the consideration.

Sincerely,

Josh Gaze
Dear Councillor Forbes, and other members of Council.

I am contacting you regarding the rezoning application 904-944 Lytton Street.

I have been a resident of the Seymour area 5 years. As a neighbour and a parent of two young children, I would welcome greater housing diversity in our community.

I felt compelled to write to you in support of this project because, as a parent, I worry about the affordability and livability of our community. Although my family is young, I worry about my kids getting pushed well out of our community when it’s time for them to live independently.

Given that North Van is a significant employment hub (Lionsgate Hospital, Seaspan, Neptune Terminals, etc), I also strongly believe that we need more housing to support our local workforce, including teachers and first responders. Many of the people who support our economy and provide critical services to our community are having to travel in from Burnaby and other neighbouring cities to get to work. This leads to traffic congestion, not to mention an unpleasant commute for the people that care for us. If we don’t create an appropriate level of housing diversity, issues around affordability and traffic congestion will only get worse.

I understand that you share similar concerns and campaigned on the creation of more rental and affordable housing to serve our local workforce. While I recognize that some of your colleagues were elected on a platform of slowing the pace of development, I think that this goal has been achieved and I hope to see housing projects that offer significant benefit to the community, like this one, approved.

I understand that the project proposed at 904-944 Lytton Street will provide rent to own housing for first time buyers who live or work in North Van. This is an opportunity that we can’t afford to lose. Additionally, this project offers a number of secured rental homes, including below market rental, and market condos, which provide a less expensive alternative to single family home ownership. A number of the homes here are family oriented, 2 to 4 bedroom homes, which will likely house our successful working population, looking to establish themselves and raise their families in North
Van.

I often hear stories from friends and colleagues who are struggling to find suitable, affordable housing in North Van. This project is still a few years away, so it won’t deliver an immediate solution, but the more rental and affordable housing options that are built in North Van, the better for the long term needs to serve the community.

I hope that this project will be supported by Council when it comes forward for consideration.

Sincerely,

Carling Gaze
Dear Council, District of North Vancouver,

As a long-time resident, I’m writing to express my support for the proposal to build a mix of rental and market housing on the vacant site at 904-944 Lytton Street.

I was raised in West Van, and now my kids are being raised in the North Van (we are in the Edgemont/Delbrook neighbourhood). While we are amongst the lucky few with secure housing, we all need to recognize that there are many families who are struggling to stay in our community as a result of the high cost of housing.

Our community needs a greater level of housing diversity. The project that has been proposed by Anthem Properties at Lytton and Mt Seymour Parkway, if approved, will contribute a range of housing types and tenures that will cater to the different needs and income levels of North Van residents – including first time home buyers, downsizers, professional couples, single parents and more. I expect that the rent to own program that is being proposed here will help people who work here or grew up on the North Shore and want to stay local, but may not have the money saved for a down payment.

Unfortunately, our community is losing seniors (who’ve lived in DNV for many years), downsizers (because they can’t find suitable housing), critical care providers and young families (because there aren’t enough attainable housing options available). Where are our teachers, care givers, barristas, fire fighters, nurses going to live, who are integral to keeping our communities livable? Where are our children going to live? I worry about them getting pushed well out of our community when it’s time for them to live independently. Here we have an opportunity to build inclusive housing in an amenity rich neighbourhood close to schools, recreation, shops and services.

I appreciate the opportunity to share my comments and I hope to see the rezoning application for 904-944 Lytton Street approved.

Jason Black
Dear Mayor, Council & District Planning Staff,

I would like to encourage Council to vote in support of First Reading for the rezoning application that is coming before you for 904-944 Lytton Street Monday night. I’m glad to hear this is progressing after some 3+ years of process.

As a North Van resident (Lynn Valley) and a mother of two young children, I am invested in the health of our community and do have concerns about the cost of housing for future generations. Unfortunately, escalating housing costs are pushing people out of North Van today, and this will only get worse if more housing supply is not created soon.

I appreciate that this project will add to the diversity of housing stock and enhance affordability in our community through the development of a mix of market and affordable rental housing as well as condos, including options for rent to own homes. Facilitating access to stable rental housing and more affordable alternatives to single family home ownership is in the best interest of the people who live and work in North Van, which is why I hope to see more projects like this one come forward.

Also, I think the neighbourhood coffee shop will be a hit.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kristen Neeser

North, Vancouver
The first reading for Seymour Estates would have full context once the OCP rewrite is complete.

If the DNV is going to embark on what is, in all material ways, an additional town center at Lyntton and Mount Seymour Parkway, then full land use in the area should be presented.

For instance 800-949 Lyntton which is a large amount of land owned by the municipality can be set aside for "250 units of rent geared to income affordable housing to reflect resolution 2 on the 2018 municipal election ballot, to be completed by the end of 2022 with funding from senior government and the municipality's reserves or debt issuance."

Municipal plans for Canlan Ice Sports and Ron Andrews Center can be established.

Transportation can be laid out as "transportation supported by the Mount Seymour Parkway spine will connect Parkgate, the Seymour Town Center (at Lyntton) and Phibbs Exchange with a B-line and a moratorium on east-west traffic light additions."

The developer MUST start work immediately and not seek uplift solely to strengthen their balance sheet while leaving the lands vacant as has occurred with the Mosaic project in the DNV and the Concert Properties project in the CNV on Kings Mill. Further, the rental and affordable portions of the project must begin immediately and not be back ended. The project should be complete in 2023.

Finally, quarterly reports must be made to council and to the public regarding the progress of the rental, rent to own, and affordable housing portions of the project. We want to avoid what has happened with the Larco project where the promised 45 units of seniors housing clearly
required in the empowering bylaw simply vanished during development with the DNV's Clerk James Gordon and the FOI desk refusing to release the documentation and records allowing the 45 units to be expunged from the project.

By copy to the Clerk, please include this submission in the file, and again, for the third time in a month please provide me the records (including the approving officer(s) with names identified) empowering with what appears, from my site visit, that the 45 units of seniors housing for the Larco project was waived along with the turnover of the community center to the municipality and that CACs were cancelled (on the basis there was no change in DNV’s reserves when the CACs were required to be paid). These are important issues which must be fully transparent and not the subject of smoke-and-mirror transactions.

Sincerely

Hazen Colbert
Dear Mayor Little and Councillors,

My name is Dr. Sheldon Juell. Please accept this letter of support for the rent to own project at 904-944 Lytton Street. I believe this project will significantly improve what is currently there today (vacant, fenced off private property), and provide much needed new housing to the Seymour the area.

I am excited about the proposal for Seymour Estates, which seeks to bring 25 rent-to-own homes, which will be available to first time buyers who either live or work in North Vancouver. My wife Ivone Juell and I have been renting our home while saving up for a down payment and would love to live in one of the new rent-to-own homes being proposed for Seymour Estates.

If approved, this proposal will help to continue bringing families to live in this area and provide home ownership opportunities through the rent-to-own program. My wife and I are hopeful that we will be selected as candidates for the rent-to-own program. We have been looking for this type of opportunity for a long time. Over the years, we (like so many people in the lower mainland) have struggled to come up with the down payment as first time buyers. Since there are only 25 homes being offered in this program, applicants will be selected through a lottery. I hope to see more rent to own projects in the future so that people like my wife and I will have the opportunity of a lifetime to qualify and to be part of a rent to own program that will lead to the purchase of our first home.

Seymour is a great family-oriented neighbourhood, and I appreciate that the project will help to ensure that the neighbourhood continues to develop in a way that supports young families. Moreover, this project will provide rent-to-own housing for families that may need a three (3) to four (4) bedroom home—market and below market rental—and good amenities for residents, including a coffee shop and outdoor spaces. Last but not least, this project will bring young families that will help to support and boost the economy of the North Vancouver community.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide my input on this project and hope that Mayor Little and Councillors will give the green light to this project in the coming weeks.

Warm regards,

Sheldon Juell, Ph.D.
Please approve the affordable housing project for Lytton street in north Vancouver
Dear Mayor Little and Council

I understand that the District of North Vancouver (DNV) Council has been excellent in passing a motion indicating their support for requiring Greenhouse Gas Intensity (GHGI) target limits as a condition of rezoning, effective immediately (which would essentially prevent using fossil gas for heat and hot water).

I also understand that a 341-unit complex, Seymour Estates, south of Mt Seymour Parkway, by Anthem Properties, proposes to meet Step 3 efficiency but not the GHGI target limits, as fossil gas heating will be installed.

I am deeply concerned that the Council may approve this development in those conditions and recommend that rezoning for the Seymour Estates development be delayed until Anthem Properties redesigns their plans to meet the new GHGI target limits and eliminate the use of fossil gas for space heating and hot water heating.

It is great to hear that, while buildings in DNV are responsible for 41% of the District’s GHG emissions, many buildings in BC already exist or are under construction that meet the highest Step Code step and GHGI limits. We need to continue this progress.

Thank you

Heather Williams
TO Mayor and Councilors of the District of North Vancouver

RE Seymour Estates Rezoning Application

I begin by congratulating the District of North Vancouver for its efforts to mitigate climate warming. The DNV June motion suggesting that rezoning applications must meet Greenhouse Gas Intensity limits is an example.

As I write this letter, I only need to look out the window to see the importance of such limits. Smoke from the California wild fires has obscured the sun and created a yellowish semi-darkness. Recent scientific research has linked such weather events directly to Carbon Dioxide levels in the atmosphere.

So action is needed to reduce CO2 emissions. An opportunity for the DNV to act will arrive on Monday.

Seymour Estates will make a request for rezoning approval. According to information I have received, the development includes fossil gas heating which means that it will not meet the requirements of the June motion.

I note that a development proposal by Cornerstone Architecture is also coming before Council on Monday and it does have a plan that meets target limits and does not use fossil fuel heating.

Surely Seymour Estates could make a matching green proposal.

So I respectfully request that Council ask Seymour Estates to return with a plan that does not use fossil fuel heating.

Yours sincerely,
Stephen Beaton

North Vancouver, B.C.
Dear Mayor Little and Councillors,

I strongly support the proposal to build rent to own homes at 904-944 Lytton Street.

Home ownership is not attainable for many people living and working in North Vancouver due to the large down payment that is typically required, which is why I felt compelled to write in support of Anthem’s proposal build rent to own homes in North Van. I would love to live here myself, and hope to be one of the lucky few selected for the rent to own program at Seymour Estates.

This project will deliver 25 rent to own homes, which will help first time home buyers who live/work in North Van to plant their roots here. At present, those who are renting their homes because they are unable to afford a down payment are facing low vacancy rates in the rental market, along with facing the challenge of renovictions. In addition to providing rent to own housing, this project offers more than 85 secured rental homes, which will allow tenants to have greater stability than with secondary market rental housing, thus ensuring that tenants can stay in their communities for a longer period of time and contribute to its success.

We need better, more affordable alternatives to single home ownership in the District. I think this project provides a great model for the housing diversity that is needed in our community.

Regards,

Ivana Redmond
Sunday September 13, 2020

DNV Council Agenda, September 14, 2020 - Items 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5, Climate related points

Thank you for Council for your past and on-going support of targeted work on the climate emergency.
We have all suffered the past week with poor air quality due to wildfire smoke drifting into BC, which we recognize as related to climate emergency – on Saturday Vancouver had the worst air quality in the world, later changing to second worst, second only to Portland, Oregon. If we needed any reminders of consequences of our actions, we receive climate emergency reminder literally with each breath we take!

I am writing on several agenda items,

**Agenda 8.3 Mixed-Use Development at 904 - 944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates),** page 93 of Agenda. Seymour Estates proposes 341-unit residential development with small commercial space for a café. The project report states, as currently scoped, will use fossil fuel to power its boilers. Council will recall the prior discussion on the importance of GHGI limitation on projects within DNV. The Seymour Estates is one of several upcoming (and all future) projects which should implement and enforce GHGI regulations.

**Agenda 8.4 1210-1260 West 16th Street – Council Early Input** p. 205-273 Rezoning and Development Permit Application, page 205 of Agenda. The West 16th Street proposes two, four-storey multi-family apartment buildings (one containing 31 market ownership units and the other 31 market rental units. Under heading ‘Green Building Measures’, applicant proposes “A building operation that is fossil fuel free”. I remind Council of the importance of DNV Council passing regulations for new and re-zoned development to align with GHGI regulations. Under heading ‘Vehicle Parking’, there was no mention of number of EV charging parking spots, although perhaps this forms part of the currently-underway discussions between applicant and DNV Development Engineering department referenced in agenda report.

**Agenda 8.5 UBCM Reconsideration of: NEB8 Greenhouse Gas Limits for New Buildings**, page 225 of Agenda. I support intent of this motion – removing the motion from UBCM ‘not to be discussed’ and moving into UBCM ‘to be discussed’ grouping. I also support DNV voting in favour of this motion at the UBCM this month September 2020.

Thank you
Judith Brook
North Vancouver BC
Good afternoon, Mayor and Council:

I am writing to urge Council move this application to Public Hearing. CHAC has been reviewing this project for some four years as it has evolved into an impressive community development. Its features include considerable family housing, both market and below-market rentals, an innovative rent-to-own program, and other features, all of which will significantly benefit both the neighbourhood, and the general Seymour community. We particularly applaud the proposal to establish accessible homes for vulnerable residents, and the potential partnership with Hollyburn Family Services.

At its September 10 meeting, CHAC gave unanimous support for this project and will register to speak more fully at Public Hearing.

Respectfully

Don Peters
Sunday September 13, 2020

DNV Council Agenda, September 14, 2020 - Items 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5, Climate related points

I sincerely appreciate your past, present, and future targeted work on our climate emergency.

Recently we have all suffered with poor air quality from wildfire smoke drifting into BC. On Saturday Vancouver had the worst air quality in the world, later changing to second worst. This is a good example of one face of our climate emergency.

Our climate problems will get worse before they get better. Why? Because of the climate lag, determined by NASA scientist James Hansen in the 1980’s. There’s a 40 year time lag between carbon emissions and their effect on our climate. So we in 2020 are experiencing the effects of carbon pollution produced 40 years ago, in 1980. The effects of our emissions in 2020 will be felt 40 years later in 2060. We need to reduce carbon emissions very quickly, for our kids.

So we need new buildings to have fossil-fuel-free space and hot water heating. The technology is very available. I refer to the following Agenda items.

**Agenda 8.3 Mixed-Use Development at 904 - 944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)** Seymour Estates proposes a 341- unit residential development with small commercial space for a café. The project plans to use fossil fuel to power its boilers. Council has discussed the importance of GHGI limitation on projects within DNV. The Seymour Estates is one of several upcoming (and all future) projects which should implement and enforce GHGI regulations.

**Agenda 8.4 1210-1260 West 16th Street – Council Early Input** Rezoning and Development Permit Application. The West 16th Street proposes 2 four-storey multi-family apartment buildings (one with 31 market ownership units, the second with 31 market rental units. Under heading ‘Green Building Measures’, applicant proposes “A building operation that is fossil fuel free”. It’s important that the DNV Council passes regulations for new and re-zoned development to align with GHGI regulations. Under heading ‘Vehicle Parking’, the number of EV charging parking spots is not mentioned.

**Agenda 8.5 UBCM Reconsideration of: NEB8 Greenhouse Gas Limits for New Buildings** I support this motion – removing the motion from UBCM ‘not to be discussed’ and moving into UBCM ‘to be discussed’ grouping. I also support DNV voting in favour of this motion at the UBCM, this September 2020.

Let’s keep the District of North Vancouver a habitable place to live, for our kids. Can you imagine what wild fires will be like in 40 years, as a result of our present carbon emissions?

Thank you,
Dear Honourable Mayor and Council,

I retired as a teacher from North Vancouver School District in 2008, and have been devoting my retirement years to fighting climate change. I have watched Canada fail to meet any of the climate targets they have set in the past 30 years, yet I have recently seen both Canada and North Vancouver declare a Climate Emergency. Thank you for doing that! I know we all care so much about the future for our children and grandchildren, but how do we turn that desire into policies? How can we keep warming below 1.5 degrees C to avoid the most catastrophic effects of global warming?

Monday evening the District Council has an opportunity to take a bold and needed step to set standards for buildings that allow NO fossil gas for heating. Please be bold and courageous, setting a standard that won't require retrofits in a few years just to come up to the standards we know we need.

Right now I have friends in California and Oregon who have lost everything to the wildfires. Climate change is a present reality, but we can still do a lot to make the future better.

Thank you so much for devoting your lives to being leaders, looking out for the public good.

With much gratitude,

Sandi Goldie

North Vancouver, BC.

Tell me, what is it you plan to do with your one wild and precious life?
- From “The Summer Day” by Mary Oliver
Dear Mayor Little and Councillors,

I’ve been encouraged by the strong actions you’ve taken to address climate change issues. Thank you!

Early in the summer you adopted a resolution to require GHGI limits for new construction when rezoning is required. Now you have two proposals under consideration, one of which, the Seymour Estates, intends to install fossil gas heating. I thought your new GHGI limits would disallow that!

On the other hand, the proposal from Cornerstone Architecture will be zero carbon and will use electric heat pumps for heating space and domestic hot water.

I urge you to
1. postpone rezoning for Seymour Estates until Anthem tweaks their plans to remove fossil-fuel heating,
2. approve the rezoning for the Cornerstone project, and
3. encourage Cornerstone in the work they are doing, which sets an example of responsible construction in this time of climate emergency.

Thank you for your leadership in climate actions in the District of North Vancouver!

Sincerely,
Jon Carrodus
North Vancouver
Volunteer with Force of Nature Alliance and BC Drawdown
Dear Mayor & Council,

LandlordBC is an industry association whose mandate is to support a balanced and healthy rental housing market with an emphasis on private sector solutions. I am writing you today on behalf of our 3300 members, owners and managers of rental housing, to strongly support this rezoning application to build 89 new safe, secure and sustainable purpose-built rental homes for families in the District of North Vancouver as part of a larger project that will ultimately provide 341 homes for the community. Please see the attached formal submission. Thank you.

David Hutniak
Chief Executive Officer
LandlordBC - BC’s top resource for owners and managers of rental housing
Phone: 604.733.9440 ext. 202 | Fax: 604.733.9420 | Mobile: 604.644.6838
Email: davidh@landlordbc.ca
Website: www.landlordbc.ca

The information contained in this message is privileged and intended only for the recipients named. If the reader is not a representative of the intended recipient, any review, dissemination or copying of this message or the information it contains is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender, and delete the original message and attachments.
September 14, 2020

Mayor & Council  
District of North Vancouver  

Sent via email: council@dnv.org

Subject: Rezoning Application – Seymour Estates

Dear Mayor & Council,

LandlordBC is an industry association whose mandate is to support a balanced and healthy rental housing market with an emphasis on private sector solutions. I am writing you today on behalf of our 3300 members, owners and managers of rental housing, to strongly support this rezoning application to build 89 new safe, secure and sustainable purpose-built rental homes for families in the District of North Vancouver as part of a larger project that will ultimately provide 341 homes for the community. We specifically note that 33% of these new rental homes will be available at below market rents to help support Council’s goal to enhance the supply of more affordable rental homes for the community. In our view, with the economic uncertainty facing British Columbians, renting one’s home will continue to be a critically important housing option for many people. The challenge then becomes ensuring we have adequate supply of safe and healthy rental homes.

LandlordBC has long advocated for the need to have all levels of government working together to create an environment that ensures the continued viability of the rental housing sector. This is even more critical now as our sector continues to navigate the current and future impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Please know that the challenges and uncertainties are exponentially greater for anyone contemplating the building of new purpose-built rental housing.

Building more housing in existing urban areas is critical to address our continuing housing challenges, and that means building denser housing where the vast majority of residential land is available. The District of North Vancouver is no different than most communities across Metro Vancouver in that you need to increase housing diversity, housing choice and housing attainability. This project in our view addresses the need for a range of housing options in the community and will enhance the neighbourhood while taking serious steps towards more affordable housing and a more sustainable city. We are particularly interested to see the broader community’s response to the rent-to-own option the proponent is offering.

Rather incredibly we’re hearing voices within the community saying that we don’t have a housing supply problem. As with the larger housing affordability problem, the scorn heaped on rental developers and the supply side of the rental housing market in our view ignores basic economics. It’s important to remember that rental housing developers are providing a critical service, and that service is a place for individuals and families to call home. If we continue to place barriers for the
creation of this housing typology, inevitably rental developers will take away the service by not building rental housing. This risk is real at the best of times, and especially true today as our sector struggles to navigate through the COVID crisis. The long-term implications of developers ceasing to build purpose-built rental housing would be catastrophic for the District of North Vancouver and its residents. Anyone looking for an affordable place to live, and anyone in a position to influence urban housing policy, such as yourselves, need to keep that in mind. Denying the need for this supply and making the suppliers of new rental housing out to be villains is not going to solve the problem, its only going to make it worse.

In closing, while there’s much we do not know about the future for the rental housing sector, the one thing we do know is that the future is going to be one marked with significantly increased risk, uncertainty and, financial challenges. Nevertheless, you have before you a proponent who is prepared to add 89 new safe, secure, and sustainable purpose-built rental homes to the community as part of a exciting broader housing project. It is important that you unanimously say yes to this project. Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Hutniak
Chief Executive Officer
LandlordBC
Subject: Seymour Estates Rezoning Application

TO  Mayor and Councilors of the District of North Vancouver

RE  Seymour Estates Rezoning Application

It has come to my attention that DNV is committed to and is practising Climate Change action. In these times of discouraging climate change realities and political denial from world leaders, I can’t tell you how much I appreciate your stand on action. We desperately need hope and leadership. Will DNV continue to courageously take a stand and lead other local governments to follow suit?

Two issues are on the table this week. I implore you to consider their impact for all of us as well as the message you send not only to the residents of North Van but to all those in B.C.

1) A 62-unit apartment building near Marine at Pemberton, by Cornerstone Architecture, which proposes to meet the required Energy Step Code efficiency level 3 and the GHGI target limits by using a Low Carbon Energy System (LCES), i.e. electrically powered heat pumps. I am pleased that Fossil fuels are not being used and I encourage more of the same.

2. A 341-unit complex, Seymour Estates, south of Mt Seymour Parkway, by Anthem Properties, proposes to meet Step 3 efficiency but not the GHGI target limits, as fossil gas heating will be. I find it disappointing that Seymour Estates is not following the same practise of avoiding the use of fossil fuels.

You know the action required in both of these issues. I implore that you take a stand and give us- the folk that dare to hope for a safe and sustained future, continued hope. Please disallow the use of Fossil fuels.

Respectfully yours, and in deep appreciation of the stand you are committing on our children’s behalf,

Ann Echols
To: Mayor and Council of the District of North Vancouver

Re: Seymour Estate Re-zoning Application

Congratulations to the District of North Vancouver Council for the efforts towards mitigating climate change. The opportunity to react in a positive way and to follow the recommended procedures and policies to reduce CO2 emissions is part of two proposals today – Seymour Estates and Cornerstone Architecture.

It is important that we start now to follow our guidelines to reduce the use of fossil fuels in all developments and procedures. The two proposals for rezoning, “Seymour Estates” and “Cornerstone Architecture” are opportunities to follow our guidelines and slow/stop the use of fossil fuels. Thank-you for giving this your careful consideration.

Sincerely

Evelyn Leskiw

North Vancouver, B.C.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Good morning to you all,

Rezoning for the Seymour Estates development must be delayed until Anthem Properties redesigns their plans to meet the new GHGI target limits and eliminate the use of fossil gas for space heating and hot water heating. Two large developments, both requiring rezoning, are coming before Council on September 14:

1. A 62-unit apartment building near Marine at Pemberton, by Cornerstone Architecture, which proposes to meet the required Energy Step Code efficiency level 3 and the GHGI target limits by using a Low Carbon Energy System (LCES), i.e. electrically powered heat pumps.

2. A 341-unit complex, Seymour Estates, south of Mt Seymour Parkway, by Anthem Properties, proposes to meet Step 3 efficiency but not the GHGI target limits, as fossil gas heating will be installed.

This is a priority to meet or exceed our targets for the Paris agreement and MUST be addressed before any new building using old technology or inefficient methods or materials should be approved for build. I was involved with the North Shore climate Hub when Council declared the climate emergency, that was a good move, but only symbolic unless you take action on the people's behalf. NOW.

the Community Energy & Emissions Plan, and the resetting of climate targets to match the UN’s latest climate reports (the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) says we must turn things around in the next 10 years and be net-zero-carbon by 2050).

The buildings in DNV are responsible for 41% of the District’s GHG emissions, it’s our problem too!

-- many buildings in BC already exist or are under construction that meet the highest Step Code step and GHGI limits. NO new building should require retro-fits later to make them zero carbon.

We are in a crisis state right now, today.

Flooding, fires, pandemics, civil war, mass inequality globally. This cannot remain as it is.
How much more evidence and how many more examples do you need to take a stand in your role as a community leadership group?

Sincerely,

Jeff Scharf

"Abundance breeds waste, Scarcity breeds wisdom"
Mayor Little and Council Members,

I am writing to you to express my support for the redevelopment proposal at Seymour Estates. I have been following this application for some time now and hope to see the project realized.

I am pleased to see a redevelopment proposal that will create new housing opportunities, not only for myself, but for those with young ones and in a similar fiscal place in their lives. It is awesome to see a project like this at this location; it's a shame to see this site sit vacant for so long, and I cannot wait to see it thrive and bring a greater community footprint. I appreciate that the developer is proposing more affordable alternatives to single family home ownership here, including condominiums, market and below market rental as well as rent to own homes, something sorely missed on the North Shore.

My family and I would love to live in one of the new homes in this development and have applied for the rent to own program. We have built a life in North Van, have family here, and this will be a way to stay here for the foreseeable future. We are our crossing our fingers that we are selected for the rent to own program and would encourage more developments of this nature in our community.

I wholesomely support this application and I look forward to seeing such a rare project like this proceed.

Kindly,
Good morning to you all,

Rezoning for the Seymour Estates development must be delayed until Anthem Properties redesigns their plans to meet the new GHGI target limits and eliminate the use of fossil gas for space heating and hot water heating.

Two large developments, both requiring rezoning, are coming before Council on September 14:

1. A 62-unit apartment building near Marine at Pemberton, by Cornerstone Architecture, which proposes to meet the required Energy Step Code efficiency level 3 and the GHGI target limits by using a Low Carbon Energy System (LCES), i.e. electrically powered heat pumps.

2. A 341-unit complex, Seymour Estates, south of Mt Seymour Parkway, by Anthem Properties, proposes to meet Step 3 efficiency but not the GHGI target limits, as fossil gas heating will be installed.

This is a priority to meet or exceed our targets for the Paris agreement and MUST be addressed before any new building using old technology or inefficient methods or materials should be approved for build.

I was involved with the North Shore climate Hub when Council declared the climate emergency, that was a good move, but only symbolic unless you take action on the people’s behalf. NOW.

the Community Energy & Emissions Plan, and the resetting of climate targets to match the UN’s latest climate reports (the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) says we must turn things around in the next 10 years and be net-zero-carbon by 2050).

The buildings in DNV are responsible for 41% of the District’s GHG emissions, it’s our problem too!

-- many buildings in BC already exist or are under construction that meet the highest Step Code step and GHGI limits. NO new building should require retro-fits later to make them zero carbon.

We are in a crisis state right now, today.

Floods, fires, pandemics, civil war, mass inequality globally. This cannot remain as it is. How much more evidence and how many more examples do you need to take a stand in your role as a community leadership group?

--
Jeff Scharf
Co-director
North Shore climate Hub
Climate Reality Leader
Dear Mayor Little and District Council,

In response to your September 14, 2020 agenda, I’d like to express my encouragement that you will be considering Anthem’s Seymour Estates housing proposal. I think this proposal is the type of projects needed in our community – low-mid rise, on major arterials (like the Parkway), offering a full range of housing options (and tenures) with green space and some commercial space.

I’ve lived in the community with my family for decades and am a business owner & employer here as well. The District’s ongoing housing challenges are of concern to me both from a professional and personal standpoint. As a business owner, diverse housing choice means I’m able to retain local employees for the long term. As a father, more housing means that as my kids grow up and look to start their own families, they will be able to consider the District as a viable and affordable option. I want to see more housing, of all tenures, built in the area to help cater to this current and growing demand.

And of course… the traffic. We do live in a neighbourhood with congested major streets. I am of the opinion that projects like this will not make a dramatic impact on our road systems; as working from home has become an increasingly viable and required option.

I would be disappointed to see this opportunity pass our community by. We need housing, and this project represents a really thoughtful solution to that challenge, while still respecting the surrounding neighbourhood character.

I strongly urge you to vote in favour of this proposal and move this application forward to a Public Hearing.

Sincerely,

Alex Sartori
Good morning Mayor and Council,

I live at [redacted] North Vancouver and our family live in Blueridge in the Seymour area.

I am writing in support of this First Reading and moving forward to a future Public Hearing.

I have participated in several public information meetings and as a member of CHAC I have also attended several meetings with the applicant to discuss this development proposal. There have been many positive changes made over the past few years.

This proposal has many positive features which I will briefly list as follows:
1) 341 residential units which are needed in DNV
2) 33 non-market housing units
3) 56 rental units in perpetuity
4) Habitat for Humanity 3 bedroom home for a family
5) 25 rent to own units - innovative and to be encouraged in DNV

I will keep this email short and plan to speak at a future Public Hearing. Thanks for the opportunity to participate.

I'm writing in support of this proposal.

Barry Fenton
Dear Mayor and Council,

With regard to Item 8.3 on your Council Meeting agenda for September 14, 2020 - I support the application to build family oriented, multifamily housing at 904-944 Lytton Street in North Vancouver.

I applaud the applicant for including a number of 3 and 4 bedroom homes in this development – this is quite rare for apartments and condominiums. I can confidently say finding affordable family sized housing is stressful and competitive, given the lack of options.

I am supporting this application based on the fact that it offers family sized homes in a highly desirable location within walking distance to transit, multiple schools, a day care, community centre and parks.

I hope that Council will support this project.

Respectfully,
Courtney Iannone
Resident
Hello Mayor and NVD Councillors,

I am writing to urge you to require that the rezoning for the Seymour Estates development be delayed until Anthem Properties redesigns their plans to meet the new GHGI target limits and eliminate the use of fossil gas for space heating and hot water heating.

As the fires raging across North America remind us, we do not have much time to act in reducing our GHG emissions and ensuring a livable planet for future generations. Please take your responsibility to our children and grandchildren seriously and prevent any future use of fossil fuels in the District.

Sincerely,

Catherine Strickland (she/her)
I live on the unceded territory of the Squamish, Tsleil-Waututh and Musqueam Nations.
Dear Members of the District of North Vancouver Council Members:

In June, District of North Vancouver (DNV) Council passed a motion indicating their support for requiring Greenhouse Gas Intensity (GHGI) target limits as a condition of rezoning, effective immediately (which would essentially prevent using fossil gas for heat and hot water).

Two large developments, both requiring rezoning, are coming before Council on September 14:

1. A 62-unit apartment building near Marine at Pemberton, by Cornerstone Architecture, which proposes to meet the required Energy Step Code efficiency level 3 and the GHGI target limits by using a Low Carbon Energy System (LCES), i.e. electrically powered heat pumps.

2. A 341-unit complex, Seymour Estates, south of Mt Seymour Parkway, by Anthem Properties, proposes to meet Step 3 efficiency but not the GHGI target limits, as fossil gas heating will be installed.

The North Vancouver District Council has laid a strong foundation upon which decisions can, and will be, made that support climate action one decision at a time. Buildings in the District of North Vancouver are responsible for 41% of the District's GHG emissions. How can it be that the Council will even entertain zoning for Anthem Properties Seymour Estates development, as its buildings are designed using fossil gas for space heating and hot water heating; whereas, a 62-unit apartment building near Marine at Pemberton, by Cornerstone Architecture, proposes to meet the required Energy Step Code efficiency level 3 and the GHGI target limits by using a Low Carbon Energy System (LCES), i.e. electrically powered heat pumps?

The District of North Vancouver has set itself a climate-positive agenda for which strong policies are needed. Policies are only as effective if they are adhered to, and only as effective if implemented to a high standard of their intentions.

I am proud to live in a community, in a district, that sets a strong climate-action agenda. I only hope that the Council will be strong enough to stay the course it has set by making each and every decision, where climate interests are at stake, matter...to this end, I strongly urge the Council to respectfully, and in alignment with the District's goals and policies, ask Anthem Properties, to redraft their plans in alignment with the GHGI targets it has set, and be more in step with other developers, like Cornerstone Architecture.

Sincerely,

Anna-Lisa Jones
Member of Highlands United Church Growing Greener Group
North Vancouver, BC
SUBJECT: Rezoning for the Seymour Estates development REQUEST FOR DELAY

Good morning to you all,

Rezoning for the Seymour Estates development must be delayed until Anthem Properties redesigns their plans to meet the new GHGI target limits and eliminate the use of fossil gas for space heating and hot water heating.

Two large developments, both requiring rezoning, are coming before Council on September 14:

1. A 62-unit apartment building near Marine at Pemberton, by Cornerstone Architecture, which proposes to meet the required Energy Step Code efficiency level 3 and the GHGI target limits by using a Low Carbon Energy System (LCES), i.e. electrically powered heat pumps.

2. A 341-unit complex, Seymour Estates, south of Mt Seymour Parkway, by Anthem Properties, proposes to meet Step 3 efficiency but not the GHGI target limits, as fossil gas heating will be installed.

This is a priority to meet or exceed our targets for the Paris agreement and MUST be addressed before any new building using old technology or inefficient methods or materials should be approved for build.

My husband was involved with the North Shore climate Hub when the Council declared the climate emergency, that was a good move, but only symbolic unless you take action on the people's behalf. NOW.

the Community Energy & Emissions Plan, and the resetting of climate targets to match the UN’s latest climate reports (the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) says we must turn things around in the next 10 years and be net-zero-carbon by 2050).

The buildings in DNV are responsible for 41% of the District’s GHG emissions, it’s our problem too!

-- many buildings in BC already exist or are under construction that meet the highest Step Code step and GHGI limits. NO new building should require retro-fits later to make them zero carbon.

We are in a crisis state right now, today.
Thank you

Melissa Powell Scharf.
sent and put you on the cc line

On Mon, Sep 14, 2020 at 12:06 PM melissa powell wrote:
SUBJECT: Rezoning for the Seymour Estates development REQUEST FOR DELAY

Good morning to you all,

Rezoning for the Seymour Estates development must be delayed until Anthem Properties redesigns their plans to meet the new GHGI target limits and eliminate the use of fossil gas for space heating and hot water heating.

Two large developments, both requiring rezoning, are coming before Council on September 14:

1. A 62-unit apartment building near Marine at Pemberton, by Cornerstone Architecture, which proposes to meet the required Energy Step Code efficiency level 3 and the GHGI target limits by using a Low Carbon Energy System (LCES), i.e. electrically powered heat pumps.

2. A 341-unit complex, Seymour Estates, south of Mt Seymour Parkway, by Anthem Properties, proposes to meet Step 3 efficiency but not the GHGI target limits, as fossil gas heating will be installed.

This is a priority to meet or exceed our targets for the Paris agreement and MUST be addressed before any new building using old technology or inefficient methods or materials should be approved for build.

   My husband was involved with the North Shore climate Hub when the Council declared the climate emergency, that was a good move, but only symbolic unless you take action on the people's behalf. NOW.

   the Community Energy & Emissions Plan, and the resetting of climate targets to match the UN’s latest climate reports (the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) says we must turn things around in the next 10 years and be net-zero-carbon by 2050).

   The buildings in DNV are responsible for 41% of the District’s GHG emissions, it's our problem too!
   -- many buildings in BC already exist or are under construction that meet the highest
Step Code step and GHGI limits. NO new building should require retro-fits later to make them zero carbon.

We are in a crisis state right now, today.

Thank you

Melissa Powell Scharf.

--

Melissa Powell
Good morning Council,

I’m emailing you to vouch my support for Anthems proposed rent to own development on Mount Seymour parkway, the Seymour estates.

I was born and raised in North Vancouver, Lynn Valley to be exact. I am a 30 year old working professional who has resided here ever since. Due to today’s high cost of living it has been almost impossible for me to afford to live in my own hometown and save the necessary funds for a down payment. Which is why I want to say it’s amazing a developer even considers offering these rent to own programs. I want to stay here and start a family of my own, and the chance this could be built just blocks from where I currently rent gives me hope that I too could actually own a home here.

Thank you for your time, I truly appreciate it.

Cameron Dombroski
Good Afternoon,

My name is Annalise Carlacci and I’m emailing you today to show the support for Anthems proposed rent to own development on Mount Seymour parkway.

My partner and I currently reside in North Vancouver and have our entire relationship. He was born and raised in Lynn Valley and I made the move over here after seeing how beautiful the North Shore really is. We both work really hard but due to the high cost of living it’s almost impossible for us to afford to live here as well as save for a down payment, that’s why this project is an incredible opportunity for us (and others!). We currently rent near the proposed location of the rent to own and it would be great to finally have a chance at owning a place and staying somewhere that we have called home for so many years.

Thank you for taking the time to read my email

Have a great day

Annalise Carlacci
Dear Mayor and Council,

A member of Council has requested the Transportation Impact Assessment for the development proposal at 904 – 944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates). The proposal and introduction of associated Bylaws 8423, 8424, and 8425 are scheduled for consideration by Council at this evening’s Council meeting and can be found under item 8.3 of the Agenda.

The Transportation Impact Assessment for the project was prepared by Bunt & Associates and is dated November 13, 2019. The report has been accepted by the District’s Transportation Staff. Given the size of the report document, it has been provided in the Council dropbox, under file name ‘Seymour Estates – Transportation Assessment by Bunt & Associates’. Please let me know if you have any difficulty opening the attachment.

For further information, please contact Darren Veres, Senior Planner (veresd@dnv.org).

Kind Regards,

Adriana Reiher
Council Liaison/Support Officer

355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
reihera@dnv.org
D: 604-990-2204
C: 604-220-4156

Get the latest information on the District’s response to COVID-19 at DNV.org/COVID-19 or visit us on Twitter or Facebook at @NVanDistrict
Honourable members of council.

My name is Riaan de Beer, I am the Vice President of Development at Anthem Properties.

I was hoping to provide some introductory remarks tonight, but since there is no presentation at 1st reading, I am offering my introductory remarks to you here.

Thank you for considering our proposal tonight.

4 years ago, the 114 owners of this property, collectively agreed to sell it for redevelopment, because the wood frame buildings had deteriorated significantly since they were built in 1969. We offered to buy it. We then worked for over 20 months with the renters who lived on the property, to find them new homes of their choosing.

We are proud to say that not a single tenant was evicted.

The property has now stood vacant for nearly 2 years. An OCP designated multifamily location, next to a school, a rec centre, on transit and on a major arterial road. It is time to put families back on this site.

Over the past three years of working with the community, listening and learning, the project has evolved to reflect what this community values most, whether that is a coffee shop, transit innovation, zero fossil fuel, more rental supply, affordable housing partnerships, or a rent to own offering for our neighbours who would love to own a home but cannot afford a down payment.

Our work with the community has generated strong support, as we saw in our last public open house, which was the busiest we have ever had and it generated an unheard of 87% vote of support in the comment sheets. The need for diverse housing options are clear, as evidenced in the well over 400 local North Shore registrants for our proposed rent to own program, and these local residents range across all age groups.

This project is a rare opportunity for a win-win.

Tonight you can move innovative and diverse infill housing, in a low impact location, with strong community partnerships and community support forward to a public hearing.

My colleague, Brent Carlson and I will be there in person, ready to answer any questions.

Thank you
Riaan Debeer  
Vice President Development

Anthem Properties Group Ltd.  
Suite 1100, Bentall 4, Box 49200  
1055 Dunsmuir Street, Vancouver, BC  
V7X 1K8

anthemproperties.com
Good afternoon, Mayor Little and members of Council,

My name is Eric G. Andersen and I live at [Address Redacted].

In view of tonight’s Council meeting agenda, I would like to submit my comments on the Seymour Estates proposal at 904 – 944 Lytton Street as follows:

Density – I still feel that the density is too high. The number of units will essentially triple (from 114 to 341 units) which, if not addressed now, may bring many more vehicles on the roads.

Rental units – although it is a step in the right direction that there will be more rental units than initially proposed, I feel strongly that the number of rental units is too low and should be increased. The percentage of rental units should be higher in order to provide lower-cost housing, which is needed. I am happy to see the one unit dedicated to Habitat for Humanity, and I also hope that the proposed Rent To Own Program will be successful.

Parking – The overall number of parking stalls has been reduced from 599 to 576, which is good, but the current proposal with 503 parking spots reserved purely for the residents, is still far too high and will assume (and almost encourage) that every unit will have between one and two cars. I feel that the number of parking stalls should be reduced substantially in order to attract more people with fewer cars and who are not car-dependent. If the location is considered attractive because it is close to public transportation, this should also be reflected in the proposal.

Traffic – The changes will be completed on Highway #1 in the foreseeable future, but nobody knows how this may or may not ease the well-known traffic problems in Seymour. Nobody can guarantee that the proposed changes on the highway will benefit the Seymour residents. As usual with transportation, the proof will be in the pudding. There are no indications of planned improvements for the bus service in the Seymour area.

Phasing – I am happy to hear that a phasing of the construction will take place.

Too compact/number of buildings – I still think that 15 buildings on this site will be too compact. Fewer buildings would enable the site to appear less busy and it would generate less traffic both internally and on the public roads.

Height – I find that six storeys is too much for Mount Seymour Parkway which - with one unfortunate exception - only has buildings of four floors in height, that was also recommended and stated in the Seymour Local Plan.
Coffee shop – I am pleased that Anthem listened to the community and that a coffee shop has been included in this project based on the desire of the local surrounding community, including Blueridge & Seymour Heights. Until earlier this year there wasn’t any real coffee shop in the area outside of Parkgate. There is now a coffee shop across the street, The United Strangers Coffee, but the popularity of this place more than indicates that there would be room for two cafés in the area, even if located relatively close to each other. This would also bring the neighbourhood together and be a definite gathering point for the new residents in the proposed redevelopment.

Finally I hope that the entire development, whatever may be agreed to, will be built as per the very highest specifications in terms of GHG emissions from buildings. This is the time to ensure absolute compliance with the most stringent GHG reduction plans!

Thanks for taking these comments into considerations when discussing the Seymour Estates proposal.

Eric

Eric Godot Andersen

Before printing this e-mail, please assess if it is really needed
Dear Mayor Mike Little and North Van District Council:

Many of us in North Vancouver have been pleased to note that our District Council has taken the lead in our area with the climate emergency declaration, the Community Energy & Emissions Plan, and the resetting of climate targets to match the UN’s latest climate reports. We note that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) states we need to turn things around in the next 10 years and be net-zero-carbon by 2050.

Our buildings in DNV are responsible for 41% of the District’s GHG emissions. With these facts in mind it is important that all new buildings including Seymour Estates be constructed now with the new GHGI target limits in place. Retrofitting and reconstruction costs are very expensive, fuel consumptive and inefficient.

Let’s continue to show the lower mainland that NVD is forward thinking and is willing to hold to the climate targets we have set as goals.

Stop the development of Seymour Estates until Anthem Properties has successfully redesigned their proposed plans to fully meet the new GHGI target limits. Help us to move closer to these net-zero carbon targets now.

Best Regards:

Jean Prescott
North Vancouver
BC
Good Evening Your Worship and Council,

It's nice to see you all in person again. I come before you to speak in favour of granting first reading to the Anthem Seymour Estates Proposal.

It should be noted that I do not presume to speak on behalf of the Seymour Community Association in this matter — but for my own part.

The reasons I ask you to grant first reading are the following:

• I have worked with both the Planner and the Applicant to discern some statistics about the proposal and I have broken it down into this chart.

• Now I based my opinions on this underlying opinion — I do not feel that the District of North Vancouver needs more luxury market purchase condos and townhomes at this time. I don't need to wait for the OCP review to tell me that.

• I do feel however that we are in urgent need of more market rentals, more sub-market rentals and I like the idea of the innovative rent-to-own concept — I would like to see that succeed. I do not feel I need to wait for the OCP review to tell me these things either.

• If you do not see fit to continue this conversation by granting first reading, I believe that the Applicant will go with their “Plan B” — to replace what was there with luxury market-purchase homes. Those homes will sell at a premium and will do nothing to enhance the neighbourhood, certainly not over the good residents who lived there before.
• What was there before was 113 units with just over 204,000 square feet. Plan B – that is what we will get and at an average of 1800 sq ft per unit and at prices of $1,000-$1,250/sq ft these units would sell for between $1.8 and $2.2 million dollars each. There are single family homes in the neighbourhood available for less.
• But how long can we expect the Applicant to hold on to this vacant land? SOMETHING will be built here – but what?
• If you approve first reading, here is what we can get.. Perhaps we can even improve on it?
  o The proposal allows the Applicant to increase the square footage of purchase units by 30% - from 204,000 sqft to 265,000 sqft.
  o In return we will get:
    ▪ 56 units of market rentals.
    ▪ 33 units of sub-market rentals.
    ▪ 25 units of rent-to-own units.
• These things I would like to see.
• I am out of time but just want to close by saying – if you reject first reading, you will be asking for 113 more luxury market purchase condos.
• If you approve first reading we get to keep talking and explore these things we do need some more. Please do that.
• I will have more details to comment on at future meetings, such as the empowering of On-Demand Community Shuttles, design, fit to the neighbourhood, etc.
• Thank you for your time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Max Allowed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>25,339.80</td>
<td>Sq Metres</td>
<td>RM3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>204,403.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>355,715.53</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,667.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Rent to Own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127,639.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,262.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,643.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Sub Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,505.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>265,568.0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>100.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) over former</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,164.7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,147.5</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: James Gordon <gordonja@dnv.org>
Sent: September 16, 2020 11:29 AM
To: David Stuart <StuartD@dnv.org>; Charlene Grant <GrantC@dnv.org>; Dan Milburn <milburnd@dnv.org>
Cc: Louise Simkin <louise_simkin@dnv.org>; James Gordon <gordonja@dnv.org>
Subject: From Hazen Colbert - FW: [REDIRECTED]Anthem - Public Input

From: Hazen Colbert
Sent: September 16, 2020 11:12 AM
To: mike@mikelittle.ca; Lisa Muri <MuriL@dnv.org>; Jim Hanson <jameshanson@shaw.ca>; BETTY FORBES <bkaf@shaw.ca>; Megan from Room6 <megan@room6.com>; mathew@mathewbond.com; Jordan Back <jordan@jordanback.net>; James Gordon <gordonja@dnv.org>
Cc: 
Subject: [REDIRECTED]Anthem - Public Input

Council and Others,

There is a major flaw in the Anthem rent-to-own component of Seymour Estates.

There is no legal way to prevent an existing homeowner from applying for and receiving a rent-to-own home. Then not moving into it, but rather sub leasing it out for rent.

The covenants for the project include a prohibition on rental restrictions. So anyone can buy and rent, or rent and sub lease.

As such, an existing home owner can apply for a rent-to-own home, and once approved, then put a tenant into the property with a sub lease for the two years until the rent-to-own scheme is vested. Technically they, not their tenant is paying the rent. At the end of the two years, they can then trigger the purchase.

Why would someone take this approach?
Because it makes their rental payments toward the eventual purchase tax deductible.

How?

Because the home for which they are the original renter now becomes a rental property for them under the sublease. All the revenue less expenses (which includes rent) must be captured in the annual tax return. So the rent they are paying, which is in all material ways a down-payment, is now tax deductible.

The process is entirely legal. At the end of the two years they trigger the purchase and continue with what is now a lease with the same tenant.

I have simplified detail because there are other tax considerations involved. However this flaw is going to result in hundreds of real estate investors flooding Athem with requests for the rent-to-own component if they already have not. I know of no law that can limit Anthem to providing rent-to-own units to people who do not already own real estate but I stand corrected. Anthem is indifferent. Their financial projections do not change.

By copy to Mr. Gordon, please have staff address the matter and revert to council and I with their response.

Sincerely

Hazen Colbert
The below noted is forwarded for your information.

Louise Simkin  
Acting Deputy Municipal Clerk  
District of North Vancouver  
604-990-2413

-----Original Message-----
From: On Behalf Of Dave Umbach
Sent: September 22, 2020 1:40 PM
To: DNV Input <input@dnv.org>
Cc: Dave Umbach
Subject: 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver proposal

To whom it may concern,

This is just a short note to express my support for 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver. I work by the proposed development site. I grew up in North Vancouver and have sentimental ties to the neighbourhood.

This project is worth your support for these reasons:
- Below-market homes are greatly needed in this city.
- I support this project because it will create more accessible homes in my neighbourhood.
- The project could have more family-friendly units.

I would also like to see the following if possible:
- Building more homes near existing homes shouldn’t require a decision from council.

Thank you for your time,
Dave Umbach
North Vancouver
Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I was pleased to see that Council recently supported the proposal to Seymour Estates – however, I was also surprised to learn that this is the first private market development that has been advanced since 2018.

My husband and I are fortunate to own a condo in North Van and we plan to stay in the area for the long haul. But, at some point, we will be looking to upsize… and there don’t seem to be many options. I am worried that when it’s time for us to move to a larger, family oriented home, nothing will be available, or it will be unaffordable, because of the lack of supply. Additionally, most condos are limited to 1 and 2 bedrooms – it is rare to come by something larger.

Townhomes in particular are an attractive option for families looking to upsize as they are a much for affordable alternative to single family home ownership. Since nothing has been approved over the last two years, and construction takes at least 2-3 years, I expect that townhomes will be in short supply for years to come. This worries us – and I’m sure we’re not alone.

We need better, more affordable alternatives to single home ownership in the District. I hope to see more progress made on the housing front. In particular, I hope that Council will support and encourage more townhome development in our neighbourhood. There are many families like mine who will be looking to upsize in the next couple of years and our hope is that we won’t have to leave North Van – we love it here.

Sincerely,
Talisa Pirri
District Resident

Sent from my iPhone
The below noted is forwarded for your information.

Louise Simkin
Acting Deputy Municipal Clerk
District of North Vancouver
604-990-2413

-----Original Message-----
From: infoweb@dnv.org <infoweb@dnv.org> On Behalf Of Jason Wexler via District of North Vancouver
Sent: October 13, 2020 1:55 PM
To: Infoweb <infoweb@dnv.org>
Subject: Form submission from: Share your thoughts with Mayor and Council

Submitted on Tuesday, October 13, 2020 - 13:54 Submitted by user: Anonymous Submitted values are:

Your name: Jason Wexler
Your phone number:  
What would you like to tell Mayor and Council?
Re: 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

Dear mayor and Council,

I am writing to submit my whole-hearted support for the Seymour Estates application.

To disclose up front, I am a board member at Hollyburn Family Services Society and 33 Below Market Units proposed in this application are earmarked to be managed by HFSS.

This project provides much needed below market housing to the District and the north shore. The number of people that are at-risk who need housing on the north shore is extremely high compared to the greater region, and I believe that is because of the high cost of land and costs to develop new homes on the north shore.

Rising land values, construction costs, rezoning costs and various taxes make so many projects too costly to develop. When a project does pencil out, ultimately these costs are passed on to the end user in the form of a high price per square foot. Furthermore, with relatively low numbers of newly developed housing units, there is very little supply to meet the housing demand on the North Shore. Hence, further upward pressure is put on housing sale prices. Developers, contractors, the province, city staff and councilors are all complicit in this meteoric rise in housing costs over the past several years by constraining supply and forcing a development model to serve only the highest end of the market. In the absence of a district staff-led mass re zoning and revised CAC program, home ownership chances for the average north shore resident will never improve. Given the effects of the recent pandemic and wave of unemployment, middle and lower class individuals will be even more challenged. Often these are the workers that support our local businesses and restaurants. They are forced to live further and further away from their place of work, and are forced to travel in from great distances to support the great shops we have on the north shore. This further clogs up traffic, rather than providing housing for north shore workers in the communities where they work and recreate.

Now imagine the prospects for individuals that are seniors without incomes, adolescents that have been kicked out of the house and partners leaving their homes fleeing domestic abuse. Finding space to live with dignity on the north...
shore for these individuals should be paramount for a community with such good fortune and privilege.

Housing attainability has become the number one issue for local politics now and we can do something about it. Together as a community, we can support projects that address the need and focus on the benefit rather than the minor inconveniences to us as residents.

In summary, home ownership has become unattainable on the north shore for most income levels, and this project provides much needed housing combined with below market homes. I applaud the team at Anthem for delivering such a well considered, environmentally conscious design that will meet a very real housing need.

Furthermore the District should comment themselves for getting to this point on a great project which I personally believe with be a true benefit to the north shore. Anything that council could do to lessen the overall cost burden for the developer in this current world climate would be an added bonus. I would consider that the 33 BMU should suffice as an excellent community amenity contribution to the District.

Thank you for your consideration.
Kind Regards, Jason
To whom it may concern,

This is just a short note to express my support for 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver. I have friends and family who live nearby, and I want the best for them.

I support 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver because:

• This project will make North Vancouver a more vibrant, exciting neighbourhood.
• Different tenures in one project will enable different levels of income to all live together.
• I think the Rent to Own program is great
* Density is the most environmentally sustainable way to build
* Diverse populations have been shown to be best for overall wellbeing of communities

Best,
Joanne Randle
Vancouver, BC
Dear DNV Council,

As a resident of the District, I am writing to express my support for this project. I am very much in support of affordable housing, including rental and below-market rental for those that qualify. I also understand this project is offering a rent to own program, which offers a great and I think unique opportunity for young people to get on the challenging path to homeownership. The commitment to clean energy, as well as e-bike sharing and transit partnerships will contribute to making this project one we can all be proud of as North Shore Residents. I also anticipate using the much-needed neighbourhood coffee shop after mountain biking on Seymour!

Well done to Council and Anthem to get this project to this stage. I look forward to seeing it developed.

Regards,

Rick Eastman

North Vancouver
HI there, I would like to show my support for the development at Seymour Estates. North Vancouver needs affordable housing for young families. Multi family development allows for home ownership to be possible for young families. Additionally I believe it would increase property taxes and allow for the continued support of the excellent recreation facilities that North Vancouver offers.

Yours in health, Craig Boyd
Mayor Little and Council,

My name is Omar Dharamsi, and I am sending this e-mail to support the redevelopment of Seymour Estates at 904-944 Lytton Street (Public Hearing: November 17, 2020).

As someone who grew up in Lynn Valley, I am grateful to have had the opportunity to remain in the District and raise my children in the same neighbourhood I grew up in. I am writing this e-mail in support, because I want to ensure my children will have the same opportunities that I did – the opportunity to live, work and maybe raise their own kids here one day. With more housing options like on offer at Seymour Estates, the chances that they are able to do so will vastly increase. We need to act decisively in ensuring that future generations have housing choice and diversity, or we will lose them as they seek more affordable living options elsewhere.

I appreciate your thoughtful consideration, and I hope you will consider my concerns for our community’s future residents as you make your decision on this application.

Sincerely,
Omar M. Dharamsi
Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to you in support of the proposed development on the corner of My Seymour Parkway and Lytton Street. I believe this proposal is coming to a Council meeting soon, and I hope that you consider approving the proposal.

I am a physician at both Vancouver General Hospital and St. Paul’s Hospital, and I rent my home in Vancouver. The entire Lower Mainland is undergoing a major housing shortage, and many working professionals are having difficulty finding housing to rent or own.

I would consider moving to the District of North Vancouver if more housing choices were provided, particularly if the housing had easy access to the improved Highway 1. For people looking to find a home on the North Shore (to rent or buy), choices are very limited right now.

This housing project won’t begin construction until the new traffic improvements on Highway 1 are completed, meaning it will take advantage of better road conditions instead of worsening the already bad traffic on the North Shore.

This project also provides a mix of housing, with condominiums and rental housing. In addition, there is the option for rent-to-own, meaning that there are opportunities for a mix of residents. I am a renter, so I understand the difficulty in finding and securing rental housing in the Lower Mainland, let alone purchasing property. Constructing more rental housing allows for more people to access housing, and constructing condos is beneficial because current renters who are looking to purchase homes can do so, leaving their rental housing free for other tenants who are seeking rental properties.

I hope you consider approving this development, as it would provide more housing choices in North Vancouver, allowing working professionals like myself the option to rent or buy property in the area. Thank you for receiving my letter.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jessica Hann
To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my support for 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver. I would like to live in North Vancouver someday, and I think that's more likely to happen if projects like this are permitted.

This project is worth your support for the reasons listed below:
• I would like to move to North Vancouver someday, and that will be easier if there are more homes there.

Of course in an ideal world, things would be a little different:
• I believe the neighbourhood, the city, and the region, would benefit if the project was allowed to include even more units.

In conclusion, 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver is a worthy proposal and I urge you to approve it.

Regards,
michele cook
I am writing to object to Bylaw 8423, proposed amendments to the Zoning Bylaw, to permit the creation of a 341-unit mixed-use development at 904-944 Lytton Street.

Mosaic Development's ("Mosaic") renoviction of the residents of 904-944 Lytton Street, supported at the time by Councillor Matthew Bond, displaced 37 households, destroying a community. Mosaic then sat on the property, waiting for a more opportune time to develop the land, before selling the land to Anthem Properties ("Anthem"). Meanwhile over two years have passed and the land has sat vacant. The families that were renovicted and forced to move to different parts of the lower mainland are all paying higher rents for smaller spaces. Anthem purchased the property fully aware of the existing bylaw designation. Anthem does not deserve to be financially compensated through a bylaw change to meet their development requirements simply because they want to maximize their profit.

A development of 341 units is completely out of character for the neighborhood. If there is an average of 1.5 cars per unit, that will place an additional 511 cars on the road. The additional cars will contribute to the daily gridlock on Mt. Seymour Parkway, increasing greenhouse gas emissions and impacting the health of residents. Nevermind the additional trash and impact to the environment an additional 1,000 residents will have. Finally the 341 unit proposal, and the bylaw change, are out of touch with the current needs of the District of North Vancouver.

Centarians are the fastest growing segment of the Canadian population. Building for the future does not mean cramming as many people into as many small one bedroom and two bedroom condos as possible. Building for the future means developing retirement communities and facilities for our aging population. Anthem's proposal does not address these needs.

I urge Council to reject Anthem's request for a bylaw change.
I urge Council to reject the development proposal being put forward to them by Anthem.
Finally, I urge Council to ask Anthem to submit a proposal that meets the needs of our aging population.

Thank you
Dave Iverson
Dear Mayor and Council,

I would like to share my written support for the rezoning application for Anthem’s Seymour Estates proposal. I spoke to you in person at the September Council Meeting where you decided to refer the application for final consideration, and I would like to reiterate my comments.

As long-time residents of the North Shore, my husband and I are really pleased this proposal is being considered for our community as it offers so much for so many people.

I’d firstly like to raise the rent to own program which this project offers. As hopeful first-time home buyers ourselves, this is a desirable component to our family specifically. First time home buyer doesn’t necessarily mean 30 somethings; it includes families like ours, who have been a long-time active member of the North Shore community.

Despite living and working in the community for many years, we have yet been able to make the jump to homeownership. Projects like this would absolutely make that happen and secure our family’s continued future in the District of North Vancouver.

I’d also like to touch on the suite of other benefits this project brings because there are quite a few! I love that the project integrates all types of housing on one site. Condos, rental, subsidized rental and accessible housing all in one place. This, coupled with the proposed resident amenities spaces and coffee shop, would make a really inviting and inclusive community for future residents.

I also really like how Anthem has considered the ongoing traffic challenges on the North Shore and are actively looking to create practical transit solutions like an on-demand partnership with Modo/TransLink, offering transit passes to residents and even looking into an e-bike share program.

This project is thoughtful, inclusive and one I think as Mayor and Council, you could be proud of supporting. On behalf of my family, I’d like to encourage you to vote in favour of this project and to bringing more high-quality, affordable housing options to the area.

Thank you.
Karen Harmon

--
Karen Harmon
Author and Fitness Expert
The below noted is forwarded for your information.

Louise Simkin
Administrative, Information & Privacy Coordinator
District of North Vancouver
604-990-2413

My concern about this development is that it will be too dense. Traffic is already a nightmare on Mount Seymour Parkway. It will only get worse with this development.
Dear North Van District Council,

I'm writing this note to strongly support this redevelopment for the "Seymour Estates". This area has long been under-utilized and has become an eyesore for the community. With teenagers of my own growing up in the North Shore, there is very little chance for them to have a chance to stay in the area. This type of development provides this type of housing alternative for the next generation that wishes to stay on the North Shore. This redevelopment will attract or retain a substantial amount of residents on the North Shore who will support local businesses as well as access to Capilano University. I hope the council can see these same benefits and allow this development to move forward, especially in these difficult economic times. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dan Stringer, CPA, CGA
Dear Mayor and Council,

I would like to comment in support of the housing development that has been proposed for Seymour Estates at 904-944 Lytton Street. I have been following this project with great interest, and in particular, I wish to support the rent to own program. There are many proponents of this program, who are keen to see this project move forward.

I understand that the rent to own program being proposed for Seymour Estates is the first of its kind in North Vancouver. As a result, I expect that there has been lots of interest in this project from hopeful future residents. I hope to see more rent to own housing projects on the North Shore in the years to come.

Council, please vote in support of this application when it comes before you for formal consideration at a Public Hearing on November 17th. I hope to see this project come to life.

Sincerely,
Lobna Elsayed & Ahmed Attya

--
Lobna El Mansoury
--
Lobna El Mansoury
From: Corrie Kost
Sent: November 07, 2020 9:28 PM
To: Darren Veres <VeresD@dnv.org>
Cc: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>; Peter Teevan
Subject: Proposal for 904-944 Lytton Str

Dear Darren Veres,

I note (see attached) that no shadow studies have been provided for December 21 - which of course is the worst time of the year! In the public hearing on Tuesday 2018-06-26 Dec 21 was at least included (although 6pm was not!). The times shown are a bare minimum - which are, IMHO, not up to our community standards.

The provided snapshots at 10am 12pm 2pm 6pm just do not cut it. **Hourly snapshots from 1.5hrs after sunrise to 1.5hrs before sunset are much better.**

As I have indicated for many years, the attached is an excellent standard to follow (see for example page 2). Can they be provided?

Yours truly,
Corrie Kost
STANDARDS FOR SHADOW STUDIES

Shadow Studies illustrate the impact of development in terms of sun and daylight access to the surrounding context including surrounding buildings, the public realm, public and private open space.

Shadow Studies may be required in support of development applications to demonstrate that the location and height of a proposed building if greater than 10.7m, will not cause undue shade on the subject lands, and on surrounding context including building facades, private and public outdoor amenity and open spaces, public parkland, sidewalks and other components of the public realm.

Shadow Studies and Analyses will be conducted for the following dates:

- June 21
- September 21 (similar to March 21, and therefore, criteria for Sept. 21 are deemed to apply to March 21)
- December 21

At the following times:

- Solar Noon (SN)
- Hourly intervals before and after Solar Noon (SN), up to and including 1.5 hours after sunrise and 1.5 hours before sunset

Hourly solar data are specified for each date

See Tables 2, 3 and 4: Mississauga Sun Angle Data

Sun Angles:
Sun Angles are based on the latitude and longitude of the Mississauga Civic Centre at 300 City Centre Drive, Mississauga ON L5B 3C1

- Latitude: 43 deg. 35' 20" N
- Longitude: 79 deg. 38' 40" W

Time Zone: Eastern
Standard Time: UT - 5 hours
Daylight Time: UT - 4 hours
UT denotes Universal Time i.e. Greenwich Mean Time

Shadow Length (SL) = Building Height (H) x Shadow Length Factor (SLF). See Fig. 1
Ensure Adequate sunlight on the following:

1. Residential Private Outdoor Amenity Spaces

To maximise the use of private residential amenity spaces during spring, summer and fall, shadow impacts from proposed developments should not exceed one hour in duration on areas such as private rear yards, decks, patios and pools of surrounding residential dwellings on each of the following dates:

- June 21
- September 21 (Mar. 21 shadow patterns are similar but occur 14 minutes later)

This criterion is met if there is shadow impact for no more than two consecutive hourly test times within the space between the exterior wall of the dwelling that abuts the amenity space and the line of impact assessment ("No Impact Zone").

The line of impact assessment shall be, a line 7.5m minimum from the rear wall or other appropriate exterior building wall of the dwelling that abuts the private amenity space. See Fig. 2 and 3

New shadows shall not result in less than 2 hours of direct sunlight. Where less than 2 hours of sunlight already exists within the "No Impact Zone", no new shade may be added.

Balconies are not considered "residential private outdoor amenity spaces" unless they are the only outdoor living area available to the dwelling unit, are unenclosed, and project 4m or more from the exterior wall of the building.
Ensure Adequate sunlight on the following:

2. Communal outdoor amenity areas including, children’s play areas, school yards, tot lots, and park features such as sandboxes, wading pools etc., and outdoor amenity areas used by seniors and those associated with commercial and employment areas during spring, summer, fall and winter.

Shadows from proposed developments should allow for full sun on the above places at least half the time, or 50% sun coverage all the time, on each of the following dates:

- June 21
- September 21
- December 21

This criterion is met if the “sun access factor” is at least 50% or 0.5 on each of the test dates ($A_s(\text{ave})/A_T = 0.5$ or more)

See 2a for Calculation of Sun Access Factor

This criterion applies to public amenity areas and common outdoor amenity areas that are part of a proposed or existing development.

2a) Calculating Sun Access Factor:

- Measure the total Area ($A_T$) of the space or feature
- Measure the area in sunshine ($A_s$) for each of the test times from 1.5 hours after sunrise to 1.5 hours before sunset both inclusive
- Find the average of the $A_s$ values ($A_s(\text{ave})$)
- Sun Access Factor = $A_s(\text{ave})/A_T$

3. Public realm including sidewalks, open spaces, parks and plazas to maximize their use during the shoulder seasons (spring and fall)

a) Low and Medium Density Residential streets

Developments should be designed to allow full sunlight on the opposite boulevard including the full width of the sidewalk on September 21 as follows:

For a total of at least 4 hours between 9:12 a.m. and 11:12 a.m. and between 3:12 p.m. and 5:12 p.m.

This criterion is met if there is no incremental shade from the proposed development at 9:12 a.m., 10:12 a.m. and 11:12 a.m., and at 3:12 p.m., 4:12 p.m. and 5:12 p.m.

See Fig. 4, 5, 6 and Table 1.
b) Mixed Use, Commercial, Employment and High Density Residential streets

Developments should be designed to allow full sunlight on the opposite boulevard including the full width of the sidewalk on September 21 as follows:

For a total of at least 5 hours that must include the 2 hour period between 12:12 p.m. and 2:12 p.m., and an additional 2 hour period from either 9:12 a.m. to 11:12 a.m. or from 3:12 p.m. to 5:12 p.m.

This criterion is met if there is no incremental shade from the proposed development at 12:12 p.m., 1:12 p.m. and 2:12 p.m., and three consecutive times either 9:12 a.m., 10:12 a.m. and 11:12 a.m. or 3:12 p.m., 4:12 p.m. and 5:12 p.m.

See Fig. 4, 5, 6 and Table 1 for angular planes that will achieve this criterion for Hurontario Street, Eglinton Avenue and streets with a similar alignment.

c) Public Open Spaces, parks and Plazas

Developments should be designed to provide a sun access factor of at least 50% on public open spaces, parks and plazas on September 21.

See 2a for calculating Sun Access Factor

Please note the following:

- Solar Noon in Mississauga on September 21 is 1:12 p.m.
- Shadow Patterns for September 21 and March 21 are similar
- Criteria for September 21 are deemed to apply to March 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Criterion 3a Low and Medium Density Residential Streets</th>
<th>Criterion 3b Mixed use, Commercial, Employment and High Density Residential Streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Angular Plane</td>
<td>Maximum Angular Plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eglinton Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed building on north side of Eglinton Ave.</td>
<td>38.6 degrees</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed building on south side of Eglinton Ave.</td>
<td>22.7 degrees</td>
<td>48.9 degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hurontario Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed building on west side of Hurontario Street</td>
<td>23.4 degrees</td>
<td>47.4 degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed building on east side of Hurontario Street</td>
<td>44.6 degrees</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1. Angular planes given above apply to the alignment of Eglinton Avenue and Hurontario Street and streets with equivalent orientation.
2. Angular planes are measured from the closest edge of the opposite curb (see Fig.5).
3. Angular planes are measured beginning at grade.
4. Angular planes are measured perpendicular to the street.
5. See Figures 4, 5, 6 for graphical representations of the angular plane limits.
FIG. 4:
MAX. ALLOWABLE ANG. PLANES TO PROTECT OPPOSITE BOULEVARDS AND SIDEWALKS

FIG. 5: EGLINTON AVENUE

FIG. 6: HURONTARIO STREET

Criteria 3a
- Low and medium density residential streets
- Closest edge of curb on opposite side of street

Criteria 3b
- Mixed use, commercial, employment and high density residential areas with pedestrian traffic
- No maximum angular plane limit

City of Mississauga: Planning and Building Department
Ensure Adequate sunlight on the following:

4. Turf and flower gardens in public parks

Proposed developments should allow for adequate sunlight during the growing season from March to October by allowing for a minimum of 6 hours of direct sunlight on September 21.

This criterion is met if full sun is provided on any 7 test times on September 21, from 1.5 hours after sunrise to 1.5 hours before sunset.

5. Building faces to allow for the possibility of using solar energy

Shadow impacts from proposed developments should not exceed one hour in duration on the roofs, front, rear and exterior side walls of adjacent low rise (one to four storeys) residential buildings including townhouses, detached and semi-detached dwellings on September 21.

The line of impact assessment shall be a line at grade, 3m from the front, rear and exterior side wall of the adjacent low rise residential building.

This criterion is met if there is shadow impact for no more than two consecutive hourly test times in the “No Impact Zone” i.e. the space between the front, rear and exterior side walls of the adjacent low-rise residential buildings and the respective lines of impact assessment.

See Fig. 7 and 8

Incremental shadows do not necessarily represent adverse or undue impacts, and each proposal will be assessed on its own merits.
Material to be submitted with Development Application:

1. Complete set of shadow drawings for the dates and times shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4: Mississauga Sun Angle data, from 1.5 hours after sunrise to 1.5 hours before sunset

2. Base mapping must include a minimum coverage area as follows:
   a) 4.0 times the building height to the north, east and west
   b) 1.5 times the building height to the south

3. Shadow drawings may be based on 2D mapping or air photos showing shadows from only the proposal, or they may be based on 3D mapping and include shadows from the proposed building and all buildings within the coverage area.

4. Shadow drawings shall include the following:
   a) North Arrow and scale bar
   b) Reference bearing for at least one street adjacent to the subject site
   c) A scale suitable to show the entire shadow coverage area
   d) Existing and incremental shadows differentiated by hatching or colour
   e) Approved but not yet constructed buildings identified in contrasting colour.
   f) The name of the individual who has prepared the shadow drawings

5. Shadow drawings must be submitted with a written analysis which shall include the following information:
   a) Confirmation of site latitude and longitude used in shadow drawings
   b) A statement describing how astronomic north was determined
   c) Origin/source of base plan
   d) Description of all locations/uses of areas not meeting the shadow impact criteria (include a key plan for reference)
   e) Quantification and assessment of the impact in the areas listed in 5(d)
   f) Summary outlining how the shadow impact criteria have been met and describing any mitigating features that have been incorporated into the site and building design

6) The shadow drawings and reports shall be prepared by individuals qualified and/or experienced in this field.

Additional study times and analyses may be required to properly determine the degree of impact.

The intent and objectives of the Standards For Shadow Studies are as interpreted by the Development and Design Division of the Planning and Building Department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE: JUNE 21</th>
<th>AZ (deg)</th>
<th>SLF (ratio length/height)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TIME EDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:37</td>
<td>235.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:07</td>
<td>250.48</td>
<td>4.1230</td>
<td>Rise + 1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>252.58</td>
<td>3.5045</td>
<td>SN - 6 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>262.02</td>
<td>2.0048</td>
<td>SN - 5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>272.04</td>
<td>1.3106</td>
<td>SN - 4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>283.79</td>
<td>0.8976</td>
<td>SN - 3 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>299.52</td>
<td>0.6203</td>
<td>SN - 2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>323.67</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
<td>SN - 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.3670</td>
<td>Solar Noon (SN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20</td>
<td>36.32</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
<td>SN + 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>60.47</td>
<td>0.6203</td>
<td>SN + 2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:20</td>
<td>76.21</td>
<td>0.8975</td>
<td>SN + 3 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:20</td>
<td>87.96</td>
<td>1.3105</td>
<td>SN + 4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:20</td>
<td>97.98</td>
<td>2.0047</td>
<td>SN + 5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:20</td>
<td>107.42</td>
<td>3.5042</td>
<td>SN + 6 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:33</td>
<td>109.41</td>
<td>4.0852</td>
<td>Set - 1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:03</td>
<td>124.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TIME EDT</td>
<td>Az (deg)</td>
<td>SLF (ratio length/height)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:05</td>
<td>268.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35</td>
<td>284.22</td>
<td>3.6329</td>
<td>Rise + 1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:12</td>
<td>291.23</td>
<td>2.5132</td>
<td>SN - 4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>304.14</td>
<td>1.6445</td>
<td>SN - 3 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12</td>
<td>319.68</td>
<td>1.2181</td>
<td>SN - 2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:12</td>
<td>338.54</td>
<td>1.0011</td>
<td>SN - 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9329</td>
<td>Solar Noon (SN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:12</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>1.0022</td>
<td>SN + 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>40.28</td>
<td>1.2205</td>
<td>SN + 2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:12</td>
<td>55.79</td>
<td>1.6495</td>
<td>SN + 3 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:12</td>
<td>68.68</td>
<td>2.5255</td>
<td>SN + 4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:48</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>3.6493</td>
<td>Set - 1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:18</td>
<td>91.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TIME EST</td>
<td>SHADOW DIRECTION AND LENGTH</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:49</td>
<td>302.37</td>
<td>Rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:19</td>
<td>319.05 4.8874</td>
<td>Rise + 1.5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:17</td>
<td>331.25 3.1643</td>
<td>SN -2 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:17</td>
<td>345.21 2.5293</td>
<td>SN -1 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:17</td>
<td>0.00 2.3589</td>
<td>Solar Noon (SN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>14.79 2.5293</td>
<td>SN + 1 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:17</td>
<td>28.75 3.1644</td>
<td>SN + 2 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>41.06 4.9172</td>
<td>Set - 1.5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>57.63</td>
<td>Set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Beverly Ma
Sent: November 08, 2020 6:12 PM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>
Subject: 904-944 Lytton St - Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project

Dear Mayor and Council,

I write to express my support for the increased density of the Seymour Estates Lytton Street site at 904-944 Lytton Street.

I have lived in Blueridge for a number of years and am pleased to see increasing growth and development in this area. Ours is such a wonderful neighborhood, and I am excited at the prospect that more people can experience and enjoy being a part of this community.

In my view, increasing the supply of housing helps to create more affordable homes. This is so important for young families, and a fantastic way to increase diversity and vibrancy.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Beverly Ma

---

Beverly Ma
Phone: [redacted]
Email: [redacted]
Hi:

My house is located in [redacted], and I wonder if this project will be extended in the future to include the houses till Broadview DR. The reason for my question is that I am willing to build a new house instead of the existing one, but I am worried if there will be high-rise buildings that could block my house view.

Regards

Abdul Salam Hamze
Dear Mayor and Council Members,

Please find attached our letter of support of the Seymour Estate Project on Lytton Street.

Thank you for your consideration,
Luis and Esther Mogyoros
Dear Mayor and Council,

My wife and I wish to express our support for the Seymour Estates housing project that has been confirmed for consideration at the November 17th Public Hearing. We have been following this project for some time now and are really pleased to see it come forward for your formal consideration.

As residents of the District for over 27 years now, it's nice to see more housing being contemplated for our community. We raised out two (now adult) sons in the community but they have both since moved away to other areas of the Lower Mainland. We hope one day they will have the opportunity to move back – and projects like this is what could make that a reality.

In our view, the proposal for Seymour Estates on Lytton Street would make a really worthwhile addition to the community. It will help address the demand for new housing with no foreseeable negative side effects. The project itself will revamp the whole area, will give options to people with different needs – such as first-time home buyers, renters and people looking to downsize.

At the end of the day, Anthem is a high-quality builder with a well thought out project for this vacant site in our community. We welcome and support this project, and hope you will too!

Sincerely,

Luis and Esther Mogyoros
[Address], North Vancouver
To whom it may concern,

This email is about 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver, which I support. I live close to the proposed development site. I have family and friends in North Vancouver.

Council should approve the project for a number of reasons including the following:
- It will help keep local housing prices down.
- I want my friends and family to be able to live in North Vancouver, and they won't be able to do that if there aren't enough homes.
- This project will make North Vancouver a more vibrant, exciting neighbourhood.
- We desperately need more affordable rental homes of all types in our city.
- Having a range of tenures will ensure long-term sustainability and affordability.
- Rent to own is an interesting alternative to conventional types of housing.
- I would like the project to have more family-sized units.

I do have some ideas for improvement:
- I believe the neighbourhood, the city, and the region, would benefit if the project was allowed to include even more units.
- Building homes like this shouldn't require an entire rezoning.
- Given the need for more affordable housing in the community, there should be more support for taller buildings to support a higher number of units and to make them even more affordable.

Thank you,

Natalia Izzo

North Vancouver
Dear Mayor and Council,

Please see the staff reply that was provided to Mr. Corrie Kost regarding his query about shadow analysis.

Further to your email of November 7th, shadow analysis for this project was completed in accordance with the guidelines in Schedule B to the District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan. Additional information for December 21 has also been provided for reference.

Guideline B1.3 in Schedule B to the OCP states “…applications should be accompanied by a shadow analysis that illustrates the impacts on March 21st, June 21st, and September 21st (spring and fall equinox and summer solstice) at 10 am, 12 noon, 2pm, and 6pm).”

Shadow information for the March 21st, June 21st, and September 21st analysis dates, as well as the additional information for December 21st is available at the following link:

https://owncloud.dnv.org/owncloud/index.php/s/vJXsIN8XZ1RVkZV

For more information on the District’s shadow study requirements, please see page 228 of the Official Community Plan at the following link:

https://www.dnv.org/sites/default/files/bylaws/Bylaw%207900.pdf

I hope this information is helpful.

Kind Regards,

Adriana Reiher
Council Liaison/Support Officer
Dear Darren Veres,

I note (see attached) that no shadow studies have been provided for December 21 - which of course is the worst time of the year! In the public hearing on Tuesday 2018-06-26 Dec 21 was at least included (although 6pm was not!). The times shown are a bare minimum - which are, IMHO, not up to our community standards.

The provided snapshots at 10am 12pm 2pm 6pm just do not cut it. **Hourly snapshots from 1.5hrs after sunrise to 1.5hrs before sunset are much better.**

As I have indicated for many years, the attached is an excellent standard to follow (see for example page 2). Can they be provided?

Yours truly,
Corrie Kost
Hello

Please see my attached letter of support for the Seymour Estates development project. Please don’t hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Thank you
Dan Driscoll
North Vancouver, BC
Dear Mayor and Council,

Please accept this email of support for the redevelopment of the vacant lot at 904-944 Lytton Street.

I am a long-time District resident (Lynn Valley) and appreciate the need for new forms of housing to take root in our community. Single family housing isn't for everyone – for many, it is not attainable, while others don't wish to deal with the maintenance that comes along with a house and a yard.

This project offers many types of housing that will be attainable and suitable to residents at various stages in their life; this includes condos, rental apartments, rent-to-own apartments, and townhouses ranging from 1 to 4 beds. The development also includes plenty of green space suited for children to play and a coffee shop that will be enjoyed by both residents and neighbours. The site is well situated for this family-oriented development, given its location adjacent to a high school, rec centre and transit service; these are big draws for families.

I believe this proposal will help young families stay in, and return to, North Van. This proposal is certainly a much better option than keeping the site vacant or rebuilding what was already there. I am supportive of this project and hope that Council will support it at the Public Hearing.

Thank you,
Dan Driscoll
North Vancouver BC
Hello Mayor and Council:

I’d like to offer some comments in support of Anthem’s proposal to renew the Seymour Estates property with a range of housing types, outdoor amenity areas and a neighbourhood coffee shop.

I am a multi-generational North Vancouwerite; I raised my two children here, I own and operate a business here, and I care deeply about the future of this community.

I consider myself lucky to live in North Van – I still live in the neighbourhood where I grew up. Many of the kids growing up in North Van today, including my own, won’t be so fortunate, unless action is taken to address the housing supply shortage in our community.

I have reviewed the details of Anthem’s application for Seymour Estates and I believe it offers a range of housing options that cater to the diverse housing needs of our community (size, layout, adaptability, affordability, etc.)

As a business owner, I also feel that it is important to advocate for workforce housing. Many businesses on the North Shore are challenged by staff turnover and long employee commutes. For our local economy to thrive, it is in our interest to have housing options that are affordable and accessible to support our local workforce. The rent to own homes, rental and below market housing being proposed as part of this development offer a great option for housing the people working in, and providing services to, our community.

I hope to see Anthem’s project supported by Council when it comes forward for a Public Hearing on November 17th.

Regards,

David Crone
Dear Mayor and Council,

Kindly find attached a letter from Judy Savage, President & CEO, LGH Foundation and Karin Olson, Vice President, Coastal Community of Care, VCH re: support for Anthem Seymour Estates Multi-Family Residential Development.

Yours truly,

Delia

Delia Jamieson
Executive Assistant to Judy Savage, President & CEO

P 604 984-3811  F 604 984 5786  www.lghfoundation.com
231 East 15th Street, North Vancouver, BC V7L 2L7

Bringing life-changing care to the North Shore.

Donate Today
November 8, 2020

Dear Mayor and Council,

Support for Anthem Seymour Estates Multi-Family Residential Development

Vancouver Coastal Health faces an ongoing challenge attracting employees (nurses, care aides, therapists, support workers etc.) to work in our North Shore health care facilities. Increasingly, the range of housing options does not meet the affordability requirements of many of our public sector employees, even with competitive wage and benefit packages. By necessity, this means many of our staff are forced to commute to North Vancouver, thereby adding to congestion and diminishing the appeal of working at our various health facilities. During the height of the Covid-19 pandemic, the LGH Foundation helped us secure hotel rooms to make it easier for our hard working staff to live closer to the hospital and avoid lengthy commutes and risk of burnout during those stressful times.

That is why we are both writing you today. Anthem Properties have two projects which are of great interest to Vancouver Coastal Health. One is their 225 unit apartment currently under construction on Eastern Avenue, walking distance from Lions Gate Hospital. The second is Anthem’s proposed Seymour Estates development at 904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver, BC.

We strongly encourage Council to give favourable consideration to the Seymour Estates development. We’re particularly appreciative of the range of housing options that will be provided at the development. The mix of townhomes, condominiums, market and affordable rental, along with the Rent-to-Own option on 25 condo units, provides the type of housing likely to be within reach for many of our employees. Of equal importance, Anthem has committed to providing public sector employees of Vancouver Coastal Health priority access to rent and/or buy apartments and homes at both of Anthem’s North Vancouver projects.

This ‘front of the line’ opportunity for health care workers will be greatly appreciated by our employees. We cannot underscore the importance of creating housing options for our employees which allow them the opportunity to live and work in the same community.

We thank you for the work you do to expand housing options for all the residents and workers in the north shore.

Sincerely,

Judy Savage
President & CEO
LGH Foundation

Karin Olson
Vice President, Coastal Community of Care
Vancouver Coastal Health
Dear Mr. Hamze,

In response to your question below, the boundary of the current development application at 904 – 944 Lytton is shown in red on the map below. There is no proposal or plan provision for multi-family development east of this site.

I hope this information is helpful.

Darren

Darren Veres  
Senior Community Planner

355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
veresd@dnv.org
604-990-2487

Get the latest information on the District’s response to COVID-19 at DNV.org/COVID-19 or visit our social media channels by clicking the icons above.
Hi:

My house in [redacted] I wonder if this project will be extended in the future to include the houses till Broadview DR. The reason for my question that I am willing to build a new house instead of the existing house, I am worry if there will be high rise building will block my house [redacted] view.

Regards

Abdul Salam Hamze
Dear Mayor and Council,

My name is Genevieve Bittorf, and I am writing to support the proposal for Seymour Estates by Anthem. I work at Strive Living Society located near Mt. Seymour Parkway and I have to commute from my home in Vancouver to North Vancouver daily via the Ironworkers’ Memorial Bridge. I’m sure you are all aware, but this bridge is incredibly congested in the peak morning and evening times and is a huge toll on all who have to use it at this time. I would love the opportunity to move to North Vancouver permanently so I can remove myself from adding to this congestion and be closer to my work. If I lived at Seymour Estates, not only would it drastically reduce my commute, it would also help to improve the situation on the bridge – I imagine this is true for many of us who commute over to the North Shore daily. I can see myself renting at this location and I especially appreciate the rent to own program as a more long-term option. I grew up in North Vancouver, where I attended Carson Graham Secondary. This development would provide better opportunity for home ownership for someone like myself, who wishes to one day make it back to the North Shore. Not only to be closer to work, but to be closer to family and perhaps one day raise my children in an area that I very much consider my home. Please consider people like me who wish to live in North Vancouver but must commute daily for work and connection to family, when you make your decision.

Thank you,
Genevieve Bittorf
Dear Mayor and Council,

I’m writing this letter as a long-time District resident (who has just recently moved) to share my support for the Seymour Estates project.

I am a young, working professional currently completing my studies to attain my Master’s in Public Administration. I moved to North Vancouver after high school in 2009 and immediately fell in love. I wish I could have stayed, put down roots, and eventually start my own family here, but sadly, this is not an option for me because of the limited housing choices available right now. This is the sad reality of many working professionals who wish to call North Vancouver their home.

Projects like Seymour Estates are great because they offer variety – housing opportunities that include market and below-market rental housing, rent-to-own, as well as condos and townhouses for ownership. Ideally that’s the spectrum we want to see throughout the District, so that young people like me who are working hard can afford to remain and continue to live here rather than being forced out due to a lack of options.

I have followed this project with keen interest for a long time. As many of you know I served our community in many capacities for most of my time living in North Vancouver. I had hoped to be able to apply for the rent-to-own program and stay in the District. Unfortunately, nearly four years later, we’re still only at the public hearing stage.

Mayor and Council, I encourage you to approve this project – there are many of us who would love to remain in the community. Please vote this project and others like it through, and help retain young District residents.

Sincerely,

Nick Hosseinzadeh

--

Nick Hosseinzadeh
Hello,

Please find my letter attached in support of the rezoning application for the Seymour Estates Property.

Thank you,
Erika Bell
To: Mayor Little and Council  
Re: Public Hearing – Seymour Estates, Lytton Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

I'd like to comment in support of the rezoning application for the Seymour Estates property at 904-944 Lytton Street.

I grew up on the North Shore and was fortunate to have been able to return when my family and I moved into a home in the District last year. I’m happy to be back and look forward to raising my kids here.

I’m also frequently near the Seymour Estates property as my kids play sports in the area, so I’m very familiar with the neighbourhood. Currently, the property is vacant, and has been for some time. With its proximity to community centres, schools, and outdoor space, it’s the perfect location for a family-oriented development in line with what the applicant has proposed.

I’m pleased to see a focus on family-oriented housing, both in the type (market townhomes, market rental, below market, rent to own) and the unit mix, with over 75% of homes in the 2 to 4-bedroom range. This mean families of all income levels will have an opportunity to live in this community together.

It’s also great to see that approximately 10% of all the homes will be below market rental housing for low-to-moderate income earners. I hope the applicant is successful in securing additional funding from BC Housing to allow them to provide even deeper levels of affordability. In combination with the market rental, this provides a substantial offering of homes for folks for whom home ownership is out of reach.

I thank you for taking my comments into consideration and I hope that Council will vote to support this application.

Sincerely

Erika Bell
Dear DNV Mayor and Council,

My name is Alex Mogyoros and I am a young professional (pilot) who grew up in the District, near the proposed development at 904-944 Lytton Street. I found out about this project through my parents, and want to voice my support for it, as someone who would like to return to North Van and would be interested in living in this development. I’ve been looking to relocate back to North Van for some time and can attest that decent, affordable housing options are few and far between.

I’m very interested in the Rent to Own program offered as part of this. The Rent to Own program seems perfectly suited to people like me with good jobs who are hoping to return to the place where they grew up, near family. Putting two years of rent towards the down payment of a home is a great tool to place home ownership back within reach of those who can’t afford to save for a down-payment while paying rent at the same time. As you know, market rents in Metro Vancouver are well above the national average so it’s very difficult for people to secure a down-payment.

I am asking Council to please consider the benefits this project presents to current and prospective residents of North Van, and the housing gaps it will fill.

Thank you.

Alex Mogyoros
I have reviewed the information from the first reading and am very disappointed with the amount of density proposed for this site.

Where is the green space for kids to play? I see a very small playground proposed close to Building 1. This does not seem anything close to the park that the City got from the developers in Moodyville. Kids need somewhere to ride bikes and play street-hockey.

Where is the green space for nature?

I grew up on Kieth Road (now Mount Seymour Parkway) just across the street and am disgusted with this proposal.

Jay MacArthur
North Van, BC
November 12, 2020

Dear Mayor, Little and DNV Council,

We are writing in support of the proposed redevelopment at 904-944 Lytton Street. The main reason we hope to see this redevelopment proposal go ahead is because of the rent to own program. I’m sure the rent to own homes will get filled up immediately, and for good reason.

Housing on the North Shore is very expensive, and it can be difficult to save up enough money for a down payment on a home. We are long term North Vancouver residents and hope to soon be homeowners. We have been keenly following this project and have registered our interest in the rent to own program. If we are one of the 25 families selected for the rent to own program, we will be able to soon realize our home ownership goal by applying two years of rent towards a down payment.

Me and my wife Emma are both working professionals and we still are struggling to save. Without this program, we may never be able to own a home, since more than half of our income is currently being allocated towards rent and utilities. Our situation is not unique – there are many people renting on the North Shore who would love to own, but saving a hefty down payment is not within reach.

Please approve this project.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Gary Campbell & Emma Patena

North Vancouver BC Canada
-----Original Message-----
From: Kathy Purves
Sent: November 10, 2020 4:33 PM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>
Subject: Seymour Estates Lytton Street Site

I am writing today to let you know that we are against the development at 904-944 Lytton Street. A proposal for 341 units and 581 parking stalls is far too large of a project for this area. It is a very busy area of Mt Seymour Parkway already. There are many feeder streets coming down from Blueridge, a gas station, Ron Andrews Rec Center, Canlan Ice Arena and Windsor Secondary ~ Lytton being the drop off street for the students. We just had a coffee shop open across the street from the proposed area so another coffee shop is unnecessary. A proposed plan on a smaller scale would be more appropriate for the area.

Sincerely,
Kathy Purves
Resident of Blueridge

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,

I am writing to voice my support for the Seymour Estates project at the November 17th Public Hearing.

As someone who grew up in the neighborhood, went to Windsor & Seycove, it is very important to me that people of my age (32, graduated in 2006) have the opportunity to get into the real estate market where I was raised.

The opportunity to “rent to own” I believe is the most realistic approach towards home ownership for people my age, especially for those who have the desire to upsize as our families grow.

Thank you for your consideration.

Owen Hope
Hello,

I am writing to communicate my support for the proposed development on Mt. Seymour Parkway "Seymour Estates". This site has been somewhat of an eyesore for a while now, and I'm happy to see a development plan submitted for it that addresses affordability, increases rental stock and has a progressive rent to own program.

Having grown up and lived in the district of North Vancouver for 32 years it's nice to see a project that caters to younger people of my generation who are just starting out. Many of my friends have been forced to leave North Vancouver as they've grown, married and had kids. It's sad to see these people leave because of affordability as they were ones who gave back to the community that raised them. People who coach youth sports and volunteer with community clubs to make our city a pleasant and welcoming place to live. The rent to own program is has become a topic of conversation amongst my friends, (ranging in ages from late 20's to mid 30's), as many see it as one of the few ways to get into the housing market and continue to live in the place we grew up. Please approve this development, I see it as a great addition to the area.

Regards,

Taylor Shaak
Dear Council,

This e-mail is to provide my support for a project proposal at the corner of Lytton Street and Mt Seymour Parkway. The proposed mix of housing units and the Rent-to-Own program mean that this could be a development for everyone, not just investors looking to purchase empty condos in downtown Vancouver. There will be rental housing, condos, townhouses, affordable rental housing, accessible housing, a Habitat for Humanity unit, and a neighbourhood coffee shop. This housing mix would allow for an inclusive and varied community that the existing neighborhood could benefit from.

This neighborhood is already friendly and welcoming, but increasing the ability for renters and those needing affordable housing to choose this neighbourhood means we will keep growing for the better. My partner and our friends grew up on the north shore and are struggling to be able to stay in the area due to affordability. We want housing where real people will live their lives, where people can live in the community they want and not be pushed out and where young people can raise families.

Recently we saw the benefit of a new retail shop in the area and was astounded by how busy and sorely needed this was, as people have flocked to it and always has a line. I love that this project proposes a new neighborhood coffee shop as it promotes social connections, chance meetings and an overall sense of community. It is also nice to have some newer, more hip spots for young families or members of the community to visit. There are a ton of great amenities such as the recreation center and ice rink, mountains, biking...etc. but not enough food and beverage options for people to go to afterwards so this would be a wonderful addition to the area.

For these reasons above, I believe that the project at Lytton Street and Mt. Seymour Parkway will benefit our neighborhood and hope that you feel the same way.

Sincerely,

Mackenzie Godfrey and Russell Reichgeld
My comments on the above rezoning application are attached.

Please circulate the my letter to our Mayor and Council.

Thank you,

Frederick Rathje
North Vancouver BC
November 12, 2020

District of North Vancouver
55 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5

SUBJECT: 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

Dear Mayor and Council,

I have been a resident of East Seymour now nearly 50 years and am writing to express my support for the redevelopment at 904-944 Lytton Street known as Seymour Estates.

I also would like to specifically address the concerns about increased density, and ways to minimize traffic impacts and reduce pollution by choosing active forms transportation.

I am pleased with the commitment to support convenient active transportation by including innovative bike parking and associated amenities for almost 800 bicycles. In the past, such facilities would have been a one room bike lockup located inconveniently in the car parkade and being not particularly secure. This one is special and will be appreciated by those using it.

In addition to bike servicing stations in the Seymour Estates proposal, I especially like that the secure bike parking will include charging facilities to serve potentially over 400 owners of ebikes. Further, the two ebikes at each of three locations will allow residents to experience an ebike. Given that the uptake of ebikes has been very significant recently in most of the world, this form of transportation is expected to become increasingly important as more people work from home and ultimately decide not to renew their car leases. They will save a lot of money. Trading in ones car for an ebike may well become a trend. While bicycles are often viewed as recreational equipment, the ebike has the potential to attract those who presently rely on a car to go to local shops or to commute to work.
The North Shore is also the Mecca for mountain biking so a development that caters to two wheel activities will be very desirable and contribute to a residents' healthy lifestyle.

For many of us living in East Seymour in detached homes, parking and charging a personal ebike is usually not an issue. I am fortunate to be in that situation. For many living in apartments one is often forbidden by building management to bring a bike to the upper floors of the building to a secure place like a bedroom. In this development, security of the bike and the ability to charge the battery while parked without having to remove it and have it parked securely is critically important and makes possible the adoption of a car-free lifestyle. People of all ages value convenience such as one takes for granted with the car parked in the underground parkade. In the Seymour Estates the bike room with lockers would be located at grade level which will offer convenience and safety to those choosing to cycle.

I believe there are also benefits to locating a higher density development next to a recreation centre. The location will enable residents to patronize the Ron Andrews Centre by walking there perhaps even during ones' lunch hour. Residents further to the east in the area of Windsor School will have walkable access via a new trail right of way through the development so they too will be able to easily walk to Ron Andrews. The working-from-home residents who feel the need to go for a swim, play racket ball or ride a stationary bike can simply stroll over to Ron Andrews Recreation Centre. With this lifestyle, there will be no need for the District to expand the parking at Ron Andrews because of the added density (unlike all the other projects Councils approved along the Mt. Seymour Parkway) where the car dominates.

I noted that councillor Jim Hansen took exception to the 580 vehicle parking spots being provided for the 341 homes. I too am concerned that providing an excessive amount of parking for private vehicles will bite us as the world moves towards forms of transportation other than the personal car, thus making parking spaces redundant. At one end of the spectrum the District of North Vancouver insists on a minimum amount of parking in new developments perhaps to appease those who do not want competition for their free street parking, forcing developers to provide residents with their own private parking spot (and indirectly expecting them to want to own a vehicle), is not consistent with addressing the climate emergency we all face. We promote the idea that a resident be given a choice of using a car or a bike and insist on infrastructure for both. We know there are people who may not want to own a car, especially the younger demographic we want to attract to our community. We need to support them in making a shift away from car dependency. I personally rarely drive my vehicle and prefer to use my ebike. That has been my lifestyle for fifteen years. I don't feel that I am making a sacrifice. As far as I am concerned, riding a bike everywhere has contributed to my good health. I am therefore pleased that the developer is allowing the resident to opt out of a parking spot or alternatively, pay a monthly fee of $100 if they need one because most won't. With our already high cost of housing, this monthly fee and the monthly payments for a
car, cost of fuel and maintenance and insurance is something to avoid if one is to bring down the cost of living as it is not an insignificant cost. Nor is the cost of building underground parking, which can be as much as $50,000 per parking spot. Is it wise to spend $200 million just to store cars! I think not! Building with a minimum of parking is rare but times are changing. As you know at Park Royal they are currently adding five stories of rental apartment space on the two Gateway Towers, and the developer has opted out of providing additional parking which the DWV approved. This came on the heels of the Rapid service at Park Royal. Seymour Estates likewise is located right next to reasonably good transit. With more patrons, Translink could well increase the frequency of service to East Seymour.

Councillor Muri expressed concern about density, saying that if this project were located in the nearby community of Maplewood it would fit in well. Maplewood is a special case in that the Community Plan foresees it to be a walkable and cycle able community. Presumably, in that location one would assume it would be all bicycle parking and very little car parking and good transit service. In fact, one Maplewood Plaza development application for two six story apartments is already approved and interestingly, the developer proposed a bike room on each of the 6 floors allowing residents the ultimate in convenience rivaling car parking arrangements. Picture the scenario; a resident, coming home from work, stops off for groceries at Northwoods and then continues to his or her apartment where a dedicated elevator is waiting to whisk bike and rider to the waiting bike room, where groceries are unloaded. The routine might be to then relax perhaps with a glass of wine before making dinner for that significant other. It is a much healthier lifestyle and one does not have the expenses of owning a car.

While the Seymour Estates is remote from Maplewood, the distance is not great if one travels by bike and returning home from local shopping on an ebike is not at all challenging for anyone able to ride a bike. This same routine can easily be duplicated whether one lives in Maplewood or Lynn Valley. The electric assist is what makes it possible. For some, car share might be a better option but even that does not require car ownership. With the Modo option, a car is available should it be necessary,

We should not be withholding approval based on increased traffic concerns, rather, we should focus on providing housing while minimizing parking for cars and maximizing amenities for bicycle and alternate forms of transportation.

Sincerely,

Fred Rathje, P.Eng (retired)
Hello,

I’m writing to provide feedback on the rezoning application in respect of 904-944 Lytton Street. I had previously provided feedback to the DNV rezoning planner Robyn Hay and the applicant Brent Carlson in December 2019, and it does not appear that feedback was incorporated into the proposed development.

As a multi-phase project that proposes to include 341 units, this project is woefully inadequate in terms of additional services and retail. These projects should include a mixed-use component to ensure that basic services are included to service the planned community, to increase the vibrancy and use of the public space and the reduce dependency and use of vehicles for everyday tasks. Pushing forward the development in the current design, omitting space for small scale community-serving retail, is not in line with contemporary urban design and good community planning. This development is on a major thoroughfare and adjacent to a large community in Blueridge, as well as a highschool and a community centre. There are currently only two amenities in this entire area – a gas station and the new United Strangers coffee shop and corner store. This project presents an excellent opportunity to increase community connection and vibrancy and reduce the reliance on vehicles by including ground level retail that services this future community area of thousands of residents. Allowing further development without considering the service needs of the community would be a huge missed opportunity for the DNV.

Respectfully,
Karin Grubb

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Robyn Hay <HayR@dnv.org>
Date: Mon, Dec 2, 2019 at 8:42 AM
Subject: RE: Seymour Estates
To: Karin Grubb

Hi Karin,

Thank you for your email.

Your comments will be taken into consideration in the project review.
Hi there,

I am a resident of the area that the Seymour Estates will be constructed in and I am writing to express a support for (and interest in) a greater component of ground level retail in the development. The area is underserved from a retail perspective and would benefit from some ground level retail integrated into this design - perhaps a small grocer or some other types of everyday services that residents in the development and area could access and which would also reduce dependences on vehicles for every day tasks.

Thank you for your consideration,

Karin Grubb
Dear Mayor and Council,

We are writing to support the proposal for Seymour Estates by Anthem Properties.

We are new residents of the District, having just moved to Deep Cove from South Surrey. We decided to move here simply because we have found ourselves living in a house that was too big for our needs, and we found ourselves drawn to the North Vancouver lifestyle and all it has to offer.

We are currently renting in Deep Cove but will be moving in a few months to multi-generational housing in North Van. We are really excited to be living in a community like North Vancouver.

We are in support of this proposal by Anthem because it will provide people in our type of situation more options for downsizing. Had Seymour Estates been built and selling already, we likely would have considered it as an option for our family’s needs. We are newcomers to North Vancouver and chose to be here – others may have spent their whole lives here and may instead opt to stay in homes that are too big for them just so they can stay in their communities.

We hope you approve this proposal so your future and current residents can find the housing that best suits their needs.

Thank you,

Rick & Shirley Kingdon
North Vancouver, B.C.
Dear Mayor, Council and District Planning Staff,

First of all, thank you for all your hard work. I’m writing to share my sincere support for Anthem’s Seymour Estates proposal.

Anthem’s Rent to Own (RTO) program would be of great help to all the people like me who have a dream of their own roof but could not afford it because of the skyscraping down payment and interest rate. Currently, I am working and living on rent in North Shore, it would be great if I could afford living here since I studied and got my first job here. The RTO program will be a great boon if I can own my apartment without having a huge financial strain. It is my humble request to the District of the North Vancouver Council, please also consider the feelings and anxiety for the first time home buyers in the decision process.

Thank you.

Jaswinder Singh

Warm regards,
Jaswinder Singh
B.SC (IT)
Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my support for the project at 904-944 Lytton Street, as I think it is needed in North Vancouver.

I recently moved to the North Shore two years ago because I was drawn to the unique lifestyle it offers while still being close to Downtown. As a young professional, many of my peers would like to move to North Vancouver but cannot do so. Although the price of "entry-level"/smaller homes are on the lower end of the spectrum for the North Shore, they are still hard to attain because of high demand for these homes. The “rent-to-own” program proposed by Anthem at this project may provide another means of home ownership, and will add new homes to an aging stock of existing condos and rental apartments where strata fees and large long-term maintenance levies are costly. I believe that we need more, and new projects that offer alternatives to home ownership and open the door to security in tenure, within North Vancouver.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this comment, and I encourage the approval of this project at Public Hearing so we can provide more housing, and draw more young professionals to North Vancouver.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Garvin
Hello Mayor and Council,

Please approve the proposal for 904-944 Lytton (Seymour Estates) by Anthem Properties.

I like the look and location of this development. Close to transit, recreation, small business malls and shopping. We are looking to downsize from our Deep Cove home of 40 years and want some convenient options in our east of the Seymour neighbourhood.

It is very important for us to have rent to own options not only for our adult children, but for all people to have a reasonable opportunity to stay in the District. This will not happen if all we see being built are more new single-family homes, homes on leased land - or nothing at all. In my opinion, we need smaller homes like condos, apartments, and townhouses, for sale and for rent to help provide housing choices.

This is a good proposal that we seriously want approved.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my opinion.

Joanie Mitchell
North Vancouver, BC
Good afternoon Mayor and Council,

I’d like to offer my written support to the application to renew the Seymour Estates site on Lytton Street, which I understand is will be considered at the November 17, 2020 Public Hearing. I was raised on the North Shore and continue to live here with my family. I’m an active member of our neighbourhood and I’m invested in the wellbeing of our community’s future.

The proposal Lytton Street would bring 340+ new and much needed homes to the community. The consistent housing challenges our community faces needs to be addressed. In my view, approving this proposal would be a great step in the right direction.

On top of the long list of benefits this project brings, the physical building itself is also attractive and would fit into the surrounding area really nicely. I think the developer have taken great care with regard to this aspect of the proposal, and I really appreciate that.

I’d like to see this project move forward and quick!

Kindly,
Morgan Iannone
Resident
Dear Mayor Little and Council,

I wish to offer my written support of the proposed redevelopment of the Seymour Estates site at 904-944 Lytton Street.

I was born and raised in North Van – I grew up in the District and now live in the City. I’m currently renting my home and hope to purchase a home in North Van in the future.

As a young professional (I work in the service industry), home ownership seems out of reach; I know this is a feeling that many young people who grew up in Metro Vancouver share… And, unfortunately, this dream won’t come true for many of us. I felt compelled to support this project because the Rent to Own program, which I learned about after attending the Community Open House at Ron Andrews last year. I think this is a fantastic way to help young professionals like me realize their dreams of becoming homeowners.

I hope Council will approve this development, recognizing the amazing opportunity this project represents for young people, and hopeful homeowners in North Van, while also adding new families and new life to a vacant piece of land.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my comments,

Jazmin Crone
Dear Mayor & Council,

I am a lifelong resident of the District of North Vancouver who is fortunate enough to be able to raise my young family in the community that I grew up in. Many people are unable to do the same so I strongly believe that we require new housing that is carefully-planned and well served by transit. I am writing to you in support of the proposed housing development at 904-944 Lytton Street. The proposed density is less than the maximum permitted under our OCP and it provides excellent benefits such as a mix of housing types, a new rent-to-own program and a neighbourhood coffee shop.

This development will add much-needed housing diversity in the DNV. The unique mix of rent to own housing, market and below market rental, condos and townhomes will provide housing options for more North Shore residents including our critical workers and those leaving home for the first-time. I expect new residents of this development may include those struggling to remain in our community, renters looking for their first home ownership opportunity, downsizers, up-sizers and people who work in the District but commute from elsewhere.

The rent-to-own program and below market housing (via Habitat for Humanity and Hollyburn Family Services) will be a welcome addition to our community. Many people living on the North Shore cannot afford the down payment for a house. The rent-to-own program is a unique opportunity for 25 District families to start their journey to property ownership. The townhouse unit allocated to Habitat for Humanity will also provide stability for a family in need and the below market housing managed by Hollyburn will offer housing security for seniors with low, fixed incomes.

Finally, the proposed neighbourhood coffee shop will make an excellent contribution to the neighbourhood. This is something that residents in the neighbourhood have been asking for – and Anthem has delivered. The DNV has several amazing village centres—like Edgemont Village or Lynn Valley Centre—which provide amenities within walking distance. However, the surrounding neighbourhood of the proposed Lytton Street development has almost no commercial space. Residents of Windsor Park, Seymour Heights, and Blueridge deserve a local gathering space, where they can grab a coffee or meet a friend.

I hope that Council recognizes the positive impact that this project will have on our community and will respond with some leadership by supporting this application.

Sincerely,

Brad Howard
Hi,

Please see attached my comments on this project.

Thanks,

Graeme Mitchell

North Vancouver, BC, [Redacted]

Ph: [Redacted]
Cell [Redacted]

Virus-free. www.avast.com
Re: 904-944 Lytton (Seymour Estates)

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am sending this note to ask the council to approve the request for development of this project. We lost a large number of dwellings when the existing project was rased and I feel it important that they be replaced as soon as possible. My take on Anthem’s proposal is that it will fit the needs of the community and should go ahead.

Traffic issues are part of a larger picture and should not stop all development east of the Seymour.

Thanks,

Graeme G. Mitchell

[Name redacted]. North Vancouver, [Name redacted]
Dear Mayor and Council,

We are in support of the proposal for 904-944 Lytton Street by Anthem.

We own a business and live in the Lower Lonsdale neighbourhood in the City of North Van. We love North Vancouver and are fortunate to be able to rent and work in the same neighbourhood. In fact, we have convinced our parents to move here too so we can all live together!

As young parents with a growing family, we live currently live in a one bedroom + den. Given the housing situation on the North Shore, we are looking to move into a multi-generational home where we can raise our children and live near our parents at the same time – something like Seymour Estates would be perfect for people like us!

We are writing this letter of support because we feel it’s important to let you know that there are many of us who appreciate the family-oriented nature of the District, and that family friendly developments like Seymour Estates would only complement that character. Projects like Seymour Estates are helpful for families (like ours) who are looking to live closer together.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, I hope you will support this project and help diversify the housing options in the District.

Thanks,
Danielle Kingdon & Christopher Cardoso
Please see the following letter regarding the Seymour Estates Development Proposal. Thanks, Rhonda Spence
November 13, 2020

Seymour Estates Public Hearing
November 17, 2020
District of North Vancouver

To Mayor and Council:

I am strongly in favour of the proposal for the redevelopment of Seymour Estates. I have been reviewing the details of the plan and I am very impressed with the work done to address the urgent need for affordable housing on the North Shore.

There are so many positive aspects to this proposal but I will just pick out a few. To quote our Official Community Plan "maintaining a healthy, diverse, and vibrant community providing more diverse and affordable housing choices for people of different ages, incomes and family sizes is a key objective of our O.C.P." The District’s Rental and Affordable Housing Strategy clearly articulates steps to meet these objectives and The Seymour Estates plan is on point with the variety of housing options that are proposed.

In particular, the rent to own model provides a fantastic option for young people to purchase their first home. As well, the proposal to partner with Hollyburn Family Services to manage below market rent housing is an extremely important aspect. In fact there is a long list of innovative and creative housing options that will build a well rounded and vibrant community. It is clear that this development company has also been listening to Council’s concerns. A commitment to renewable energy and a proposal to address parking concerns both speak to this. And the alternative transportation measures are excellent.

I don’t think anyone would argue with the evidence that the District of North Vancouver has an affordable housing problem. This development proposal would be a great opportunity to kick start a way forward. As a senior who was born in North Van and has lived here most of my life I can attest that we need to take bold action for the future. We need young people and families living in our community. Providing housing options for those who work here to be able to live here is critical. We can build a diverse and positive community and at the same time take steps to address traffic concerns and overall lowering of our carbon footprint.

Council’s job is to represent the interests of everyone in the District, from Lower Capilano to Lynn Valley to Deep Cove. There are no perfect options - but there are opportunities to take positive steps forwards and the Seymour Estates proposal is one of them.

I sincerely hope that Council takes this opportunity to show leadership in tackling what is one of the most significant issues here on the North Shore.

Yours truly,
Rhonda Spence

[Redacted for Privacy]
Dear District of North Vancouver Council,

I hope that Council will support the rezoning application at Lytton Street and Mount Seymour Parkway that is coming forward for consideration at public hearing on November 17.

I live and work in North Vancouver and I see every day the huge number of people who commute to work at jobs in North Vancouver. There are lots of offices and shops around Lonsdale, industrial businesses along the waterfront and large employers and commercial centres in the District. We need new housing that provides housing options for people to live in North Vancouver, so that fewer people need to commute long distances.

The 340+ new units being proposed here offer a great mix of housing types and varying levels of affordability. Below-market rental, market rental homes, condos, rent to own homes, and townhomes – it’s a great variety. It’s good to have a diverse and mixed neighbourhood. The site is positioned near a major road and the old townhouses are already demolished. This site should be revitalized, it should not sit vacant.

This project is a great fit for the District, and I hope you approve it.

Best regards,
Amanda Zibin
North Vancouver, BC
See attached letter in support of the Seymour Estates which is being presented to council on November 17th.

Thanks,

Brandon Ayers
Dear Mayor and Council,

I was born and raised in North Vancouver. I still call North Van home today, as I rent a two bedroom home on the North Shore. I work in the trades as an electrician and like many hard workers in the area, have been feeling pressure from increased housing costs, worsening traffic, and limited job potential.

I am writing to you today in support of a proposed development in the District at Lytton Street and Mt Seymour Parkway. The development would include 341 new housing units close to a major arterial route, allowing for traffic to flow smoothly.

The construction of this development will support at least 100 new construction jobs, many of which would be in skilled trades. Large housing developments such as the Lytton Street/Mt Seymour Parkway development have construction timelines of three to four years, providing steady jobs for people throughout that time. I know other people working in skilled trades who would love the opportunity to work on the North Shore on a large project such as this. Approving this development would provide economic growth in our community, and allow for skilled tradespeople like myself to work in their own community.

I hope you consider the economic benefits of this project, and approve the development. If the project is denied then these jobs will simply go elsewhere in the Lower Mainland, which we do not want to happen.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brandon Ayers
In support of rent-own project Anthem. Currently employed in the District of North Vancouver - NV: Education. My family unable to sustain long-term living plan here, * not alone in this piece as recruitment and retainment is a reality of the rising cost of living in DNV. If not this project, something/someone needs to address living as the income difference/widening.

Not for those working in minimum wage jobs, but professional and essential workers salaries do not line up with cost. These people are intelligent enough to know a move out of the DNV vs. attempting to sustain an unrealistic mortgage/rent cost etc.

Thank you for adding me to the speaker's list.
North Vancouver, November 13, 2020

Dear Mayor Little + District Council:

As a North Shore resident, I am writing to share my strong support for Anthem’s Seymour Estates proposal at 904-944 Lytton Street. I am unable to attend the scheduled Public Hearing on November 17, 2020, and appreciate you considering my written comments instead.

I have been living on the North Shore for 34 years and working in my community. Because of that I have no desire to move out of the North Shore to find my first home. I love to live in North Vancouver however it is becoming increasingly less affordable for people like me.

This application not only brings a diverse range of housing options, but also includes a program to help first time homeowners get into the housing market. Initiatives like this provide people in our community, who don’t otherwise have the means, to secure a long-term future in the District. I think this is a fantastic program that will really make a meaningful impact on both the lives of those who live in the rent to own homes, but also our broader community.

I’m wholeheartedly behind this proposal and urge you to approve it at the Public Hearing next week.

Sincerely,
Ed Choromanski
FYI

Darren Veres
Senior Community Planner

355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
veresd@dnv.org
604-990-2487

Get the latest information on the District’s response to COVID-19 at DNV.org/COVID-19 or visit our social media channels by clicking the icons above.

-----Original Message-----
From: Scott & Ella Misfeldt <VeresD@dnv.org>
Sent: November 15, 2020 1:30 PM
To: Darren Veres <VeresD@dnv.org>
Subject: Anthem development feedback

Hi Darren,
As Windsor Park residents, as well as parents of 2 youth at Windsor Secondary, we are writing to express our concern about the Anthem development application for Mount Seymour Parkway / Lytton St.
Our primary concern regards the threefold increase in the number of units on this space, and the traffic pressures this will cause. We note that although there is, included in the proposal, an ‘on demand’ transit proposal, there are still 576 parking spaces proposed. These additional cars, in an area where other developments already underway (eg the townhouse development backing onto Northlands) will impact traffic, will seriously affect the quality of life of existing residents as we battle ever more traffic on our main arterial roads. There seems to be little regard given to current residents by Council, when we are the ones already living here and paying taxes. We feel like we are being forced to look elsewhere for the lifestyle and surroundings that so attracted us to buy here in the first place 15 years ago.
Additionally, the increase in traffic around Windsor Secondary is concerning. Lytton is one of the main access roads to the school, used by hundreds of pedestrian youth daily. More vehicles will ultimately lead to more accidents which will involve our youth.
Thankyou for allowing us the opportunity to share our concerns.
Ella & Scott Misfeldt
North Vancouver.

Sent from my iPad
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to voice my support for the Seymour Estates project at the November 17th Public Hearing.

As someone that grew up in Lynn Valley, it is very important to me that I can hopefully raise a future family in the backyard that I love.

It is truly sad to see the amount of friends that tend to move away once we trickle into your early thirties due to the lack of affordable housing options on the North Shore.

More supply, rent to own and overall growth of under developed areas seem like steps in the right direction.

Please do not continue to make it harder for the families that helped build this great community that we live in.

Open to any further communication in hopes of seeing this project move forward.

Best,

Adam Mills
To whom it may concern,

I grew up in North Vancouver, continually traveling to Deep Cove and back through all surrounding neighborhoods. I miss the area; I had to leave because it wasn't affordable for a young adult like myself. I moved to Toronto.

So now, when rent to own initiatives such as the Seymour Estates project come up and the city opposes it, it frustrates me to no end. Therefore, I have to voice my opinion and take action! I fully support the Seymour Estates project at the November 17th public hearing!

Please, for people my age (33), it's not always easy to afford expensive Vancouver homes. We either need help from our parents, or we're pretty much out of luck. We need to keep a community in the area of all age groups, all family sizes, all races, not exclude anyone, and not discriminate against anyone. Projects like these have the most realistic approach towards homeownership for younger generations. If the district wants to maintain any sense of culture and neighborhood, projects like this have to go forward.

Hopefully, this doesn't go on deaf ears.

Danny Brody
Hello,

I've grown up in Deep Cove and have had the opportunity to see first hand how a tight knit community can really impact a person's life. As we progress into the future, it seems as though opportunities for families young and old are becoming more and more scarce.

Seymour Estates is providing not only the chance to provide a leg up in this difficult real estate market, but also an alternative means to inject new and diverse families into the area which is a valuable opportunity that should not be squandered. This "Rent To Own" model provides a way for families from a variety of backgrounds the chance to call the North Shore home.

Let us not be a hurdle but a helping hand.

Thank you for your Consideration.

Troy Kelly
To whom it may concern,

I am very much not alone in stating that I am a 30-something-year-old that grew up in the District of North Vancouver that has been forced to move elsewhere, with no potential route of returning in sight.

Seymour Estates by Anthem Properties, with its Rent-to-Own program, its dedication to sustainability, and its countless other features with the greater good of the District in mind, comes across as a resoundingly positive change to a relatively stagnant area. The benefits of this project greatly outweigh any potential worry of its slight additions to the region’s density, traffic, or contributions to negative climate implications.

While the City of North Vancouver has surged as an exciting and vibrant area, the District remains determined to sit still with essentially no goal of accommodating the young people that it has raised to be capable of achieving homeownership in that same area.

Seymour Estates is a step in a positive direction for the District of North Vancouver. Let’s hope I’m able to live there one day soon.

Regards,

Jim Keenleyside
Dear Council, District of North Vancouver,

As a long-time resident, I’m pleased to be sharing my comments once again in support for the proposal to build a mix of rental and market housing on the vacant site at 904-944 Lytton Street.

I was raised in West Van, and now my kids are being raised in the North Van (we are in the Edgemont/Delbrook neighbourhood). While we are amongst the lucky few with secure housing, we all need to recognize that there are many families who are struggling to stay in our community as a result of the high cost of housing.

Our community needs a greater level of housing diversity. The project that has been proposed by Anthem Properties at Lytton and Mt Seymour Parkway, if approved, will contribute a range of housing types and tenures that will cater to the different needs and income levels of North Van residents – including first time home buyers, downsizers, professional couples, single parents and more. I expect that the rent to own program that is being proposed here will help people who work here or grew up on the North Shore and want to stay local, but may not have the money saved for a down payment.

Unfortunately, our community is losing seniors (who’ve lived in DNV for many years), downsizers (because they can’t find suitable housing), critical care providers and young families (because there aren’t enough attainable housing options available). Where are our teachers, care givers, barristas, fire fighters, nurses going to live, who are integral to keeping our communities livable? Where are our children going to live? My boys are [redacted] years old. I worry about them getting pushed well out of our community when it’s time for them to live independently. Here we have an opportunity to build inclusive housing in an amenity rich neighbourhood close to schools, recreation, shops and services.

I appreciate the opportunity to share my comments and I hope to see the rezoning application for 904-944 Lytton Street approved.

Jason Black
Hello and to whomever all it may concern:

**Re: Seymour Estates @ 904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver, BC**

Given that my wife, Lyndsay Venance, and I cannot physically attend the public hearing for the proposed Seymour Estates project by Anthem, I am writing on our families behalf to communicate our sincere support for what we hope to be a future development of much needed quality, modern housing inventory.

We have just moved into the area from the Lower Lonsdale neighbourhood in the City of North Vancouver where we spent the past five years. We witnessed our Lower Lonsdale neighbourhood get more and more vibrant and dynamic each and every day, with more and more young families and young professionals moving to the area. We watched businesses start and thrive and the residents were all very proud to be a part of it and support the growth. We truly believe that it was the direct result of a progressive municipal council that laid the foundation for a myriad of development companies to build quality housing projects that were attainable for the next generation to put their first stake into.

Several of the developments we witnessed come into fruition were completed by Anthem. Each and every one added tangible and intangible value to the surrounding community and changed the landscape of the City of North Vancouver for the better, without a doubt.

As we now start the next chapter we want to make sure that we support well thought out housing developments that will keep our new found community moving forward and allowing a diverse array of residents the opportunity to be apart of and contribute to the growth thereof.

The concept of “rent to own” is brilliant. This could be a game changer not just for the surrounding neighbourhood, but for the whole region which is clearly in a housing supply crisis. I say housing “supply” and not “crisis”, as the media often refers to it, which isn’t wrong but the crisis is simply a direct result of a lack of quality supply. This will not change without fostering new supply of modern, sustainable, housing projects that many will be able to invest in and take pride in as home. Approval of this project will pave the way for other developers to do the same all over the lower mainland.

To say that the supply crisis is a problem is obvious, but certainly has a negative connotation which I think we’re all fatigued by. What the conversation should focus on, is the potential we’re not reaching because of this barricade. Anthem is a home grown company and a leading development firm to our region. Please let them lead!

Thank you for your consideration during the due process. We look forward to hearing the news of an approval for this project and watching our new community grow as we raise our young family here and make connections with others alike for many years to come.

Sincerely,

David Venance
The information contained in this email (including any attachments) is confidential, may be subject to legal or other professional privilege and contain copyright material, and is intended for use by the named recipient(s) only.
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Although we have taken reasonable precautions to reduce the risk of transmitting software viruses, we accept no liability for any loss or damage caused by this email or its attachments due to viruses, interference, interception, corruption or unapproved access.
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Please do not let this proposal proceed. Have you done a traffic study but keep in mind it will not be accurate as the First Nations Health Authority Traffic is yet to happen. (how many cars) Currently due to Covid schools and work are limited. Have you considered Maplewood traffic and other projects in the process. In addition Mount Seymour has become more popular. Thanks for listening, Kathy Hilts, Windsor Park
Ps- some days so hard to turn onto Parkway or Dollarton. Lights please

Kathy Hilts, cell ——
Hello DNV,

My wife and I are unable to attend the public meeting on Tuesday, but I am writing in advance to share our support for the Seymour Estates Project.

Growing up in North Vancouver, specifically Deep Cove, was a monumental piece of my life. Having access on your doorstep to the mountains, rivers, trails and ocean breeds a certain type of human. We are like salmon, we want to swim home!

My wife and I are in the market for our first townhome. Our target area is anything east of the Seymour River towards Deep Cove, with 2/3 bedrooms. There is a minimal amount of freehold product available for this requirement, we are having a difficult time finding anything suitable. Raven Woods is a nice development, but the banks do not like lending for Leasehold land, especially first time home buyers.

We are just one example, There is a long list of young professionals in the Seymour area who are in the same situation as us, priced out of their home market and unable to start a family where they grew up. This mixed-use project would provide a choice for locals and non-locals to enter the market at an affordable price, and for downsizers to sell and stay in their neighbourhood. Moreover, the rent-to-own opportunity will be some buyers only option.

We're hopeful you will approve this project so others like us will be able to enjoy the community and beauty of North Shore living in the Seymour area.

Sincerely,

Marc & Molly Gerow
Dear Mayor Little and Councillors,

This email is to register my support for Anthem’s rezoning application off Mount Seymour Parkway, heading to Council this week for a public hearing. This application is 3+ years in the making, and the final proposal appears to reflect input from the community and Council’s priorities around housing and climate action. I commend everyone for their hard work to bring this application together so well.

While I support the range of housing options, the small commercial coffee shop included, the affordable housing for those who need and the general repurposing of this property from a derelict, vacant property, to a new mixed community; I’m particularly interested in Anthem’s Rent to Own program.

I have raised two teenagers in the District and soon, they will be leaving the house to start a home of their own. Home ownership is so out of reach for the average person, or young person these days due to the required down payment. This innovative strategy to encourage/allow access to homeownership to those who want is awesome, and I hope we start to see more of this in our community!

This plan has been well thought-out, and refined over the years. I’m pleased to support its approval.

Thank you Council.

Sincerely,

Kristy James
Please add my name to the list of supporters of Anthem Properties and Anthem's proposal of Seymour Estates. Anthem should be commended and encouraged in their attempt to improve on the previous buildings on the site. They have shown a concern to keep North Shore and Seymour residents on their home turf and should be helped in that attempt. Thank you, John Keenleyside. [Redacted] North Vancouver.
Good Morning,

I am the immediate neighbour to the proposed building site of Seymour Estates. We live at [redacted]. We are all for building communities and providing housing at an affordable rate within the reach of everyone. It looks like the propose plan encompasses a wide range of great ideas for our neighbourhood eg rent to own program and we would love for it to be passed by council.

Thank you

Cathi Wetsch
Dear District Council,

I wish to offer my support for the rezoning application at 904-944 Lytton Street. This project, subject to Council approval, will supply a variety of housing options desperately needed in North Van, including townhouses, condos, rental apartments, and affordable housing. The District needs more than just single-family housing because not everyone who lives and works here can afford the down payment or the rent on a $2M home.

I live in the District because it's the best place in Greater Vancouver to live. We can get more people moving here from downtown, working here, or telecommuting from here and driving less. My office is downtown but I now work from home more often and go downtown less often. To attract most workers to the District we will require more apartments and condos.

The proposal for Seymour Estates offers the range of housing types needed in our community. I also think it’s great that the developer has made commitments to using sustainable building techniques. Along with the inclusion of car share and e-bike share programs, I like that the applicant recently made a promise that the new buildings will use clean energy only, and not fossil fuels. We need more innovative developments like these.

Thanks for your consideration and I hope you will be approving this rezoning.

Sincerely,

--

Cam Good
I am messaging to show my support for the proposed development of the Seymour Estate rezoning application that I believe is being put forward for consideration in the coming weeks.

As a District of North Vancouver resident, I believe this improvement will be embraced by the community. I have lived in North Vancouver for 18 years and have raised 3 children here. I believe that we should encourage community oriented multi-family developments like this proposal from Anthem. We need more housing choices with higher density to allow for greater access to the housing markets for up and coming generations. More rental choices are needed.

Best,

Rod Armstrong
Dear Mayor and Council,

I am a resident in Dollarton and father to 3 school-aged boys in the area and am writing in support of the above noted site rezoning. This application provides exactly the kind of housing that we need more of in our community. Diverse, attainable housing options for essential workers, young families and "empty nesters" along the area's major thoroughfare which is key for the long-term health of our community. It is adjacent to the communities' central recreation hub (Ron Andrews and Canlan Ice Sports) and local high school, provides suitable parking for proposed uses and density and is located near connector trails and bike paths. It also provides sorely needed commercial space that this specific location sorely needs. The only design improvement that one might consider at Seymour Estates would be for additional commercial space given lack of retail amenities for the surrounding neighbourhood and pushing retail units to the higher profile corner at Mt. Seymour Parkway in order to ensure success for these businesses versus being tucked away in the back.

With positive news of increased immigration targets by the federal government announced recently, a good proportion of these new Canadians will find their way to Metro Vancouver and very likely North Vancouver given it's broad appeal. With further resident arrivals on the horizon, it is our community duty to provide more diverse and sustainable housing such as proposed here or we will risk further alienating our younger demographic due what will certainly be a worsening affordability crisis without more housing supply.

All things considered, this is the right project for this specific location.

Regards,

Jarvis Rouillard
Good morning,

I'm writing about the proposed property for development at 904-944 Lytton Street which has a public hearing tomorrow.

I own a house in Blueridge and work on Dollarton, so spend a lot of time in the area. I am completely in support of the property being developed. I know some neighbours are loudly proclaiming their NIMBY-ism and trying to shut it down, but I sincerely encourage council to consider the quantity of noisy voices in relation to the quantity of silent people (many of whom I'm sure tacitly support the initiative) who live in the area, before reacting to the squeaky wheels. They do not represent all of us.

We sorely need low-income units, rental properties and social housing in the district and the lower mainland in general, and this development proposes to address all of those needs. Yes traffic is an issue, but for those of us East of the Seymour River I would argue that much of the reason we have traffic is because we hastily shut down development without thinking through the benefits. If we could create some hubs for amenities like drug stores, medical services, banks, coffee shops and grocery stores so that people don't have to get on the highway and drive to Lonsdale or Main Street to access those basics, then there would be a lot less traffic flowing across the highway and bunging up the Parkway and other routes. Also, if we could find other ways to provide feasible transportation options to those hubs (small local buses that do frequent, short loops without having to go all the way to Phibbs); figuring out how to get evo/modo/car2go into neighbourhoods like Blueridge which currently fall outside the zone ; safe and connected bike lanes ) then that would also alleviate some of the traffic.

All that to say, though, that traffic isn't the issue at hand. Housing is. Keeping folks out of our neighbourhood because it's inconvenient for the drivers when housing is such a massive issue in our region, is burying our head in the sand and missing the point. We have an opportunity to do the right thing here, let's not be afraid to make the right choice and think long-term so we can build a resilient, diverse, thriving community. There is an opportunity to educate neighbours about the benefits and rationale for the property, I would love to see some of that shared more actively so we hear more than just the voices of the frustrated commuters.

Thanks for your time.

Katie Wilson
Dear Mayor Little and Councillors,

I wish to express my support for the rezoning application going before Council on Tuesday, November 17, 2020. Both my husband and I grew up on the North Shore, and are lucky to be raising our child here in the District of North Vancouver.

Following years of staff planning and community input, this proposal seems to be offering a wide range of housing options which will serve our community well – from affordable rental housing, and market rental housing, to rent to ownership and strata townhomes. I’m also excited to see the project includes an affordable family home through a partnership with Habitat for Humanity – a first on the North Shore I believe.

The location makes sense on a major road with transit, and in walking distance to a school, recreation center, and short distance to other shops and services.

It seems well considered, and I hope to see it approved.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments.

Stacy Chala
Hi,

I am writing in support of the Seymour Estates development on Lytton Street.

We are a young family living in the area. The North Shore, especially east of the Hwy is dominated by single family homes and the development will bring much needed higher density and more affordable home ownership options ensuring a diversified neighbourhood and growing tax base.

Thank you for your consideration.

Greg Ambrose
Dear Mayor Little,

With regard to your confirmed Public Hearing on November 17, 2020 - I support the application to build family oriented, multifamily housing at 904-944 Lytton Street in North Vancouver.

As I have shared with you already, I applaud the applicant for including a number of 3 and 4 bedroom homes in this development – this is quite rare for apartments and condominiums. I can confidently say finding affordable family sized housing is stressful and competitive, given the lack of options.

I am supporting this application based on the fact that it offers family sized homes in a highly desirable location within walking distance to transit, multiple schools, a day care, community centre and parks.

I hope that Council will support this project.

Respectfully,

Courtney Iannone, North Vancouver
To All

I was born and raised on the North shore 62 years ago. I have 3 adult children that I want to keep on the North Shore so they can raise their children just like we did in the Lynn Valley.

The Seymour Estates answer some of my concerns with their new Realesate options.

As the Founder of HAVE Cafe that runs the kitchen in the North Shore Shelter and My wife that sits on the Board of the North Shore Community Foundation our kids know what it means to give back to their community.

So please help us and other Parents by supporting this new concept in building our community so our kids raise their children on the North Shore.

---
Thank You
Brad Mills
I am writing to voice my support for the Seymour Estates project at the November 17th Public Hearing.

I recently moved to Deep Cove and have fallen in love with the area. Although I was fortunate to afford a single family home, I have noticed there are very few affordable options in the area. I personally know 3 young families that cannot afford to be in single family as house prices start in the mid $1m range. The demand is strong and we need to make sure young families can live here. The opportunity to “rent to own” is a great concept that will help so many young families get into the market.

Regards,
Matt
Attention: Council, Mr. Milburn and Planning Staff,

I’d like to lend my written support to Anthem’s proposal to redevelop the property at Lytton and Mt Seymour Parkway, which Council is considering tomorrow evening. This site has been sitting vacant for far too long.

I understand that the developer is proposing to build a variety of housing typologies and tenures to support the diverse housing needs of current and prospective North Van residents. As a resident of the Seymour area (and father of two) I encourage Council to approve this application which would see this derelict property renewed and revitalized with high quality housing, retail and amenities to serve the neighbourhood.

This project represents a much better use than what is there today – a vacant lot – and the project has been revised over several years to reflect public input. It’s time to get on with it.

Thanks for the consideration.

Sincerely,

Josh Gaze

North Vancouver, BC,
Hello,

This letter is in support of the proposed development at 904-944 Lytton Street.

I am a North Vancouver District resident who currently resides in the Indian River Drive area.

I grew up in the District and recently returned to raise my young family.

As someone who recently purchased a home, I saw first-hand the limited number of housing options currently available.

The proposed project at 904-944 Lytton Street provides an improved housing offering that will ensure a good future for our community.

For this reason, I support the development of 904-944 Lytton Street.

Thank you,

Alex Messina
Dear Mayor and Council,

I would like to express my written support for the rezoning application for Anthem’s Seymour Estates proposal. As long-time residents of the District, my wife and I are really pleased this proposal is being considered for our community as it offers so much, for so many people.

We have two sons, aged 32 and 30. Both currently rent apartments in downtown Vancouver. Our elder son was recently married and he and his wife are expecting a child in April 2021. His wife’s family also lives in North Vancouver so they are keenly interested in moving to the North Shore. The North Shore is also the preferred destination for our younger son. However, the prospects of home ownership is daunting for any first time buyer.

Accordingly, I am especially supportive of the rent to own program which this project offers. This is exactly the type of innovative program that gives first time buyers the hope of living in our community. It has been disheartening to see so many of our neighborhood children having to move out of the District when they’re older, due to lack of realistic housing options.

I’d also like to touch on the mix of housing options being proposed for the site. It is rare that sites of this size become available for redevelopment and it is critical Council not waste the opportunity to provide a housing mix that meets the needs of today’s families. Condos, rental, subsidized rental and accessible housing all in one place. This, coupled with the proposed coffee shop, would make a really inviting and inclusive community for future residents.

As I live just off Seymour Parkway, I experience the ongoing traffic challenges on the North Shore. I was concerned about the timing of this development, but am very comforted by the fact no residents will move in before the Province completes their upgrades to the Lower Lynn Highway 1 area. Once completed this will dramatically improve traffic flow and coupled with the developers incentives to encourage non-car alternatives, I can strongly support the project.

This project is thoughtful, inclusive and one I think as Mayor and Council, you could be proud of supporting. On behalf of my family, I’d like to encourage you to support this.
project and help bring more high-quality affordable housing options to the area.

Thank you.

Lorne Burns.
From: Patrick Stafford-Smith <Patrick@nvchamber.ca>  
Sent: November 16, 2020 11:01 AM  
To: James Gordon <gordonja@dnv.org>  
Subject: RE: Speaking at November 17 Virtual Public Hearing

Hi James

I’m not sure of who I should direct this letter to, but please find the attached letter of support for this project.
Please let me know if I should be sending it elsewhere.

Thanks so much I advance.

thanks

Patrick

Patrick Stafford-Smith  
CEO – North Vancouver Chamber  
c: 778.987.0110 | w: 604.987.4488

From: James Gordon <gordonja@dnv.org>  
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 9:21 AM  
To: Patrick Stafford-Smith <Patrick@nvchamber.ca>  
Cc: Genevieve Lanz <LanzG@dnv.org>; Shannon Dale <dales@dnv.org>; Jenelle Simpson <SimpsonJ@dnv.org>; Cheryl Archer <archerc@dnv.org>; James Gordon <gordonja@dnv.org>  
Subject: Speaking at November 17 Virtual Public Hearing

Hello.

We are now signing up speakers and I have added you to the list. Note that the hearing is taking place virtually and commences at 7 pm on Tuesday, November 17. I have attached some information about participating virtually. My colleague Cheryl Archer will be in contact with you about connecting to our WebEx virtual meeting platform.

Until then, let me know if you have any questions.
Hello Mr. Gordon

I would like to register to speak on the topic of the Seymour Estates at the Public Hearing on November 17th. Is there availability?

Kind regards,

Patrick

Patrick Stafford-Smith, MBA P.Eng.
CEO - North Vancouver Chamber
Suite 102 - 124 West 1st Street | North Vancouver, BC | V7M 3N3
c: 778.987.0110 | wr: 604.987.4488 x 102
nvchamber.ca | facebook | twitter
November 8th, 2020

Mayor and Council
District of North Vancouver
355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC, V7N 4N5

Dear Mayor and Council;

Re: 904 Lytton (Seymour Estates) Development Proposal

On behalf of the North Vancouver Chamber Board of Directors, I am writing to you today to provide our input on the redevelopment proposal at 904 Lytton (Seymour Estates).

The Chamber’s Policy Committee monitors urban planning and development in our region and we are often asked to provide our input or support for certain projects. Our Policy Committee received a development support request application for the redevelopment proposal at 904 Lytton (Seymour Estates). The NV Chamber has an established process that requires developers to provide detailed information on their development.

The North Vancouver Chamber is supportive of this project based on its ability to help address some of the major economic and community issues currently faced by North Vancouver.

Top Challenges for Business in North Vancouver:
For a number of years, the NV Chamber has underlined the top three economic issues for North Vancouver: Transportation; Employee Housing; and Employer Retention. These issues remain important - in a recent NV Chamber survey of business, conducted in advance of the Provincial Election, we learned that of the Top 7 issues for business, 4 of the priority issues confirmed this need:

3. Investment in Public Transit Infrastructure
4. Finding skilled staff
6. Affordable housing for my Staff
7. Climate change
All of these issues are of course interrelated. We believe this development proposal for Seymour Estates addresses these key issues:

1. **Public Transit Infrastructure / Transportation.**
   - This development is close to key transportation routes that will support existing public transit viability and any future transportation investment. This project supports all residents who need or prefer to use public transit.

2. **Finding Skilled Staff.**
   - The location of this property is close to local areas of employment and potential employment lands. This project will create greater certainty and support the viability of local businesses by making it possible for more staff at all levels to afford to live locally.

3. **Affordable housing for my Staff.**
   - This project offers affordable housing options for families with incomes of $30K-$80K; a core income bracket for many employees in North Vancouver small business.

4. **Climate Change.**
   - Many families are not able to find affordable accommodation locally and are having to commute into NV to work. This location will help reduce the length or need for a commute for many families, and therefore reduce the environmental costs of getting to work.
   - This project contains many built-in items that support reduced GHG.

The North Vancouver Chamber is supportive of this project based on its ability to help address these major issues we continue to hear from the business community. By supporting housing projects like this, we can build a stronger and more resilient future for North Vancouver, and in turn, support the people and employment that sustains the community.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Stafford-Smith
CEO, North Vancouver Chamber
Dear Mayor Little and members of Council,

I am a long-time resident of the Blueridge community, neighbouring Anthem’s Seymour Estates rezoning proposal at Lytton and the Parkway. My wife and I have raised our two children here, who are now young adults. I am writing to register my voice in support of this rezoning. I will keep my comments focused on a couple areas.

1. Not only is this proposal “the right thing to do here...” – this site has been multi-family for the last 40+ years. The buildings were beyond reasonable maintenance for the owners, and their best case scenario was to sell their strata properties to a builder to intensify density. This site is on transit, next to a school and a community centre, and in close proximity to Parkgate + Maplewood for other daily shops and services. We know our community needs to absorb additional growth in order to retain our level of community and livability; this development (which is under the OCP’s FSR for this site as I understand) is a reasonable increase in density while also helping to achieve our growth targets.

2. Commercial is what builds community – I am a firm believer in this, and was pleased when Anthem responded to the comments from Blueridge to consider some commercial space with a small coffee shop. Other North Van communities have commercial – Edgemont, Deep Cove, Parkgate, etc. Blueridge has nothing. For us to get a cup of coffee (until just recently), my only option was the Chevron station across from this site. Neighbourhood commercial encourages community to get out of their cars, walk the streets, meet their neighbours, notice strange activity/ changes in their neighbourhood, etc. While I still would like to see a larger component of commercial here than what is proposed in a more visible location out on the corner of Mt Seymour Parkway and Lytton, some is better than none which is what the original plan presented.

Yes, there will be increases in vehicle traffic in our area but I believe these impacts will be minimal. The benefits proposed here, in my opinion, outweigh the impacts. I urge Council to approve this rezoning at the Public Hearing this week.

Dan Turner
North Vancouver
Dear Council Members and planning staff,

I am contacting you regarding the rezoning application 904-944 Lytton Street headed to a Council Vote on Tuesday, Nov. 17th.

I have been a resident of the Seymour area for 5 years. As a neighbour and a parent of two young children, I would welcome greater housing diversity in our community.

I felt compelled to write to you in support of this project because, as a parent, I worry about the affordability and livability of our community. Although my family is young, I worry about my kids getting pushed well out of our community when it’s time for them to live independently.

Given that North Van is a significant employment hub (Lionsgate Hospital, Seaspan, Neptune Terminals, etc), I also strongly believe that we need more housing to support our local workforce, including teachers and first responders. Many of the people who support our economy and provide critical services to our community are having to travel in from Burnaby and other neighbouring cities to get to work. This leads to traffic congestion, not to mention an unpleasant commute for the people that care for us. If we don’t create an appropriate level of housing diversity, issues around affordability and traffic congestion will only get worse.

I understand that you share similar concerns and campaigned on the creation of more rental and affordable housing to serve our local workforce. While I recognize that some of your colleagues were elected on a platform of slowing the pace of development, I think that this goal has been achieved and I hope to see housing projects that offer significant benefit to the community, like this one, approved.

I understand that the project proposed at 904-944 Lytton Street will provide rent to own housing for first time buyers who live or work in North Van. This is an opportunity that we can’t afford to lose. Additionally, this project offers a number of secured rental homes, including below market rental, and market condos, which provide a less expensive alternative.
to single family home ownership. A number of the homes here are family oriented, 2 to 4 bedroom homes, which will likely house our successful working population, looking to establish themselves and raise their families in North Van.

I often hear stories from friends and colleagues who are struggling to find suitable, affordable housing in North Van. This project is still a few years away, so it won’t deliver an immediate solution, but the more rental and affordable housing options that are built in North Van, the better for the long term needs to serve the community.

I hope that this project will be supported by Council when it comes forward for consideration.

Sincerely,

Carling Gaze
Dear Mayor & Council,

Please accept my feedback and comments in support of the proposed Seymour Estates redevelopment.

I think this project offers a great range of housing options that are in demand by renters, new homeowners, upsizers and downsizers – from market and affordable rental to rent to own homes and townhouses.

While we are fortunate to already have our home in the District, we recognize this is not a reality for many, and this project will bring new housing choices, at a variety of tenures and prices to accommodate members of our growing community.

I have two young children who I hope will have the option to live where they were raised—projects like this will help make that dream possible.

I hope to see this project – and others like it – move ahead.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Megan Sewell
North Vancouver
Good afternoon. I heard about this terrific development. I am hoping you will proceed with it.

Our sons grew up on the North Shore (residents for 30 years).

We would very like to see them be able to afford to buy and live on the North Shore

Best Regards

Ian
Hi,

This email is about 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver, which I support. I live in North Vancouver and will be affected by this project.

I'm enthusiastic about 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver for these reasons:
- We have a shortage of non-profit rental housing in this community.
- I like that a range of housing tenures are included in the proposal.
- Non-market homes, especially accessible ones, are in high demand.
- I think the Rent to Own program is great.

In conclusion, 904-944 Lytton Street, District of North Vancouver is a worthy proposal and I urge you to approve it.

Thank you for your time,
Tiffany Melius
North Vancouver
Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to voice my support for the proposed Seymour Estates Development on Lytton Street in the District of North Vancouver.

I am a long-time North Vancouver resident and grew up here – I attended elementary and high school in North Vancouver, and after a stint living in Vancouver, my husband and I knew that North Vancouver was where we wanted to settle down. We were fortunate to be able to return here and buy a home. Many of our hard-working friends, who also grew up on the North Shore, are struggling to stay or return; mainly due to the lack of housing options, and most notably in the District. Single-family homes are out of reach for many people in their 20s, 30s, and 40s, and most people in this demographic are hopeful to be able to buy or rent a decent apartment or townhouse.

The development proposal being considered by Council checks all the housing boxes, with options to own and rent. There is also below market rental and a rent to own program, which provides even more options for people of all income levels. The rent to own program is a very creative way to help people enter the housing market in a market that makes home ownership otherwise unattainable for many.

This will be a diverse community that many folks will want to live in. We should be embracing this kind of thoughtful development and working together to be a more inclusive community.

Thank you and I sincerely encourage you to approve this project.

Regards,

Mona Khandan
Good evening Mayor Little and Council,

My name is Nicole Elder. I am 42 years old, have been a lifelong resident of North Vancouver, and I am writing in full support of Anthem's proposed development on Mount Seymour Parkway and Lytton Road.

I am a college graduate, and have been working in health care for the last 20 years. I love my job, and I love helping people, but I have a very real concern about affordable housing, that does not necessitate me commuting for hours a day.

I, like many people that have had the privilege of growing up on the North Shore, moved out from home at a younger age (19), and have been living on my own since. As someone who did not have the benefit of living at home until well in to my 20s in order to save, I am someone who would greatly benefit from the proposed rent to own program in this development in order to own my own home in the North Shore area, and in turn securing that I wont need to move further out in the Lower Mainland, substantially increasing my commute to and from work.

Having the ability to own a condo in North Van, and at the same time, freeing up a desperately needed rental suite, would mean the absolute world to me. My grandpa moved to North Van in approximately 1911, and lived here until he passed in 1991. So many areas of this city remind me of him. My friends, extended family, step sons, and pretty much entire life, are in North Van. I have always valued just how lucky we are to live in such a spectacular part of the Lower Mainland, and have been thoroughly and respectfully enjoying all that Mother Nature has to offer here, since I was a child.

It means so much to be able to continue to live in this city, supporting local businesses and mom and pop shops, and helping my step sons, and nieces and nephews to develop the same love and passion for this beautiful and unique city.

I thank you for your time and strongly encourage you to approve this proposal, so that more lifelong residents of the North Shore, like me, have an opportunity to continue to call stunning place home.

Yours sincerely,

Nicole Elder
Good evening Mayor and Council,

My name is Hayley. I am 25 years old and I was born and raised in the District of North Vancouver.

I am speaking tonight in support of Anthem’s Seymour Estates Development.

Right now I am lucky enough to continue to live in the District of North Vancouver. In fact, the home I live in is a secondary transition house, given to Hollyburn Family Services Society from the District. The house offers security to youth like me who are in a post-secondary program, but do not have family to lean on.

Hollyburn has helped me enroll in my college program, supported me during my education and this week I write my final exam.

Where I live now has taken a lot of pressure off. I didn’t need to worry how I could attend school, work and pay my rent. This has helped incredibly. But as I look to my certification completion, the pressure is back on. Where do I go to live now?

That is the reason I support Anthem’s development. 33 units, to Hollyburn that are affordable and safe will help young adults like me, they help seniors and they help families.

Even with a post-secondary education, finding housing and finding housing I will be able to afford will be challenging. We need housing projects that offer young adults a place to call home without worrying about housing unaffordability.

We also need housing where young adults are welcomed and not discriminated on for being young. With organizations like Hollyburn having housing that they can rent to young people like me, it will allow me to start my career, pay taxes, volunteer in my community and contribute. Without this housing then all of my energy goes into worrying about where I am going to live next, if my rent will go up and what if I can’t afford it. Not all the young people in this community have a family they can fall back on. We need to make it on our own to be successful and housing like this will help!

Thank you.
Good evening Mayor and Council

My name is Hayley. I am 25 years old and I was born and raised in the District of North Vancouver.

I am speaking tonight in support of Anthem’s Seymour Estates Development.

Right now I am lucky enough to continue to live in the District of North Vancouver. In fact, the home I live in is a secondary transition house, given to Hollyburn Family Services Society from the District. The house offers security to youth like me who are in a post-secondary program, but do not have family to lean on.

Hollyburn has helped me enroll in my college program, supported me during my education and this week I write my final exam.

Where I live now has taken a lot of pressure off. I didn't need to worry how I could attend school, work and pay my rent. This has helped incredibly. But as I look to my certification completion, the pressure is back on. Where do I go to live now?

That is the reason I support Anthem’s development. 33 units, to Hollyburn that are affordable and safe will help young adults like me, they help seniors and they help families.

Even with a post-secondaty education, finding housing and finding housing I will be able to afford will be challenging. We need housing projects that offer+ young adults a place to call home without worrying about housing unaffordability.

We also need housing where young adults are welcomed and not discriminated on for being young. With organizations like Hollyburn having housing that they can rent to young people like me, it will allow me to start my career, pay taxes, volunteer in my community and contribute. Without this housing then all of my energy goes into worrying about where I am going to live next, if my rent will go up and what if I can’t afford it. Not all the young people in this community have a family they can fall back on. We need to make it on our own to be successful and housing like this will help!

Thank you.
Hello DNV Mayor and Council,

Please see attached support letter for tomorrow evenings public hearing for Anthem’s development proposal for Seymour Estates. It is the same letter as I sent earlier, I would just like it to be recorded as support for the public hearing as well as the first reading.

Thank you,

Adele Wilson

We respectfully acknowledge that the services we provide are on traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the selilwitulh (Tsleil Waututh), sḵwx̱wú7mesh (Squamish) and xʷməθköyəm (Musqueam) peoples.

This Email may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy this e-mail. Any unauthorized copying, disclosure or distribution of the information contained in this e-mail is prohibited.
Re:  Anthem’s Redevelopment Proposal for Seymour Estates

This letter is to express my personal support for the Seymour Estates redevelopment proposal, as submitted to the District by Anthem Developments.

I would like to provide District Council with the following comments regarding Anthem’s proposed development from my personal perspective as both a community member as well as a former owner of one of the units at Seymour Estates.

It is with great dismay that I see a large piece of property sitting empty for such a long period of time, while people in our community are struggling to find a place to live. I see this as a waste of land resources and a potential hazard to the general public. As a former owner, I know it offers a fabulous residential location due to its close proximity to public transportation, amenities, and forest trails. I therefore look forward to the day when I can see a lively community build themselves a future on what I considered a great place to live.

As a former project manager, managing social housing development projects throughout the Lower Mainland, I can attest to Anthem’s well thought-out development proposal which addresses several concerns from the community, and satisfies many suggestions and ideas that the community provided during Anthem’s several open house forums. Their final proposal now offers many positive attributes which I comment on below:

Anthem’s Rent-to-Own program will provide young people with an opportunity to get into the housing market on the North Shore – currently an impossible dream for most of the youth who grew up on the North Shore.

With an equal understanding of the need for more affordable housing on the North Shore, and the need for rental accommodation, I greatly appreciate Anthem’s intent to meet the needs of a wider demographic by allocating a portion of their housing to market and non-market rental units. By partnering with local housing agencies, I know their non-market rental units will be managed appropriately to ensure the non-market housing brings housing stability to families at risk.

I appreciate Anthem’s dedication to housing diversity by including 3 and 4-bedroom units in the housing mix to accommodate families in this community, particularly since the Seymour area has traditionally been a family-oriented community.

Further to the family housing concept, I appreciate their proposed outdoor communal green spaces to promote community within the housing development. Anthem’s desire to build community at the cost
of additional profits speaks to their understanding of this community’s desire for green gathering spaces.

By allocating several units to adaptable designs and 21 units in particular to fully accessible housing, this development will provide much needed dwelling spaces for people with mobility issues. Our community currently has very few purpose-built accessible units, other than in seniors-type housing, so it is refreshing to see family-type housing offering accessibility for family members.

With traffic being a major issue on the North Shore, I further appreciate their proposed contributions to reducing car dependency by including car-share and electric bike-share programs, bicycle storage, and pedestrian connectivity as part of their development.

Finally, I greatly appreciate the fact that they listened to the community in respects to a long-standing strong desire for a local coffee shop. I know since their original submission, a new coffee shop has finally emerged from the ashes of the old corner store at Emmerson and Mount Seymour Parkway. However, a second coffee shop in the area provides additional convenience and greater options for the people in the Blueridge area, the students and teachers at Windsor Secondary School, parents watching their children play soccer in the rain, and patrons of Ron Andrews Community Centre.

In short, I feel Anthem listened to the community and responded favourably to the community’s needs, interests and concerns. It is due to their diligence in understanding and addressing the needs and concerns of the community that I feel this proposal is one I can fully support.

Sincerely,

Adele Wilson

North Vancouver, BC
Dear Mayor Little and DNV Council:

I would like to offer a brief comment in support of the Seymour Estates rezoning application that you will be considering at a public hearing tomorrow (Tuesday, November 17, 2020).

As background, I’m a working professional with a young baby at home. When we decided to expand our family, my partner and I were fortunate enough to be able to move into a townhouse not far from the Seymour Estates site. We love this neighbourhood and we are incredibly grateful that we were able to find a comfortable alternative to a single-family house, especially in this part of the Vancouver lower mainland.

We understand that diverse and inclusive communities need to offer a variety of housing options to meet the needs of different family and household types. We were lucky enough to find something that fits our own particular needs (and budget), but we also recognize that for many families and individuals, the options in the area remain very limited right now -- particularly for renters. (Yes, there are some older rentals, and a few newer multi-family developments like ours that have popped up, but overall, it's not enough.)

My partner and I appreciate that this proposed development would add new market rental and below-market rental housing options, both of which are desperately needed in our area. The townhomes and condos will be in high demand with growing families like ours, and with seniors in the area who are looking to downsize from their larger single-family homes (but who don’t want to move out of the community).

To this end, I hope that Council will also see the value in this proposal, and will help expand and diversify available housing options in our community by allowing this project and others like it to move ahead.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andrea Gvozdanovich

North Vancouver, BC
To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to you today in support of the Seymour Estates development.

North Vancouver has held a special place in my heart not just due to the people that make up the community, but the access to incredible outdoors that has given me a career path in the global cycling industry.

I moved back from the US in the last few years and I'm fortunate enough to be considering buying real estate in the very place that gave birth to my passion and career. While my options are still limited in NV due to the prices, I know that NV as a whole is completely inaccessible, which is why I am writing you today in support of the development of Seymour Estates. Whether it's working with social organizations or providing rent to own options, we need MORE development that supports ALL levels of society.

As an immigrant in the early 90's to Canada, and also having been a resident of the United States, I can confidently say, what makes Canada stronger is due to our diversity as well as a stronger, educated and healthy middle class. Creating physical divides in communities or barriers only creates for more division in society as well as an erosion of the very values that make Canada one of the best places in the world to live.

Furthermore, I would imagine that further densification in the area is likely a topic of concern. While looking at this development at a micro level, it would add more residents to the immediate area, however at the macro level, it provides housing opportunities for all Canadians of all income brackets to live closer to the places they work (i.e. they may not have to commute across Greater Vancouver to get to their work place in NV). With our population set to double in the near future, we need to develop innovative ways to have people live closer to where they work, as well as optimizing public transport infrastructure.

thanks for your time,

Andrew Cho
November, 16 2020

Honourable Mayor and Council,

Re: Support of 904 Lytton Street

My name is Kamelia Abadi and I have been a member of the North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (NSACDI) for the past 6 years.

As a volunteer with ACDI, I have spent my time helping make community spaces and housing projects more accessible and have been advocating for more affordable housing options on the North Shore.

I am here today in my capacity as a community member who lives with an invisible disability as a result of a stroke at age 46.

It is important to me that I share my story with you so you have a better understanding of why I support the project at 904 Lytton Street.

I can tell you that my life changed significantly after that medical crisis.

In my life I have been no stranger to tragedy, I left Iran after seeing my own mother executed when I was 17 years old.

Life in Canada was a gift!

When my medical situation changed I had to give up working and look for new and affordable housing.

I spent lots of time asking staff at the municipal level and local organization where I could find affordable housing, and people just kept passing me along.

I was finally told to go to the local shelter. I lived there for 9 months before something became available. When you are ill and in a state of housing insecurity it is hard to even begin to make yourself well or to feel safe or to even feel of value.

Housing is the centre of the universe for many people, and for me I felt alone in this world without the security of a safe place that I could afford and feel proud of.

Once I was situated, I could start to feel like a valuable member of the community again. I volunteer all over the north shore and try to help others with housing insecurities because I know firsthand what it is like to live in that state in unknowing.

As a volunteer with North Shore Community Policing I also meet many people who are under housed and forced to live with many roommates that they don’t know in order to find something affordable.
Since all the proposed units meet the basic accessible design guidelines it means that enhancements can be made as people age in place, or, as in my case with my invisible disability, could be enhanced in the future if necessary.

The securement of units made available at a 15-25% less market rate will be a huge help to people like me who were in a situation where I just needed to find some place that I could afford and make a home. – From there all things in my life flourished and I want the same for others in my community.

Especially during these times of COVID where we realize how close people are to losing their housing, we are all on notice for the fact that there are just simply not enough affordable rental options available for all types of people, single to small families.

I want to lend my support to this project at 904 Lytton Street as I believe that the more rental in a community the better a community can thrive and be filled with diversity.

This District has not approved any project since its election but we are in need of social housing that is affordable and the longer we wait to build it’s more in need we will be in the future.

Let’s make it happen, Thank you.

Warmly,

Kamelia Abadi

North Shore Resident
Dear District Mayor and Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the development proposal for Seymour Estates. While I hope to participate in the public hearing, in case I’m unable to, I wanted to make sure I shared my feedback with you before you make your decision.

As a District resident and a parent of two young girls, I think this is a great, well rounded housing project and I encourage you to approve it.

I have many friends who have - or are looking to start - their own families and hope to raise their kids in North Vancouver. But decent housing options are few and far between.

There are lots of great schools and family amenities in the District of North Vancouver – but the population is skewed towards an older demographic. I imagine this is because housing is a barrier.

This project offers some great entry level housing options for families who are looking to rent, buy – and even rent to own. No doubt, it will help more young families move into the area. And I’m sure there are some empty nesters who would love to downsize here as well – freeing up larger homes for families looking to expand.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Jon Conlin
North Vancouver
To whom it may concern,

I am 29 years old and have been a resident of North Vancouver since I was six months old and home ownership has always been a dream of mine. My entire family has made the North Shore home and hope to always be here.

Unfortunately with the current housing market in our community my generation is having a difficult time getting over the financial barriers currently set for homeownership. I am extremely grateful that a developer like Anthem Properties is taking this issue head on. The rent to own program would give hope to many. With rent prices on the high end it is making it very difficult to save monies for a down payment that would be required for home ownership in North Vancouver.

I truly hope for myself and others like me, that this proposal is met with great reception from council and the planning department. It is my hope that more developers like Anthem begin to address the need for alternative forms of housing ownership. I do believe that this issue will continue and amplify as the younger generations begin to take over the the majority of the buying demographic in the years to come.

Sincerely

Ty Babych

Sent from my iPad
Good evening,

I would like to voice my concern over the bait and switch stunt Anthem and the District are pulling on this site.

Originally slated for just over a hundred units, you are now preparing to approve a development three times what was initially proposed. I wish I could say I was surprised, but this is how the District operates.

We left Lonsdale because density was too much and we longed for a home with a yard. In the five years we’ve lived east of Seymour, traffic has quadrupled and construction is moving at light speed. What is so disappointing is the concerns of single home family owners are ignored regularly by Council and the District. Efforts to install traffic calming on our street is ignored, we matter little to any of you.

Our quiet neighbourhoods have turned into Indy tracks, cars flying by with little concern for the families and children that play in the area.

Halloween evening two cars chasing each other flew around the corner narrowly missed children trick or treating. When we attempted to stop the second car, he drove right into me. But, let’s add another 500 vehicles to this block. Let’s watch 10 cars blow the light at Emerson instead of the 1 or 2 that regularly blow it now.

Speeds and volumes have quadrupled on the Parkway, an already outrageous limit of 60km is now 80 and 90km - including garbage/delivery/dump trucks (District vehicles included). These vehicles fly past cyclists, students, and families walking to school and to the local coffee shop. Concerns to the District and RCMP fall on deaf ears (unless of course a councillor likes you and then things happen)

If any of you lived near this proposed development you would have a clue as to just how enormous it will be. But my guess is that many of you live high in Blueridge or Deep Cove where you can enjoy the silence of your peaceful cul de sacs. And when you tire of the rif raf invading your streets to access the mountain trails during the height of CoVid, you simply flood the streets with ‘no parking signs’ ‘permit only’ denying thousands or residents access. It must be nice to make your own rules to suit you. The peons had to hike 2-3 km to get the trails because the kings and queens of Blueridge were scared we were dragging CoVid into your neighbourhoods. It was quite something to watch.

Recently Lisa Muir commented on Facebook that - if this behemoth development didn’t move ahead - Anthem’s ROI would be impacted. I guess we know that Council values the profits of developers over the concerns of residents.

What about our return on investment? I invested over a million dollars for my dream of single family home in a great neighbourhood only to have you crap all over it so Anthem can make money and you can jam in thousands of people in a tiny parcel of land that once housed a quarter of the people you want to squish in there.

You can be sure if this development was next to any of you, you would vehemently oppose it. Like everything in the District it’s all about you and screw the residents. As long as your precious streets remain quiet and calm.

I honestly voted believing the current council gave a damn about the rest of us, but clearly you only value what’s
best for you. What a disappointment. The last two years have been incredibly depressing and now a place I once dreamed of living in is turning into a nightmare and I’ll be looking to sell and move. But I guess that’s your plan, right? Make it so miserable for home owners down here so you can jam in more density. But you all sleep at night because a developer will never have a chance to destroy your dreams up in the hills.

I hope common sense prevails tomorrow night and you revisit this Anthem monstrosity. I also hope the bait and switch nonsense stops as well. It’s getting greasy.

Michelle

Sent from my iPhone
Dear council,

My husband and I strongly oppose the development proposal for Seymour Estates, Lytton St to triple the density of the number of units. Please keep the units at the original density of 114.

We live in the community of Blueridge and have experienced a huge increase in the volume and congestion of traffic in our area due to the numerous developments that the DNV and City of NV have allowed in recent years. Moving around our own region of the North Shore is time consuming and this was not previously the case.

Please do NOT authorize any more residential development properties until a third crossing over the Burrard Inlet is complete.

The DNV is no longer “a great place to live, work, and play” as your website states. Please make the right decision and do not approve anymore high residential dwellings.

Thank you for your consideration.

Vivian and Doug Biden
Hello District of North Vancouver.

- RE: Seymour Estates on Lytton Street

I have had the privilege of living in North Vancouver for 56 years. I went to school here and raised my family in North Vancouver. It is without a doubt the best place to raise a family and to live.

I have a long history living here in North Van, raising my children, who have now gone on to raise their own families here in NV. I am also fortunate that I have one remaining parent here. We have 4 generations who live in North Vancouver. In fact, Lynn Valley Road was a single dirt road when I was a child, I have some great memories.

Which takes me to the present, I am a 62 year old resident, who will be retiring in a couple of years, I hope. I am a renter and while I currently work it is affordable. Yet when I retire, my income will drop significantly. I watch in horror as the price of rentals become higher and higher. By the time I retire the rental market will be so inflated , I am faced with leaving my home here in North Vancouver, away from a place I love, away from my family and friends my community.

What is most concerning is that I see many rental buildings going up around the Lonsdale region , and the vacancy rates are so high due to the very high monthly rental cost. Without question, we are in a housing crisis that is all related to affordability .

That is why when I discovered the plans of Seymour Estates, I had to know more. Their rent to own plan is fantastic and created. In fact it was the only way my parents could purchase their home on Arborlynn Drive back in 1964. Without that option, it would have been impossible for my parents to purchase a home.

It can be very challenging for anyone to save a down payment for a home and if you are fortunate, and a young person perhaps remaining at home and saving for many years, it will allow a window of opportunity to save for a down payment.

For someone like myself, who has always worked and successfully raised four children, rentals have been the only option as a single household earner. The other option is the reduced market rental, equally as favourable, to someone like myself.

We don’t have many options for reduced market value apartment rentals, I know of one near Main & Mountain Hwy. I have reviewed Coops, and waiting lists can be very lengthy, and clearly not enough available.

I do hope the DNV truly consider these options Seymour Estates have proposed. In my view, they
clearly identify inclusion for many. I recognise that NV is a very expensive place to live, especially when you must rely on the rental market. Yet if we wish to create a community of inclusion then I urge you to consider approving the plan of Seymour Estates.

The irony about this location is I lived in the prior apartments, 30 years ago with my very young family.

I have 2-3 years before retirement, my youngest is now 24 and has left home. I am hoping that I can save some additional money to save for a portion of a down payment if I was fortunate enough to have a rent to own situation.

Even so, the reduced market value would simply offer me the option of remaining here in my home of North Van, more importantly with my family and friends. My only option is when I do retire is leave North Vancouver to live far away, as many people I know have done so.

I appreciate your consideration, the DNV have the ability to promote change and inclusion and perhaps, knowing North Van as long as I have, become pioneers in how our community can adapt the current community housing needs. NVD can be a change agent for what is needed in our communities and not exclusive to those who may have larger resources.

I thank you kindly for your consideration. You have the ability to recognise and support many good people who wish to be here in our beautiful community, for I am just one of many stories.

Kindest Regards,
Jacquie Coulter
Mobile: [Redacted]
Dear Mayor Little and Council Members,

I wish to offer my written support for the proposed redevelopment and renewal of the Seymour Estates property at 904-944 Lytton Street. The development will add a diverse mix of housing types in North Vancouver that are desperately needed, including townhomes, condos and rental (plus a rent to own program which is so refreshing to see). This is a much better use of the site than the vacant lot that exists today. I also believe that the proposal before Council is a much better option than what the existing zoning allows (replacement of the 114 townhomes which have since been demolished due to fire risk).

The District has many beautiful homes, but they take up a lot of land. We cannot continue to grow as a community by building more homes on single lots. The District is constrained on all sides, by the ocean, the City of North Vancouver, and the mountains. We cannot develop land farther up the mountains or within our regional parks. A viable solution is to provide some gentle density along arterial roads, like Mt Seymour Parkway. Townhomes are a great choice for growing families or seniors looking to downsize.

I’d also like to applaud the developer for their decision to include secured rental and rent to own housing in this development. People have different housing needs throughout their lives, which is why we need a greater variety of housing types and tenures here in North Van. I’m raising my two daughters in North Van and I hope they’ll be able to live locally when they decide to move out, which I think it’s important for parents to advocate for housing alternatives to single family. Many of our daycare family friends are currently renting multi-family and/or older homes and are ready for a home to call their own and love that this site would provide options for many of them regardless of their life stage.

My family and I spend a lot of time in the neighbourhood going to Parkgate Community Center, swimming at Ron Andrews as well as soccer at the Windsor field and I truly believe that the development proposal coming before you offers great benefit to our community and I hope it will be permitted to go ahead.

Thank you for considering my input.

Kind regards,
Lynn Crawford
Hi Mayor and Council:

My name is Salim, and I live on [redacted], which is very close to the Seymour Estates development site on Lytton Street. In fact, I can see the property from my back deck. I would like to encourage Council to please approve this project, as I believe it will be a fantastic development, and will bring a level of vibrancy to the local area.

As a long-time resident of North Vancouver, I can say that this site is in a very convenient location close to shopping, schools, community centres, and offices. It is a great idea to add more housing opportunities in areas like this, to make sure that as much as possible, we can encourage not only home ownership but also less driving around on our streets. The transportation initiative included with this proposed development will help to improve traffic in the area, by encouraging alternative methods of transportation, including cycling, car sharing and transit.

Anthem’s proposal brings a unique opportunity to the community by including a variety of housing types, such as family-oriented units as well as dedicated market and below market rental homes; not to mention the first of its kind Rent to Own program, resident amenities and even a coffeeshop – in these times, the value of small community hubs is essential and I have no doubt that the area would benefit from this addition, serving users of the community centre as well as students and staff of Windsor Secondary.

Finally, I really like that the proposal is being designed cohesively as one community by Anthem, rather than separate pieces by different developers. I think it will bring an intrinsic community feel to it and will add a lot to the immediate area.

Thank you for considering my input. I give this proposed development my full support and I hope that you approve this project.

Salim (Sal) Kanji
To Whom It May Concern,
I would like to express my support of Bylaw 8423. Thank you

Kind regards,
Gleb Podshibyakin
Hello Mayor and Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal for Seymour Estates.

As former owners at Seymour Estates, we are glad to see the proposal by Anthem finally up for public hearing – it has been a long wait.

We are in support of this proposal for the following reasons:

1. Having lived at Seymour Estate with our young daughter until 2017, we are well aware of how much it needed in terms of updates and maintenance. While it was a lovely community to be a part of, it was time for the owners to sell. It would have made no sense for our strata to continue pouring money into an old building complex, and we made the decision to sell to Anthem so they could replace Seymour Estates with new, long-lasting buildings built to modern-standards and quality.

2. The Seymour Estates site is very strategically located, especially for those with family, or are downsizers. It is a skip and a hop away from a secondary school, and the Ron Andrews Community Centre – which is great for families with youth and seniors who depend on community centres for social and recreational programming. Seymour Estates is also very close to the Maplewood area, where many offices/places of employment are located, and also to the Ironworkers Memorial, which can connect residents to Downtown Vancouver. Well-located sites like this should be developed to help support our working population who want to live in the District but are worried about commute times or accessibility.

3. Overall, the District is in severe need of more housing types. Most homes here are large single-family homes that don’t serve the needs of downsizers and are far too expensive for younger professionals and families. We need more communities like what is proposed at Seymour estates, which will offer variety, and thus help us retain a broader range of people living in the District.

All in all, we have been really pleased with our experience with Anthem through this process, and we are happily settled into our new home.
Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this proposal, we hope you will approve it.

Sincerely,
Kevin and Roberta Goodsell
Good Morning to the District Planning department!  
Please provide this letter showing my support of the Seymour Heights Proposal to the necessary team.  
I understand the closing of submissions is today at 12 noon. Thank you for your urgency.

To Whom It May Concern,

Re: Seymour Heights Anthem Development Proposal

As a North Vancouver local I recognize the need for more affordable housing and rental accommodations more than ever before. Our fast growing community is pushing out many of my friends and their children due to lack of affordability or availability.

The development proposed in the Seymour Heights area of the district is one that will provide 89 families with the opportunity to remain in North Vancouver as contributors to our community and 33 families struggling to afford the highly inflated rental rates.

I am not a supporter of over development in North Van and have never promoted the development of a community before however I see the need for affordable options.  
As my children get older I want to know that they have the choice to stay here and not be driven.

Please consider this development as a benefit to our fragile community and work with Anthem on pushing the envelope for all developers.

Together the district can be a part of the solution along with the developers that build us.

Thank you for your time and please feel free to reach out to me further!

Camille Lebeuf,  
North Vancouver, BC
I am writing to voice my concern over the proposal to develop the former Seymour Estates site to add 15 buildings housing approximately 341 homes. This is triples the number of units originally located on this site, not to mention adding unnecessary density to the area. The development will not house enough parking spaces for the number of people that will live there which will affect the minimal street parking available and bringing Modo carshare into the mix will only serve to add more vehicles onto an already strangled vehicle corridor.

Seymour and the surrounding communities, for the most part, consist mainly of single family dwellings with some larger existing apartment/condo/townhouse dwellings mixed in. As it stands currently, the infrastructure in this part of the District struggles at the best of times to contain the daily traffic on the 2 main corridors leading to the Second Narrows Bridge and the Trans Canada highway. Those being Mount Seymour Parkway and Dollarton Highway.

The speed limit (and I use that term lightly) on the Parkway incites the majority of current drivers to treat it as a racetrack. East of Riverside, there is only one cut through between these to corridors (Tollcross/Brixham/Plymouth) and that is also treated as a raceway seven days a week. There are children and pets that live and play on these streets and frankly, the blatant disregard for speed and safety shown by some drivers is unacceptable.

The increased traffic and vehicles that will strain the infrastructure even more than it is now is not worth the mega-development that Anthem Properties and the DNV have proposed. The fact that this is being considered shows that the needs and concerns of the residents that call this area home are being thrown aside for the promise of profit.

Sincerely,

Alan King
Good Morning,

I'm a bit late sending the attached letter of support for the above noted project so I am sending it directly to you in the hopes you will see it in time!

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter of support for the development, I truly appreciate all your hard work during this crazy time. See you in the virtual meeting this evening!

 Regards,

Karen Spoelstra
Ph. [redacted]
NVan
RE: Bylaw 8423, 8424, and 8425: Rezoning and Housing Agreement Bylaws for Mixed-Use Development at 904 – 944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

Dear Council,

I cannot fully explain in this letter how excited this proposed development makes me. Not only is it the perfect location for this density, it will offer a variety of delivery options that will attract a diverse group of people to the community.

The proposed development appears to handle the increased density in smart ways with mid-rises near busy areas (the Parkway and the school), while creating a neighborhood complex in the middle. The buildings, by District staff report, conform to the Official Community Plan, and the proposed density is consistent with the objectives and policies therein, and I wholly agree.

With any change in density along the Parkway, the local question of traffic comes up. My personal feeling is that the local complaints about traffic being so much worse than ‘when I was growing up in the Cove’ should not prevent the approval of good development. The current pandemic has changed the way we work and I strongly believe that the current push to work-from-home as much as possible will transcend how we work in the future.

Additionally, the transit infrastructure along the Parkway is good - something I can personally attest to as I previously commuted daily on the bus along the Parkway to downtown Vancouver. Transit infrastructure can generally only be improved once ridership numbers increase after developments such as this are built.

I grew up in Lynn Valley and was fortunate enough to purchase a home in the Parkgate area in 2011. I am now a Principal in an engineering firm and manage a team of people of various ages with mixed backgrounds. I find it so disheartening that my team, despite being well-educated and holding well-paid positions, cannot afford to buy into my neighborhood today. Projects such as the proposed can open a door to families that would otherwise not be able to afford to live in North Vancouver.

I strongly support this project and hope that the District will approve the proposed bylaws.

Regards,

Karen Spoelstra, P.Eng. LEED AP

Note: I work for an engineering firm called MCW Consultant Ltd. that does occasionally consultant for Anthem Properties, the applicant. Neither my employer nor I will directly benefit from this letter; I write this letter only from my perspective as a local resident.
Good morning,

Please consider the attached letter for today's public hearing regarding 904-944 Lytton Street.

Thank you.

Michelle Reid

Seymour Heights Play Based Programs
Administrator/Staff Supervisor
604-929-1813
Dear Mayor and Council:

I’m writing to you in my capacity as Head Administrator for the Seymour Heights Play-Based Programs Childcare Centre. We are located at 800 Lytton Street, tucked between Ron Andrews Rec Centre and Windsor Secondary, and very close to the Seymour Estates property.

Our school has been an integral part of the North Vancouver community since 1957 with over 25 years at its current location.

I’d like to comment in support of Anthem’s application to develop a vibrant new community on this site. This new development will bring a lot of benefit to the neighbourhood, and we see it as a great improvement to what is currently there: a large, vacant site.

Our centre operates on the philosophy that children flourish when their families are a part of the learning process. When the land was occupied in previous years, many of the families were a part of our community. Parents volunteer in our centre and community ties become strong. This is something we are missing now that the property sits vacant.

We look forward to the new infrastructure improvements that Anthem has committed to, including new sidewalks on both sides of Lytton Street, and traffic calming measures to make things safer. Between the dance school, the high school, the soccer bubble, and our centre, the current infrastructure does not support the needs of this area.

We are also pleased that this will be a family friendly development with options to rent and own, and lots of outdoor green space and play areas for the kids who will call this community home. Communities should be filled with all types of residents, and we look forward to welcoming new neighbours to the area!

Thank you for considering my comments and I hope Council will move this project forward.

Sincerely,

Michelle Reid
Seymour Heights Play-Based Programs
800 Lytton Street
Hi DNV Council,

I wanted to express my concern and disapproval of the rezoning and dramatic increase in housing density of the proposal for the 904-944 Lytton Development. I have lived 'east of Seymour' for the last 8 years (in Deep Cove for 6 and Blueridge for 2) and seen how dramatically the community has changed already with the increase in density. Below are some of the factors that have contributed to my negative feeling about the project:

- Traffic: The local and bridge traffic (w/o COVID) is untenable and the continued development throughout the district (esp. in Lynn Valley and near Mountain/Marine) continues to amplify the issue. Given how expensive/difficult it is for businesses to lease property on the North shore, most people work in Burnaby and Vancouver - therefore commuting in horrible traffic really affects people's lives - cuts down on time I'm with family, adds stress, wastes fuel, and is just inefficient. Taking 3 different buses to get to work is not a timely/efficient option. Until actual efficient public transit options exist or significant changes (like a new or expanded bridge) exist, I don't think it is responsible for the district to simply continue to add to the already alarming problem.

- Development: Why must we jack up the FSR on every project?! Tripling the density of the land (from 114 to 341 units) is WAY too much for such a small area - especially with talk of more development in neighboring Maplewood, the land for sale for (for likely rezoning at Riverside/Mt. Seymour). How much development is enough in this area? The number of projects that are underway (e.g. Lynn Valley, Mountain/Marine, Seylynn high rises) and under discussion (e.g. Maplewood flats) along with what is happening in the CNV is crazy. These are all predominantly scabbed-together 3-6 storey wood-framed dwellings with insufficient greenspace. What is the long-term plan and how much is actually enough? The North Shore was a place where you could drive down a road and not have every plot of land consumed. Is the goal to 'optimize' the use of every lot of land?! Where is the balance?

- Community Infrastructure: Until there is a commensurate investment in the community infrastructure east of Seymour, I don't think it is responsible to continue with increasing the density far beyond what it currently is. The community centers like Ron Andrews (right next store) need to be updated - nearby Blueridge and Seymour Hts schools are also in disrepair. There are not enough childcare centers (it took me 3 years to get into one in my community), family doctors (again took forever to find one), and even vets! Even when NVRC opens registration for activities they are full within 2 minutes. Why is it okay to cram even more people in when the community has not been commensurately scaled?
"Affordable Housing": There needs to be a different approach. This idea that 'affordability' is $800K is a joke. Okaying these projects under that premise is misguided. The rent to buy option, while okay on the surface, needs to be redefined. Approaches like caped housing in Whistler for people who have lived in the community for 5 years should also be considered. Under that program, at least you can actually get an affordable place for $350K. I think in some ways single family homes with suites serve the community and better - having rented for years.

I recommend to keep the zoning as-is and put up est 115 units as before.

Best,

Andrea
Re: rezoning and development application at 904-944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver

Dear District Mayor & Council,

My name is Craig Stanghetta and I am writing to you to express support for the proposed development at 904-944 Lytton Street. I live in the District and I believe new housing needs to be constructed that provides diversity in choice while respecting our existing neighbourhoods. The proposal at 904-944 Lytton Street will do this.

If approved, the development will replace 114 demolished townhouses with 133 new ones, plus 94 condominiums and 89 rental homes. As someone who works in Interior Design, I appreciate that the development has been designed to complement the existing neighbourhood and the natural surroundings that draw people to the area.

These new homes will provide options for people looking to downsize, expand, or renew their housing. They also offer excellent amenities, like communal green spaces for families and a new coffee shop serving the neighbourhood. I hope you consider these benefits when discussing the proposal.

Sincerely,

Craig Stanghetta
North Vancouver B.C

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Mayor and Council,

Dear Darren Veres, City Clerk,

I am submitting the attached letter of support on behalf of Jill Atkey, CEO of BC Non-Profit Housing Association, to express our organizational support for the application to rezone the property at 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates). Our colleague Ian Cullis will be joining tonight’s public hearing on behalf of our organization and as resident of the District.

Please do not hesitate to be in touch with any questions you may have.

Peer-Daniel Krause – on behalf of BC Non-Profit Housing Association

---

Peer-Daniel Krause
Policy Manager

BC Non-Profit Housing Association
220–1651 Commercial Drive, Vancouver, BC V5L 3Y3
Unceded territories of the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, səlil̓ilw̓ətaʔɬ and Skwxwú7mesh Nations
As a preventative measure against COVID19 transmission, BCNPHA employees are working remotely until further notice. Phone messages are forwarded via email and responses may be delayed.
November 16, 2020

Mayor and Council
District of North Vancouver
355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5

Per email: gordonja@dnv.org, veresd@dnv.org, mayor@dnv.org, backj@dnv.org, bondm@dnv.org, currenm@dnv.org, forbesb@dnv.org, hansonj@dnv.org, muril@dnv.org

Re: Support for 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express our organizational support for the rezoning of 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates) in the District.

Notably, the project would allow for the creation of 89 rentals (incl. 33 below market) and 25 rent to own units, in addition to 94 condo units and 133 townhouses.

We know that renters in the District of North Vancouver are facing significant challenges with affordability. As per the latest census there were 6,640 rental households in the District, representing nearly one-quarter of all households. Nearly half are spending more than the accepted standard of 30% of their pre-tax income on rent and utilities. Nearly one in four of these renter households spends more than 50% of their pre-tax income on rent and utilities, meaning they are forgoing other basic necessities and are at real risk of homelessness.

Noting that between 2011-2019 only 490 occupancy permits were issued for rental units in the District (of which only 80 were for social housing), these units constitute a significant addition to the local rental stock in relative terms. The project proposed by Anthem would not solve the housing affordability crisis overnight – many more market rental and non-market rental units across the housing spectrum are required to respond to the continuously steep housing demand – but it adds desperately needed units to a limited pool of housing that can serves middle-income earning families who cannot afford to own and who currently occupy other rental stock.

This project is important, but the need in your community is considerable and needs sustained attention. We encourage council to begin taking advantage of current funding for non-market housing for the benefit of your residents. For the first time in decades, senior levels of government are actively investing in affordable housing developments, and
municipal support of these projects is critical. Your widely-noted decisions to reject affordable housing projects has sent a troubling message to non-profits and co-ops currently operating nearly 1,000 non-profit homes in the District. Non-profits have made the wise business decisions to develop new affordable homes in neighboring jurisdictions where hundreds of units are under development. The end result of these decisions means that residents of the District will be further squeezed if there is no new supply of affordable rental homes.

We strongly encourage Mayor and Council to show leadership and approve the rezoning application as has been requested.

Sincerely,

Jill Atkey
Chief Executive Officer
BC Non-Profit Housing Association
Phone: 778-945-2155
www.bcnpha.ca

About BCNPHA: Formed 25 years ago, BC Non-Profit Housing Association (BCNPHA) is the provincial umbrella organization for the non-profit housing sector comprised of nearly 600 members, including non-profit housing societies, businesses, individuals, partners and stakeholders. Together non-profit housing societies manage more than 100,000 units of long-term, affordable housing in over 2500+ buildings across the province. Our members operate more than 700 non-profit homes in the District of North Vancouver.
Dear Mayor and Council,

In response to inquiries from members of Council regarding Anthem’s project at 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates), staff provide the following responses:

1. Is the proposed playground accessible for all abilities?

   **Answer:** A mixture of playground equipment is proposed and should provide for a range of options for most abilities. An accessible path of travel to the playground is provided for residents in Sites 1 and 2. Residents and tenants in Sites 3 and 4 can access the playground from the internal private road using the staircase provided near the access to the underground parking structure or via the pedestrian sidewalk which accesses Sites 1 and 2 via Mount Seymour Parkway at the north of the property.

2. Will the playground be for use of both tenants and strata owners in all buildings?

   **Answer:** Yes. The playground will be available for use by both tenant and strata owners in all buildings.

3. What is the proposed site coverage (building/roads etc.-impermeable) versus green space (permeable)?

   **Answer:**
   - **Total Site Area:** 273,425 sq ft (25,402 m²)
   - **Impermeable Surface Area:** 188,121 sq ft (17,477 m²) or 68% of the total site
   - **Permeable Surface Area:** 85,304 sq ft (7,925 m²) or 31% of the total site

4. Is what Anthem proposes in the Rent-to-Own program (specifically the "100% of rent to be applied to down payment") legal in BC Real Estate law?

   **Answer:** Anthem’s lawyer, Russ Benson, advises that his firm has obtained verbal confirmation from the Residential Tenancy Branch that in their opinion Anthem’s proposed Rent-to-Own Program will not create any residential tenancies under the Residential Tenancy Act. Mr Benson, who is a very senior real estate lawyer in BC, is satisfied with the
Residential Tenancy Branch's response. The Municipal Solicitor is satisfied with this response and considers it adequate from the District's perspective. The proposed Rent-to-Own program is otherwise legal in BC real estate law. He advises that there is nothing in law of which he is aware which would render this proposed Rent-to-Own program unenforceable or ineffective.

5. Are Rent-to-Own tenants responsible for Repair & Maintenance on the unit while in Rent-to-Own program or will landlord pay?

**Answer:** The Rent-to-Own purchasers will be responsible for repair and maintenance of their units.

6. What about Strata fees during the Rent-to-Own period-are they expected to be paid by tenant-buyer?

**Answer:** The Rent-to-Own purchasers will be responsible for strata fees and property taxes associated with their unit, as would any homeowner.

7. Is there an upfront application or deposit fee due from potential homeowner to Anthem for taking part in the Rent-to-Own program?

**Answer:** There will be no upfront application fee or deposit due from potential homeowners to Anthem for taking part in the Rent-to-Own program.

8. Who gets to select the Rent-to-Own candidates if this project is approved?

**Answer:** The District will be taking a section 219 covenant to secure the Rent-to-Own program in relation to the 25 Rent-to-Own units. This covenant will stipulate a fair system for accepting and approving applicants (such as a lottery system). The covenant will stipulate that purchasers selected for the Rent-to-Own program must be arms length from the developer. The covenant will also stipulate other eligibility requirements, such must be first time home buyer, must have ties to the North Shore, must satisfy income testing, declaration of inability to provide standard down payment, etc.

Kind Regards,

**Adriana Reiher**  
Council Liaison/Support Officer

355 West Queens Road  
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
reihera@dnv.org
d: 604-990-2204
c: 604-220-4156

Get the latest information on the District’s response to COVID-19 at DNV.org/COVID-19 or visit us on Twitter or Facebook at @NVanDistrict
To whom it may concern,

I am writing in response to the proposed Seymour Estates development at 904-944 Lytton Street. Unfortunately I have prior commitments and will not be able to join the Public Hearing this evening, however I wanted to voice my support for the proposed project.

As a local resident who was born and raised in North Vancouver and graduated from Seycove Secondary in 2006, it has always been an aspiration to remain and raise a family here. Like many in my generation, the availability of affordable housing is becoming increasingly concerning and problematic on the North Shore. The market east of the Seymour River is dominated by single-family detached homes, which regardless of age, size, or condition; are unobtainable for a young professional in my position. The proposed Condo’s and Townhomes, especially with the Rent-to-Own initiative, would provide an unparalleled opportunity for would-be and existing north shore residents.

This site has been a vacant eye-sore for far too long, I hope the district and local residents can see the long term, big-picture benefits here. The proposed development is a win win for the distract and local community, and I am in full support of it proceeding. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Sam Honcharuk
Dear Mayor, Council & District Planning Staff,

I’m emailing again to express my support for Council proceeding with the proposed redevelopment of Lytton + Mt Seymour Parkway by Anthem. Following years of process, Staff and Council have done an excellent job pushing this proposal to offer as much benefit to the community. Our family looks forward to it’s realization.

As a North Van resident (Lynn Valley) and a mother of two young children, I am invested of the health of our community and do have concerns about the cost of housing for future generations. Unfortunately, escalating housing costs are pushing people out of North Van today, and this will only get worse if more housing supply is not created soon.

I appreciate that this project will add to the diversity of housing stock and enhance affordability in our community through the development of a mix of market and affordable rental housing as well as condos, including options for rent to own homes. Facilitating access to stable rental housing and more affordable alternatives to single family home ownership is in the best interest of the people who live and work in North Van, which is why I hope to see more projects like this one come forward.

Also, I think the neighbourhood coffee shop will be a hit.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kristen Neeser
Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to provide my thoughts on the proposed 341-unit mixed development at 904-944 Lytton. Note that my input is my own and not necessarily reflective of any committee or association of which I am a member.

As a renter in a municipality where purpose-built rental homes have not been built in needed quantities for decades, I am supportive of the market and non-market rental components of this project. I will always support rental housing particularly on properties where no demovictions are necessary. (I understand tenants WERE displaced and compensated (though developer was not required to at the time) several years ago). Given its location on a transit corridor and near both school and recreation facilities, I feel this is an appropriate location for family rental housing and that the proposed building heights of up to 6 stories on 2 buildings are not out of scope for the surrounding area.

Now I will always advocate for (and prefer to see) **4 bedroom** rental units for diverse family compositions included in projects but I understand that there are a handful of 3+ den (with window) units in the rentals that could work for families with younger children.

I do read in the staff report (landscaping) that all outdoor spaces will be accessible to all occupants of all buildings. I am pleased to hear this as segregation of outdoor facilities to just owners in strata units at the expense of tenants would be unacceptable. I am pleased that 2.7x MORE trees will be enjoyed on the new site but am curious about the overall site coverage (cement versus permeable surfaces) and how it affects storm drainage.

As is my other common theme, I wish to see a portion of the CACs anticipated to be received as cash allocated directly to the affordable housing reserve fund. There is no further time to waste in creating a defined policy on this matter. If 15% of this were attributed to the AHRF, just under $508k could be earned. If 20%, then $677k. This is an additional, crucial way we can have private developers contribute to truly affordable housing in DNV.

I fully support Anthem's contribution of a 3 bedroom unit to Habitat for Humanity.

While the rent to own concept is an intriguing one, and I applaud Anthem for bringing innovative and creative solutions to DNV to help singles, couples and (very) small families potentially become home owners of 1-2 bedroom apartments in DNV, I have concerns regarding the proposed "100% of rent after 2 years" being allocated towards down payments. I seek clarity as to whether this is actually legal under BC Real Estate law? If so, and provided there are no extra fees for the potential homeowners to take part in the RTO program, I support this.

Finally, I wanted to speak on non-profit housing partners running the below market component of these projects. I would like to see formal agreements in place in this regard AT REZONING rather then at some unknown future date. We were told at Public Hearing for
Mosaic's Emery project that they would be required to have a non profit run the below market component and to date, as far as I know, none has been found. All that said, in reviewing the household income levels and proposed rents for the non-market component, I support the 33 units as proposed.

Thanks for your time. I look forward to listening to the public's feedback during tonight's hearing.

Kind Regards,

Kelly Bond
Dear District Bylaw Officer

Re: Bylaw 8423 Proposed amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to permit the creation of a 341-unit mixed-use development at 9040944 Lytton Street, North Vancouver

As a local resident of the [redacted], North Vancouver we have some concerns that the proposed increase in density will lead to additional traffic congestion impacting our street. The concerns relate to the following two areas:

1. **Street parking.** We are concerned that the additional density and increase in commercial shops may add to the demand for street parking in our immediate neighbourhood preventing residents from parking near their homes. Street parking is already limited and additional density may exacerbate the problem. Once potential solution to this may be to limit parking to residents of the street similar to what is done in certain areas of Vancouver’s West Side. Please consider this in your proceedings.

2. **Use of 2600 Violet Street as a short cut between Lytton Street and Emerson Street.** There is already a fair amount of traffic on 2600 Violet Street due to cars using the street as a shortcut to bypass congestion at Emerson Street and Mt. Seymour Parkway. We regularly see cars travelling at higher than requisite speeds on our street and with the expected increase in traffic from the development, we are concerned that the use of 2600 Violet Street as a shortcut for commuters will dramatically increase. As 2600 Violet Street is a narrow street already with no sidewalks on either side of the street, the current risk to pedestrians, including a large number of elementary and high school students, who utilize the street to walk to and from school will only increase. To reduce the risk to local residents and other pedestrians, some limitation on access would be recommended as well as some control over speed on 2600 Violet Street to ensure public safety.

Thank you for your consideration to this matter.

A&K Kokuryo
[redacted], North Vancouver, B.C.
Kamelia Abadi

Cell #:

Sent from Mail for Windows 10, IPhone,IPad

*With gratitude as a guest, I acknowledge that my North Shore community activities take place on the unceded territories of the Squamish, Tsleil-Waututh, and Musqueam Nations.

**The information in this email may be confidential and is intended for the use of the person(s) named above. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply email and then delete it. Any use, copying, or distribution of the information contained herein is prohibited.
November, 16 2020

Honourable Mayor and Council,

Re: Support of 904 Lytton Street

My name is Kamelia Abadi and I have been a member of the North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (NSACDI) for the past 6 years.

As a volunteer with ACDI, I have spent my time helping make community spaces and housing projects more accessible and have been advocating for more affordable housing options on the North Shore.

I am here today in my capacity as a community member who lives with an invisible disability as a result of a stroke at age 46.

It is important to me that I share my story with you so you have a better understanding of why I support the project at 904 Lytton Street.

I can tell you that my life changed significantly after that medical crisis.

In my life I have been no stranger to tragedy, I left Iran after seeing my own mother executed when I was 17 years old.

Life in Canada was a gift!

When my medical situation changed I had to give up working and look for new and affordable housing.

I spent lots of time asking staff at the municipal level and local organization where I could find affordable housing, and people just kept passing me along.

I was finally told to go to the local shelter. I lived there for 9 months before something became available. When you are ill and in a state of housing insecurity it is hard to even begin to make yourself well or to feel safe or to even feel of value.

Housing is the centre of the universe for many people, and for me I felt alone in this world without the security of a safe place that I could afford and feel proud of.

Once I was situated, I could start to feel like a valuable member of the community again. I volunteer all over the north shore and try to help others with housing insecurities because I know firsthand what it is like to live in that state in unknowing.

As a volunteer with North Shore Community Policing I also meet many people who are under housed and forced to live with many roommates that they don’t know in order to find something affordable.
Since all the proposed units meet the basic accessible design guidelines it means that enhancements can be made as people age in place, or, as in my case with my invisible disability, could be enhanced in the future if necessary.

The securement of units made available at a 15-25% less market rate will be a huge help to people like me who were in a situation where I just needed to find some place that I could afford and make a home. – From there all things in my life flourished and I want the same for others in my community.

Especially during these times of COVID where we realize how close people are to losing their housing, we are all on notice for the fact that there are just simply not enough affordable rental options available for all types of people, single to small families.

I want to lend my support to this project at 904 Lytton Street as I believe that the more rental in a community the better a community can thrive and be filled with diversity.

This District has not approved any project since its election but we are in need of social housing that is affordable and the longer we wait to build it’s more in need we will be in the future.

Let’s make it happen, Thank you.

Warmly,

Kamelia Abadi

North Shore Resident
Hello,
Please see my attached letter to the mayor and council regarding the proposed Seymour Estates Development that will be at public hearing tonight. Alas I work tonight or I would've emailed earlier to attend virtually.

Thank you,
Ellison (Eli) Mallin
--

Eli Mallin
Seymour Estates Public Hearing  
November 17, 2020  
District of North Vancouver

To Mayor and Council:

I am in favour of the proposal for the redevelopment of Seymour Estates. As a young person living on the north shore, I am very impressed with the proposals details on tackling entry level and affordable housing. I am especially impressed by the rent to own program and the proposal to partner with Hollyburn Family Services to manage below market rent housing is an extremely important aspect. The rent to own model provides a fantastic option for my generation to purchase our first home. Too many of my friends and associates my age throw away thousands of dollars a year on rent that is merely holding them back from entering the housing market in a safer and more secure way. To allow that rent to go towards equity and a down payment is innovative and much needed.

It is clear that this development company has also been listening to Council’s concerns. A commitment to renewable energy and a proposal to address parking concerns both speak to this. And the alternative transportation measures are excellent. The location is in a highly transit accessible route as well that, with an influx of transit users like most people my age I know, would help improve transit services and reduce traffic.

I don’t think anyone would argue with the evidence that the District of North Vancouver has an affordable housing problem. This development proposal would be a great opportunity to kick start a way forward. Providing housing options for those who work here to be able to live here is critical. I can say from my own experiences - I am planning to move off the North Shore by the summer if I cannot find somewhere affordable, even though my work and my family are all here. I also am a very active community volunteer, serving on some DNV committees and coaching hockey. I am not saying I am irreplaceable but if my affordability problems are indicative of a greater trend, there will be a severe lack of young people able to serve their community in the coming years at the rate we are going. I sincerely hope that Council takes this opportunity to show leadership in tackling what is one of the most significant issues here on the North Shore.

Sincerely,

Ellison (Eli) Mallin  
North Vancouver
Hi Clerks!

I am writing in opposition to the proposed rezoning of the at 904-944 Lytton Street (Bylaw 8423). Though I personally believe the architecture is pleasant and the height is of no concern.

The main issue, I believe, is the amount of units (341) and access to and from the site. Quite frankly I think vehicle access will be very strained here given that the intersection of Lytton and Parkway is very busy because it takes on a significant amount of traffic produced by Ron Andrews Rec Centre (especially pre and post COVID), and Windsor Secondary. I believe the addition of 341 units at this location will seriously and negatively impact Lytton.

A considerable reduction in the amount of total units would be appreciated (maybe a reduction of 10-15% might be considered?)

Thank-you for taking my comments into consideration.

Thank-you,

Jeff Thompson
Resident of [redacted].
Mayor and Council,

This email speaks AGAINST proposed Bylaws 8423, 8424, and 8425: Rezoning and Housing Agreement Bylaws for a Mixed-Use Development at 904 - 944 Lytton Street, known as Seymour Estates. My objections to the proposed development are as follows:

1. The development proposes mostly strata/private ownership units (252 of 341 units) whereas statistics clearly indicate that the greater need in the District is for rental units.
2. The proposal for rezoning represents a considerable uplift in land value. That privilege must be used as an opportunity for the District to request added value in the proposed development. At a minimum and considering that Council has declared a Climate Emergency, the added value must include construction to Passive House standards and provision of electrical vehicle charging stations at a ratio of 1 for every 2 parking spaces in the development.

Thank you for your attention.

Katherine Fagerlund
North Vancouver, BC
M: [Redacted]
Your Worship & Members of Council,

Attached is an outline of my presentation.
My speaking notes are mainly pages 1 to 4.

Yours truly,
Corrie Kost
N. Vancouver
Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

Attachment 1 of Dec 15 2014 Administrative and Operational Policy states the current specifications for EV outlets in new multifamily developments.

20% are EV Ready Level 1 charging with 100% wired for Level 1 charging

As shown in attachment 2 this is lower than most municipalities in the lower mainland and certainly lower than DNV and DWV which require 100% EV ready with Level 2. The DNV “standards” are dated and needs urgent updating.

As noted in attachment 3 by CNV retrofiting later can be very expensive – as much as $11,000 per outlet while when installed in new development high-rise it is $805 (no load sharing) or $275 (optimal load sharing).

Should this development be approved I urge council to specify Level 2 EV ready for 100% of the parking spots (excluding visitor spots). IMHO it would be wise for the proponent to do this.

Shadow Studies

Sunlight is an important part of the liveability of any housing project. A key element is that children should be able to play in sunny designated play areas. A great set of shadow study standards are provided in attachment 4. Notwithstanding our 2011 OCP report on recommended shadow study specifications, at the very least shadow studies should be presented over broader hours in the summer and include some times for December 21st.
In the latter the Insurance Company of British Columbia (ICBC) reports car ownership rates for the District and City of North Vancouver combined. Between 1999 and 2009, the number of cars registered in North Vancouver grew significantly from 75,000 to 85,000, a rate higher than population growth. In 2009 in North Vancouver, car ownership per capita was higher than the regional average at 0.62 vehicles per capita compared to the regional average of 0.58. Considering factors like the different land use and income attributes of the District compared to the City, car ownership rates are likely higher than 0.62 per capita within the District.

In addition, considering the fact that average DNV household income and the cost of housing are both above the lower mainland average, automated ownership, which is becoming relatively more affordable with time, will likely increase even more into the future.
PARKLAND

With 341*2.3 (average family size per unit in DNV) ~ 800 people housed in this complex is “growth paying its own way”?

The added park space per 1000 people (see page 32 of https://www.dnv.org/sites/default/files/edocs/parks-and-open-space-strategic-plan-draft.pdf) is 4 hectares or about 10 acres.

The additional parkland required conservatively – prorated to 800 people would cost about $40,000,000. How much CAC was paid? $3,386,385

So no – this development is not paying its own way - it is simply absconding the surplus existing parkland in the area. So let’s just admit that growth is not paying its own way.

Pandemics and Covid-19

First it should be noted that these words are nowhere to be found in this proposal. Steps, both in building design and operation – particularly for the two six-storey apartment (208) units, will need to be put in place. Sadly design changes take some of time – and are much more costly to retro-fit. I had hoped for at least some changes– say in elevator designs and related safety features – especially in public and high traffic areas and mechanical systems design. The 700 sq-ft indoor shared amenity space needs carefully designed safety features. I hope we learn more related best-practices before we build more(1) multi-family units.

I do want to note that the ever shrinking size of apartments does not bode well for disease control.

Transportation

Disruptive technology is going to rapidly change transportation. A highly recommended video to watch can be found at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y916mxoio0E

It is obvious to anyone who lives in the area (I do not) that traffic in the area is congested – especially during rush hours. Note that adding only a few more cars to the queue has a disproportionate impact on traffic that is already congested. This element is rarely revealed in “transportation studies” of a development proposal.

I guess this may be another case of growth NOT paying its own way. The solution is not without controversy – that is congestion pricing\(^{(2)}\).

(2) https://www.accessmagazine.org/spring-2017/the-access-almanac-traffic-congestion-is-counter-intuitive-and-fixable/

OCP Directives

Finally I want to emphasize that the 2011 OCP puts great emphasis on rental (as opposed to ownership) of affordable housing. I urge council to examine how this project fits into those directives in their decision making process.
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL POLICY

Title: Implementation of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure with Development

Section: Engineering and Public Works

POLICY

It is staff policy that electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure is implemented with development.

Policy approved on: December 15, 2014
Policy amended on:

PROCEDURE

The District’s guideline is that the following electric vehicle charging infrastructure is to be provided with new developments:

1. For multifamily developments:
   - 20% of parking stalls are EV-ready, wired for level 1 charging
   - Conduit is in place so that 100% of parking stalls can later be wired for level 1 charging
   - Allocation of EV parking spaces is the responsibility of developers and/or strata organizations

2. For commercial and industrial development, in the range of 10% of parking stalls are EV-ready, wired for level 2 charging. The following criteria will be used to determine on a case-by-case basis the appropriate amount of level 1 and level 2 charging to be provided:
   - Proximity to regional roads and highways; and
   - Expected length of stay based on long term land use tenure (e.g. more charging infrastructure will be needed where the stay is longer).

3. All secure bicycle storage is to include level 1 electrical outlets for electric bicycle charging.

Requirements are to be revisited based on implementation experience and input heard through developer consultation in Fall 2015.
Electric Vehicle Policies.

Electric vehicle policies can benefit the continued and increasing adoption of electric vehicles in BC and across Canada. Below is a list of policies that various levels of government (municipal, regional, provincial, and federal) have taken to support EVs. This is not to be confused with EV incentives such as point-of-sale vehicle incentives. This list is not exhaustive.

Federal

**Canadian Tax Code Capital Cost Allowance Classes.**

EV charging stations can be classified at a higher rate than previous allowances. The new rates are:

- Class 43.1 with a CCA rate of 30% electrical vehicle charging stations (EVCSs) set up to supply more than 10 kilowatts but less than 90 kilowatts of continuous power. This is for property acquired for use after March 21, 2016, that has not been used or acquired for use before March 22, 2016.
- Class 43.2 with a CCA rate of 50% electrical vehicle charging stations (EVCSs) set up to supply 90 kilowatts and more of continuous power. This is for property acquired for use after March 21, 2016, that has not been used or acquired for use before March 22, 2016.

This is useful for businesses that wish to claim depreciation expenses for Federal income taxes.

British Columbia

**Zero-Emission Vehicles Act**

This act requires automakers to meet an escalating annual percentage of new light-duty ZEV sales and leases, reaching: 10% of light-duty vehicle sales by 2025, 30% by 2030, and 100% by 2040.

**Ministerial Order M104**

This order allows persons who are not otherwise public utilities, as well as landlords and strata corporations, to provide EV charging services for compensation. Please note that payment for electricity by kWh still requires a device approved by Measurement Canada, but charging stations have not yet been approved. Rates by the hour, or a flat fee, to use a station are still the conventional methods of placing a rate on charging station use.

**HOV Lane Access**

This policy allowing EVs access to high occupancy vehicle lanes regardless of the number of passengers. See more details and order the required HOV lane decal on the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure site.

**Provincial Building Act**

The building act was revised in 2016 to define EV chargers as matters ‘out of scope’ under the Building Act. ‘Out of scope’ is defined as “matters… local government can regulate… if they have authority to do so in other statutes.” This gives local governments greater flexibility in making decisions regarding the use of EV charging in new developments.

**BC Strata Property Act**

The act was revised in March 2017 under regulation 6.9 to clarify that variable user fees are permitted for the use of strata common property. A consumption based rate may be charged to users to recover expenses as long as it is reasonable and in a bylaw or rule. Examples include electricity usage for those charging electric vehicles.

**Strata Property Act**
The act was revised in March 2017 under regulation 6.9 to clarify that variable user fees are permitted for the use of strata common property. A consumption based rate may be charged to users to recover expenses as long as it is reasonable and in a bylaw or rule. Examples include electricity usage for those charging electric vehicles.

**Strata Property Act**

**Municipal**

**City of Burnaby**

Zoning Bylaw 13903, Amendment Bylaw No. 24, 2018 includes provisions for electric vehicle charging requirements for new residential developments.

- All parking spaces for dwelling units shall include an energized outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging or higher
- Includes single-family homes and multi-family buildings of all sizes
- Exceptions include visitor and secondary suite parking, and parking for existing units
- Bylaw is in effect starting September 1 2018.

**City of Coquitlam**

The zoning bylaw has been amended to include EV parking spaces. See Part 714 of the bylaw.

- July 30th 2018. See the requirements guide.
- All new constructions must have one energized outlet capable of L2 charging for every dwelling unit (includes single family and MURBs).

**City of Kamloops**

Council authorized the adoption of the Electric Vehicle (EV) and Electric Bike (E-Bike) Strategy on August 25, 2020 with the understanding that only action items with no costs attached will move forward in 2021. Other actions identified within the strategy will be revisited as funding becomes available. See the strategy here.

**Targets include:**

- By 2023, all newly constructed off-street residential parking will be EV-ready.
- By 2030, all residential parking in existing apartments will be EV-ready.
- By 2030, most households without access to on-site parking for “at-home” charging will have access to EV charging, through a mix of workplace, on-street, and other forms of public charging (to be measured via surveys and/or other analysis).

**City of Kelowna**

The city provides a parking Eco Pass for electric vehicles. Electric vehicles, including plug-in hybrids, can receive a one year eco pass which allows two hours of free parking a day in paid parking areas.

**City of Nelson**

The city has amended its zoning bylaw:

- One stall per dwelling unit is required to be EV ready in new single family and multi-unit residential.
- Two stalls per 10 required stalls of new commercial builds are required to be EV ready.

**City of New Westminster**

Bylaw 8040 in 2018 amended zoning bylaw 6680.

- Amended October 1, 2018
- For new buildings that contain at least one dwelling unit, all residential parking spaces and spaces for co-operative vehicles, shall feature an energized Level 2 outlet or higher to the parking space. Energized Level 2 outlets will not be required for visitor parking spaces.

**City of North Vancouver**
The zoning bylaw has been amended to include 100% EV ready parking in multi-unit residential buildings:

- This applies to development or building permit applications accepted for review on or after June 1, 2019.
- All parking spaces in new residential buildings must have a labelled, energized outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging for an electric vehicle.
- This includes all new single family, coach houses, duplexes, triplexes and apartments, as well as parking spaces for shared vehicles.
- Secondary suites are not included.
- EV energy management systems or “load sharing” can be used to meet the requirements.

**District of North Vancouver**

Implementation of EV Charging Infrastructure with Development policy requiring multi-family, commercial, and industrial builds, document 2380934.

- Multi-family in District of North Vancouver:
  - 20% of parking stalls are EV-ready (wired for L1 charging)
  - Conduit in place for 100% of parking stalls to be wired for L1 in the future

- Commercial/Industrial in District of North Vancouver:
  - Approximately 10% of parking stalls are EV-ready (wired for L2 charging)

**City of Port Coquitlam**

Zoning Amendment Bylaw 4035 requires EV charging in new builds (residential and mixed use):

- In effect Jan 23 2018
- For a residential building other than a building with a common parking area, one parking space per dwelling unit shall be provided with roughed-in electric vehicle charging infrastructure including an electrical outlet box located within 3 metres of the unit’s required parking space.
- For a residential building with a common parking area, a separate single utility electrical meter and disconnect shall be provided in line with the electrical panel(s) intended to provide for charging of electric vehicles located within 3 metres of the unit’s required parking space.
- In a mixed-use building including residential uses and a common parking area, a separate single utility electrical meter and disconnect shall be provided in line with the electrical panel(s) intended to provide for charging of electric vehicles located within 3 metres of the unit’s required parking space.

**City of Port Moody**

EV ready requirements appear in bylaw 2937 Section 6.11 March 1, 2019.

- See the technical bulletin [here](#).
- All spaces in new residential constructions require an energized outlet capable of L2 charging.
- 20% of spaces in new commercial constructions require an energized outlet capable of L2 charging.

**City of Richmond**

Zoning Bylaw 8500 requires EV charging in new builds (residential only), revising bylaw 9756.

- October 15, 2017.
- 100% of new residential parking spaces, excluding those provided for visitors use, shall have access to an adjacent energized outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging.

**District of Saanich**

Development and Building Permit applications for new buildings applied for on or after September 1, 2020 will need to demonstrate compliance with the following Bylaws related to Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure requirements:
- **Zoning Bylaw [PDF – 17 MB]** 8200, section 7: Off-Street Parking, which establishes electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure requirements for parking in new residential, institutional, commercial and industrial buildings.


- **EV Infrastructure Requirements Technical Bulletin. [PDF – 276 KB]**

See more on District of Saanich’s EV Infrastructure Requirements page.

**District of Squamish**

**Zoning bylaw 2200, 2011**, has been amended to require:

- 30% of the required off-street parking spaces in any shared parking areas for multiple unit residential use shall have shared access to Electrical Vehicle Charging Receptacles. Electric Vehicle Charging Receptacles provided at visitor parking spaces will not contribute towards this requirement.

- 100% of the required off-street parking stalls in any shared parking areas for multiple unit residential use shall be provided with Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure. (Bylaw 2610, 2018)

**City of Surrey**

The zoning bylaw was amended on February 25, 2019 to require Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure in ALL new residential and commercial developments.

- February 25, 2019. See the technical bulletin here.

- 100% of residential parking spaces in new residential developments must each have an installed energized electrical outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging for an electric vehicle. This requirement applies to both single-family and multiple unit residential dwellings.

- 50% of visitor parking spaces in multiple unit residential developments must each have an installed energized electrical outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging for an electric vehicle.

- 20% of parking spaces in new commercial developments must each have an installed energized electrical outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging for an electric vehicle.

**City of Vancouver**

**Building Code Bylaw 10908** requiring EV charging in new builds (commercial and residential), revised bylaw Electric Vehicle Charging s 10.2.3.

- This bylaw was updated on March 14, 2018 to increase the percentage of EV-ready stalls in multi-unit residential buildings from 20% to 100%

- For new buildings current bylaw requires:
  - 1 EV-ready stall in single-family homes with garages
  - 10% of stalls be EV-ready in commercial buildings
  - 100% of stalls be EV-ready in multi-unit residential buildings

**District of West Vancouver**

**Sustainable Buildings Policy 02-80-386** requires EV ready parking spaces:

Effective April 23, 2018. New buildings should demonstrate that all residential parking spaces, excluding visitor parking spaces, include a labeled and energized outlet capable of providing at a minimum of Level 2 electric vehicle (EV) charging as defined by SAE International’s J1772 standard. Any energy management system that controls the rate and timing of EV charging shall be certified to be sufficient for this purpose.
To: Mayor Darrell R. Mussatto and Members of Council  
From: Julie Lowry, Environmental Sustainability Specialist  
SUBJECT: ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUPPLY EQUIPMENT GUIDELINES FOR NEW MULTI-FAMILY AND MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT  
Date: September 7, 2016  

The following is a suggested recommendation only. Please refer to Council Minutes for adopted resolution.

RECOMMENDATION:

PURSUANT to the report of the Sustainability Specialist, dated September 7, 2016, entitled “Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment Guidelines for New Multi-family and Mixed-Use Development”:

THAT the electric vehicle supply equipment provisions in the Sustainable Development Guidelines be amended as follows (Option 1):

- 20% of all residential parking spaces include an electrical outlet, a receptacle or electric vehicle supply equipment, and are supplied by a branch circuit rated not less than 40 A at the nominal voltage of 208 V or 240 V as applicable;

- Adequate space in the electrical room or electrical vault to support future electric vehicle charging for the remaining 80% of parking spaces.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Letter from Anne McMullin, Urban Development Institute Pacific Region, September 1, 2016 (CD # 1440404)
PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to present Council with options regarding updating the electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) provisions in the City’s Sustainability Guidelines for new multi-family and mixed-use buildings.

BACKGROUND:

Electric vehicles (EVs) produce 80% fewer lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions than the average gasoline-powered vehicle. Electric vehicles also improve local air quality and health through the reduction of harmful nitrogen oxides, sulphur oxides, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter and are quieter than internal combustion vehicles.

EV ownership in Canada has steadily increased since 2012. From 2012 to 2014, registrations for battery electric vehicles (BEV) in the City of North Vancouver increased by 91%. In 2016 a number of new EVs, ranging from long-range sedans to compact commercial vans, are expected to come on the market, providing more options for consumers at lower price points.

Over the past four years, the City has encouraged EV ownership by installing publicly accessible charging stations, advocating for provincial purchasing incentives, and providing guidance and information on our website. The City's DC Fast Charge (DCFC) station on East 1st Street receives the highest use of any DCFC in British Columbia, likely due to escalating local EV ownership combined with the absence of charging facilities in multi-family buildings.

Challenges with Retrofitting Buildings for Electric Vehicle Charging

The majority (70%) of all households in the City are apartment or condominium style multi-family dwellings. Unlike internal combustion cars which fuel up at gas stations, the majority of EVs charge at home overnight. Existing multi-family buildings can be retrofit to include electric vehicle charging, however retrofitting can be expensive and challenging.

A study completed by the Condominium Home Owners Association of BC (CHOA) found that once a building is built, the installation of one Level 2 charging station can cost as much as $11,000. These costs include upgrading the building's electrical system, coring, and running electrical cord, as well as purchasing and installing the charging station. Another challenge faced by strata dwellings is the assignment of parking spaces, which could require resolutions to approve parking re- allocation.

There is also a perceived concern about electrical energy costs, but these can be easily addressed by the strata through charging a flat monthly fee to EV owners. The average electric vehicle uses approximately $30 a month of electricity.
It is prudent to consider including vehicle charging facilities in new construction given the significant costs and challenges associated with retrofitting older construction.

**Charging Levels**

There are three different types of charging stations:
- **Level 1**: uses 120 volts and will provide a full charge in 8-18 hours;
- **Level 2**: uses 240 volts and will provide a full charge in 3-8 hours (e.g. stations in the City Hall Library parkade and off the West 13th Street lane near City Hall);
- **Direct Current Fast Charge (DCFC)**: uses 200-500 volts and will provide a full charge in 15-40 minutes (e.g. DC Fast Charging station currently leased from BC Hydro on East 1st Street).

Though DCFC provides the fastest charging, the stations are not suitable for home charging because they are expensive and have the potential to wear out car batteries when used regularly. Some vehicles can be charged at home using a Level 1 charger, however as technology improves electric vehicles will have larger battery capacity to allow for further travel between charges. Level 1 charging would be insufficient for these larger batteries. Therefore, Level 2 is the most appropriate residential charging option when considering the demands of future larger battery capacity.

**DISCUSSION:**

*20% Level 2 Charging*

Staff recommend that a minimum number of residential parking spaces include provisions for Level 2 charging. The suggested wording for the Sustainable Development guidelines is as follows:

- "20% of all residential parking spaces include an electrical outlet, a receptacle or electric vehicle supply equipment, and are supplied by a branch circuit rated not less than 40 A at the nominal voltage of 208 V or 240 V as applicable."

This language allows the developer or residents flexibility to choose the specific charging station they prefer, while ensuring the building is resilient to changes in EV technology such as greater vehicle battery capacity. For example, the developer could split the connection between parking stalls, allowing for electrical service for two stalls with less infrastructure.

**EV Readiness**

The City’s existing Sustainability Guidelines include a reference to 100% of the parking spaces to be constructed as EV-ready. Staff recommend that this provision remain, with a revision to define EV readiness. The suggested wording is as follows:

- "Adequate space in the electrical room or electrical vault to support future electric vehicle charging for the remaining 80% of parking spaces."

Given that most buildings are designed to last many decades and it is expected that EV ownership will continue to increase, designing a building with extra space in the electrical room or vault for future build out is necessary. Retrofitting an electrical room to
gain space to support future EV infrastructure, such as additional panels, is difficult because of space limitations in buildings and the strict requirements of the Canadian Electrical Code.

These two provisions for EVSE (20% Level 2 charging and EV readiness for the remaining 80% of stalls) are consistent with the current City of Vancouver building bylaw which has been in place since 2013.

**Cost of Providing EVSE in New Development**
The City commissioned a cost study to estimate the potential incremental costs to developers of the recommended EVSE provisions. For each scenario, the incremental cost increase included the recommended provisions of 20% of residential parking electrified for Level 2 charging and adequate space in the electrical room to electrify the remaining 80% stalls. Costs are summarized in Table 1 as incremental costs per parking stall in the building.

**Table 1. Costs of providing EVSE in new development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Optimal Load Sharing</th>
<th>No Load Sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-rise</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-rise</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Load sharing**
Load sharing is the ability to tie a number of charging stations together to share one circuit in the electrical room. Load sharing allows for a reduction in the electrical capacity of a building when installing multiple EVSE, thus reducing development and construction costs. In the case of the cost study, optimal load sharing was defined as having no more than four stations sharing one circuit. No load sharing assumes that each charging station has its own circuit in the electrical room. Load sharing was recently permitted under the Canadian Electrical Code, which was adopted by the Province of BC in early 2016.

**Consultation with the Urban Development Institute**
Staff consulted with the Urban Development Institute (UDI) to receive input on the proposed EV provisions. UDI has expressed support for the recommended approach in a letter dated September 1, 2016 (Attachment 1).

UDI supports the recommendation because it is flexible and allows for developers to choose the charging configuration that best suits the building.

UDI suggested that the City may wish to explore allowing for developers to split the connections between stalls, thus reducing infrastructure costs and alleviating challenges related to parking allocation. As mentioned, this configuration would be consistent with the recommended policy and would be supported.
OPTIONS:

In this report, staff provide two options for Council’s consideration:

Option 1. Amend the City’s Sustainable Development Guidelines to include more specific provisions for EVSE as detailed in the report (Recommended)

Under this option, Council would direct staff to amend the EVSE provisions in the Sustainable Development Guidelines to require the following as included in the recommended resolution:

- 20% of all residential parking spaces include an electrical outlet, a receptacle or electric vehicle supply equipment, and are supplied by a branch circuit rated not less than 40 A at the nominal voltage of 208 V or 240 V as applicable;
- Adequate space in the electrical room or electrical vault to support future electric vehicle charging for the remaining 80% of parking spaces.

Staff recommend this option as the provisions are consistent with the City of Vancouver’s bylaw which has been in place since 2013. The provisions are also supported by the Urban Development Institute (Attachment 1).

Option 2. Refer the matter to a Policy Committee Meeting (Not recommended)

Under this option, Council would refer the matter to a Policy Committee meeting. A Policy Committee meeting would include a presentation from staff and an opportunity to hear from members of the public with regards to the proposed amendments to the Guidelines.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Some additional administrative staff time for Planning and Building staff is expected as a result of the implementation of the recommended guidelines.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL IMPLICATIONS:

The guidelines were developed in collaboration with Community Development and will be incorporated into existing planning and development procedures. This report was reviewed and endorsed by the Major Projects Committee on February 23, 2016.
CORPORATE PLAN AND/OR POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The EVSE guidelines support the City’s goal of reducing community-wide greenhouse gas emissions by 15% below 2007 levels by 2020 and 50% below 2007 levels by 2050.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Julie Lowry, MRM (Pl.)
Environmental Sustainability Specialist
September 1, 2016

Caroline Jackson
Section Manager, Environmental Sustainability
City of North Vancouver
141 West 14th Street
North Vancouver, BC V7M 1H9

Dear Ms. Jackson:

RE: Proposed Guidelines for Electric Vehicle Equipment for New Multi-Family/Mixed-Use Development

Thank you for contacting the Urban Development Institute (UDI) regarding the City of North Vancouver’s proposed Rezoning Guidelines for Electric Vehicle (EV) Equipment for new multi-family and mixed-use projects. UDI supports the City’s efforts to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and we recognize the benefits of electric vehicles.

We have also been in discussions with BC Hydro, the Condominium Home Owners Association (CHOA) and other municipalities about the implementation of EV equipment in new buildings. UDI believes that several outstanding issues (outlined below) need to be resolved as local governments move forward with EV charging By-laws.

However, the steps proposed in your Rezoning Guidelines are reasonable – especially since as guidelines there will be some flexibility in their implementation. We believe the industry can accommodate in most projects having:

- "20% of all residential parking spaces include an electrical outlet, a receptacle or electric vehicle supply equipment, and are supplied by a branch circuit rated not less than 40 A at the nominal voltage of 208 V or 240 V as applicable;"

- Adequate space in the electrical room or electrical vault to support future electric vehicle charging for the remaining 80% of parking spaces.”

The City may wish to explore allowing the option for developers to split connections between stalls (if electrical load management technology would be employed). The City’s objective of having an electrical outlet available in 20% of parking stalls in new buildings would still be achieved. At the same time, this approach could potentially reduce the amount of electrical infrastructure our members would need to install inside and outside of buildings (although more discussion is needed with electrical inspectors, B.C. Hydro, the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of British Columbia, and the B.C. Safety Authority).
As noted above, there are still numerous issues that need to be resolved before local governments take further steps than what the City of North Vancouver is proposing. They include:

- Electric vehicle charging equipment costs can be quite high – especially for charging above level one;
- Part of the cost increase is due to how loads are calculated under the Canadian Electrical Code, as frequently, it is assumed that each charging station will be used 100% of the time, so projects can surpass thresholds beyond which the hydro infrastructure servicing requirements will then need to be substantially increased;
- There is an unfairness with current B.C. Hydro policies because people who live in multi-family buildings have to pay for additional electrical infrastructure to accommodate EV charging, while those living in single family homes do not;
- If a municipality’s minimum parking standards are quite high, EV infrastructure costs will further increase – unless local governments consider caps in these cases;
- It has not been decided how energy efficiency benchmarks in future updates to the Building Code and “stretch codes” will take into account electricity charging for EVs, which may lead to these standards being more difficult to meet;
- It is also not clear whether homeowners or stratas will be pushed into higher hydro rate classes because of electric vehicle charging;
- There is no clearly established way for developers or stratas to pass capital or electricity costs onto those plugging in their cars;
- As a result, some stratas may disconnect the EV chargers; and
- It is difficult to change parking spaces in stratas, so a person with an electric vehicle, may not be able to connect to a charging station.

We believe progress is being made in resolving these issue through industry discussions with BC Hydro, municipalities, CHOA and others, and we hope that clearly established solutions will be in place soon.

In the meantime we are supportive of the proposal by City of North Vancouver staff, and look forward to working with them and others to further improve EV charging opportunities across the region.

Yours sincerely,

Anne McMullin
President and CEO
STANDARDS FOR SHADOW STUDIES

August 2011
STANDARDS FOR SHADOW STUDIES

Shadow Studies illustrate the impact of development in terms of sun and daylight access to the surrounding context including surrounding buildings, the public realm, public and private open space.

Shadow Studies may be required in support of development applications to demonstrate that the location and height of a proposed building if greater than 10.7m, will not cause undue shade on the subject lands, and on surrounding context including building facades, private and public outdoor amenity and open spaces, public parkland, sidewalks and other components of the public realm.

Shadow Studies and Analyses will be conducted for the following dates:

- **June 21**
- **September 21** (similar to March 21, and therefore, criteria for Sept. 21 are deemed to apply to March 21)
- **December 21**

At the following times:

- **Solar Noon (SN)**
- **Hourly intervals before and after Solar Noon (SN), up to and including 1.5 hours after sunrise and 1.5 hours before sunset**

**Hourly solar data are specified for each date**

See Tables 2, 3 and 4: Mississauga Sun Angle Data

Sun Angles:
Sun Angles are based on the latitude and longitude of the Mississauga Civic Centre at 300 City Centre Drive, Mississauga ON L5B 3C1

- **Latitude:** 43 deg. 35' 20" N
- **Longitude:** 79 deg. 38' 40" W

**Time Zone:** Eastern  
**Standard Time:** UT - 5 hours  
**Daylight Time:** UT - 4 hours  
**UT** denotes Universal Time i.e. Greenwich Mean Time

Shadow Length (SL) = Building Height (H) x Shadow Length Factor (SLF). See Fig. 1
Ensure Adequate sunlight on the following:

1. Residential Private Outdoor Amenity Spaces

To maximise the use of private residential amenity spaces during spring, summer and fall, shadow impacts from proposed developments should not exceed one hour in duration on areas such as private rear yards, decks, patios and pools of surrounding residential dwellings on each of the following dates:

- June 21
- September 21 (Mar. 21 shadow patterns are similar but occur 14 minutes later)

This criterion is met if there is shadow impact for no more than two consecutive hourly test times within the space between the exterior wall of the dwelling that abuts the amenity space and the line of impact assessment (“No Impact Zone”).

The line of impact assessment shall be, a line 7.5m minimum from the rear wall or other appropriate exterior building wall of the dwelling that abuts the private amenity space. See Fig. 2 and 3.

New shadows shall not result in less than 2 hours of direct sunlight. Where less than 2 hours of sunlight already exists within the “No Impact Zone”, no new shade may be added.

Balconies are not considered “residential private outdoor amenity spaces” unless they are the only outdoor living area available to the dwelling unit, are unenclosed, and project 4m or more from the exterior wall of the building.
Ensure Adequate sunlight on the following:

2. Communal outdoor amenity areas including, children’s play areas, school yards, tot lots, and park features such as sandboxes, wading pools etc., and outdoor amenity areas used by seniors and those associated with commercial and employment areas during spring, summer, fall and winter.

Shadows from proposed developments should allow for full sun on the above places at least half the time, or 50% sunlight coverage all the time, on each of the following dates:

- June 21
- September 21
- December 21

This criterion is met if the “sun access factor” is at least 50% or 0.5 on each of the test dates ($A_{S(ave)}/A_T = 0.5$ or more)

See 2a for Calculation of Sun Access Factor

This criterion applies to public amenity areas and common outdoor amenity areas that are part of a proposed or existing development.

2a) Calculating Sun Access Factor:

- Measure the total Area ($A_T$) of the space or feature
- Measure the area in sunshine ($A_S$) for each of the test times from 1.5 hours after sunrise to 1.5 hours before sunset both inclusive
- Find the average of the $A_S$ values ($A_{S(ave)}$)
- Sun Access Factor = $A_{S(ave)}/A_T$

3. Public realm including sidewalks, open spaces, parks and plazas to maximize their use during the shoulder seasons (spring and fall)

a) Low and Medium Density Residential streets

Developments should be designed to allow full sunlight on the opposite boulevard including the full width of the sidewalk on September 21 as follows:

For a total of at least 4 hours between 9:12 a.m. and 11:12 a.m. and between 3:12 p.m. and 5:12 p.m.

This criterion is met if there is no incremental shade from the proposed development at 9:12 a.m., 10:12 a.m., and 11:12 a.m., and at 3:12 p.m., 4:12 p.m. and 5:12 p.m.

See Fig. 4, 5, 6 and Table 1.
b) **Mixed Use, Commercial, Employment and High Density Residential streets**

Developments should be designed to allow full sunlight on the opposite boulevard including the full width of the sidewalk on September 21 as follows:

For a total of at least 5 hours that must include the 2 hour period between 12:12 p.m. and 2:12 p.m., and an additional 2 hour period from either 9:12 a.m. to 11:12 a.m. or from 3:12 p.m. to 5:12 p.m.

This criterion is met if there is no incremental shade from the proposed development at 12:12 p.m., 1:12 p.m. and 2:12 p.m. and three consecutive times either 9:12 a.m., 10:12 a.m. and 11:12 a.m. or 3:12 p.m., 4:12 p.m. and 5:12 p.m.

See Fig. 4, 5, 6 and Table 1 for angular planes that will achieve this criterion for Hurontario Street, Eglinton Avenue and streets with a similar alignment.

c) **Public Open Spaces, parks and Plazas**

Developments should be designed to provide a sun access factor of at least 50% on public open spaces, parks and plazas on September 21.

See 2a for calculating Sun Access Factor

Please note the following:

- **Solar Noon in Mississauga on September 21 is 1:12 p.m.**
- **Shadow Patterns for September 21 and March 21 are similar**
- **Criteria for September 21 are deemed to apply to March 21**

---

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eglinton Avenue</th>
<th>Criterion 3a Low and Medium Density Residential Streets</th>
<th>Criterion 3b Mixed use, Commercial, Employment and High Density Residential Streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Angular Plane</td>
<td>Maximum Angular Plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed building on north side of Eglinton Ave.</td>
<td>38.6 degrees</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed building on south side of Eglinton Ave.</td>
<td>22.7 degrees</td>
<td>48.9 degrees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hurontario Street</th>
<th>Proposed building on west side of Hurontario Street</th>
<th>Proposed building on east side of Hurontario Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.4 degrees</td>
<td>47.4 degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.6 degrees</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

1. Angular planes given above apply to the alignment of Eglinton Avenue and Hurontario Street and streets with equivalent orientation.
2. Angular planes are measured from the closest edge of the opposite curb (see Fig.5).
3. Angular planes are measured beginning at grade.
4. Angular planes are measured perpendicular to the street.
5. See Figures 4, 5, 6 for graphical representations of the angular plane limits.
FIG. 4: MAX. ALLOWABLE ANG. PLANES TO PROTECT OPPOSITE BOULEVARDS AND SIDEWALKS

Criterion 3a
low and medium density residential streets

Criterion 3b
mixed use, commercial, employment and high density residential areas with pedestrian traffic

FIG. 5: EGLINTON AVENUE

Criterion 3a
low and medium density residential streets

Criterion 3b
mixed use, commercial, employment and high density residential areas with pedestrian traffic

FIG. 6: HURONTARIO STREET
Ensure Adequate sunlight on the following:

4. Turf and flower gardens in public parks

Proposed developments should allow for adequate sunlight during the growing season from March to October by allowing for a minimum of 6 hours of direct sunlight on September 21.

This criterion is met if full sun is provided on any 7 test times on September 21, from 1.5 hours after sunrise to 1.5 hours before sunset.

5. Building faces to allow for the possibility of using solar energy

Shadow impacts from proposed developments should not exceed one hour in duration on the roofs, front, rear and exterior side walls of adjacent low rise (one to four storeys) residential buildings including townhouses, detached and semi-detached dwellings on September 21.

The line of impact assessment shall be a line at grade, 3m from the front, rear and exterior side wall of the adjacent low rise residential building.

This criterion is met if there is shadow impact for no more than two consecutive hourly test times in the “No Impact Zone” i.e. the space between the front, rear and exterior side walls of the adjacent low-rise residential buildings and the respective lines of impact assessment.

See Fig. 7 and 8

Incremental shadows do not necessarily represent adverse or undue impacts, and each proposal will be assessed on its own merits.
Material to be submitted with Development Application:

1. Complete set of shadow drawings for the dates and times shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4: Mississauga Sun Angle data, from 1.5 hours after sunrise to 1.5 hours before sunset

2. Base mapping must include a minimum coverage area as follows:
   a) 4.0 times the building height to the north, east and west
   b) 1.5 times the building height to the south

3. Shadow drawings may be based on 2D mapping or air photos showing shadows from only the proposal, or they may be based on 3D mapping and include shadows from the proposed building and all buildings within the coverage area.

4. Shadow drawings shall include the following:
   a) North Arrow and scale bar
   b) Reference bearing for at least one street adjacent to the subject site
   c) A scale suitable to show the entire shadow coverage area
   d) Existing and incremental shadows differentiated by hatching or colour
   e) Approved but not yet constructed buildings identified in contrasting colour.
   f) The name of the individual who has prepared the shadow drawings

5. Shadow drawings must be submitted with a written analysis which shall include the following information:
   a) Confirmation of site latitude and longitude used in shadow drawings
   b) A statement describing how astronomic north was determined
   c) Origin/source of base plan
   d) Description of all locations/uses of areas not meeting the shadow impact criteria (include a key plan for reference)
   e) Quantification and assessment of the impact in the areas listed in 5(d)
   f) Summary outlining how the shadow impact criteria have been met and describing any mitigating features that have been incorporated into the site and building design

6. The shadow drawings and reports shall be prepared by individuals qualified and/or experienced in this field.

Additional study times and analyses may be required to properly determine the degree of impact.

The intent and objectives of the Standards For Shadow Studies are as interpreted by the Development and Design Division of the Planning and Building Department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE: JUNE 21</th>
<th>Az (deg)</th>
<th>SLF (ratio length/height)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TIME EDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:37</td>
<td>235.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:07</td>
<td>250.48</td>
<td>4.1230</td>
<td>Rise + 1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>252.58</td>
<td>3.5045</td>
<td>SN - 6 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>262.02</td>
<td>2.0048</td>
<td>SN - 5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>272.04</td>
<td>1.3106</td>
<td>SN - 4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>283.79</td>
<td>0.8976</td>
<td>SN - 3 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>299.52</td>
<td>0.6203</td>
<td>SN - 2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>323.67</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
<td>SN - 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.3670</td>
<td>Solar Noon (SN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20</td>
<td>36.32</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
<td>SN + 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>60.47</td>
<td>0.6203</td>
<td>SN + 2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:20</td>
<td>76.21</td>
<td>0.8975</td>
<td>SN + 3 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:20</td>
<td>87.96</td>
<td>1.3105</td>
<td>SN + 4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:20</td>
<td>97.98</td>
<td>2.0047</td>
<td>SN + 5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:20</td>
<td>107.42</td>
<td>3.5042</td>
<td>SN + 6 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:33</td>
<td>109.41</td>
<td>4.0852</td>
<td>Set - 1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:03</td>
<td>124.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TIME EDT</td>
<td>Az (deg)</td>
<td>SLF</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:05</td>
<td>268.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35</td>
<td>284.22</td>
<td>3.6329</td>
<td>Rise + 1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:12</td>
<td>291.23</td>
<td>2.5132</td>
<td>SN - 4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>304.14</td>
<td>1.6445</td>
<td>SN - 3 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12</td>
<td>319.68</td>
<td>1.2181</td>
<td>SN - 2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:12</td>
<td>338.54</td>
<td>1.0011</td>
<td>SN - 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9329</td>
<td>Solar Noon (SN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:12</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>1.0022</td>
<td>SN + 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>40.28</td>
<td>1.2205</td>
<td>SN + 2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:12</td>
<td>55.79</td>
<td>1.6495</td>
<td>SN + 3 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:12</td>
<td>68.68</td>
<td>2.5255</td>
<td>SN + 4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:48</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>3.6493</td>
<td>Set - 1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:18</td>
<td>91.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TIME EST</td>
<td>SHADOW DIRECTION AND LENGTH</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:49</td>
<td>302.37</td>
<td>Rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:19</td>
<td>319.05</td>
<td>Rise + 1.5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:17</td>
<td>331.25</td>
<td>SN -2 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:17</td>
<td>345.21</td>
<td>SN -1 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Solar Noon (SN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>SN + 1 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:17</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>SN + 2 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>41.06</td>
<td>Set - 1.5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>57.63</td>
<td>Set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attn: Municipal Clerk

I am in favour of redevelopment of the property.

However, I would like to provide input that there be sufficient parking for the living & business units.

I have lived across the busy Mount Seymour Parkway from the prior development for over 30 years.

The prior Seymour Estates appeared to have reasonably large parking lots. Yet our neighborhood, across a busy street experienced many vehicles parked along the streets near our house with the occupants/ drivers returning to & from the prior Seymour Estates.

I realize Council has had a goal of less parking/ vehicles and a more green experience and I share that goal, but not to the extent that surrounding streets are clogged with vehicles from blocks away.

Please ensure there is sufficient parking at the new development.

Steven Breakingbury
North Vancouver
Dear Council and Staff,

Please add this submission to the binder for Seymour Estates 900 block Lytton Street.

I will referring to it during my comments before you,

Peter Teevan

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [redacted]
Date: November 17, 2020 at 10:51:48 AM PST
To: Peter Teevan
Subject: Seymour estates public hearing.pptx
SEYMOUR ESTATES

Public Hearing Input – November 18th 2020

Peter Teevan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Max Allowed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>25,339.80 Sq M</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>RM3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205,052.00</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273,425.00 Sq F</td>
<td>205,052.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>273,425.00 Sq F</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>355,715.53</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>90,667.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Rent to Own</td>
<td>16,000.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>127,639.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>47,262.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Market Rent</td>
<td>44,643.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Sub Market Rent</td>
<td>29,505.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purchase Total**: 265,568.0

**Increase (decrease) over former**: 60,516.0

**Other Total**: 90,147.5

MY ANALYSIS AFTER SPEAKING WITH MR. VERES
### Seymour Estates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Max Allowed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,339.80 Sq Metres</td>
<td>RM3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205,052.00</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273,425.00 Sq Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273,425.00 Sq Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>355,715.53</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(new)</td>
<td>90,667.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent to Own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127,639.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,262.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,643.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,505.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(new)</td>
<td>265,568.0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) over former</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,516.0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,147.5</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avg Unit 1800 sq ft**

**PLAN B: IF WE SAY “NO” – REPLACE WHAT WAS THERE**
## Seymour Estates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Max Allowed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,339.80</td>
<td>RM3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205,052.00</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>355,715.53</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site 1         | Purchase | 90,667.0 | 94   |
| Site 1         | Rent to Own | 16,000.0 | 25   |
| Site 2         | Purchase | 127,639.0 | 102  |
| Site 3         | Purchase | 47,262.0 | 31   |
| Site 4         | Market Rent | 44,643.0 | 56   |
| Site 4         | Sub Market Rent | 29,505.0 | 33   |

| Purchase Total | 265,568.0 | 227   | 99.1% |
| Increase (decrease) over former | 60,516.0 | 113   | 30%   |
| Other Total    | 90,147.5  | 227   |

**How Much More Are They Asking For?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Purchase</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Max Allowed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,339.80 Sq Metres</td>
<td>RM3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>273,425.00 Sq Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205,052.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>273,425.00 Sq Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>355,715.53</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Rent to Own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127,639.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,262.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,643.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Sub Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,505.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>265,568.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) over former</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,516.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,147.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE GREEN: WHAT WE WANT MORE OF IN DNV**
There is the "Deal"
PLAN “A” VS PLAN “B”

Plan A – Approve the proposal.

Plan B – Anthem Replaces what was there.

If there is a Plan C, D or E – please tell us?

This Public Hearing only has Plan A or B as options...

Shouldn’t Public Input be on all possibilities?

Making this about Plan A vs Plan B is kind of like a “zoning game of chicken”.
Why do we need to allow this?

• Simple answer: because rentals are 70% less profitable than market purchase to build.

• In a scenario where builders markup is 15%:
  • Markup represents 13% of market value.
  • GST self assessment is 5% on market value
  • Provincial Property Transfer Tax is 4.3% on market value
  • $9.3\% \div 13\% = 71.5\% = \text{lost profit}.$

WHY DO WE NEED DENSITY TO GET RENTALS?
Reactions of the Seymour Community Association:

- We like the styling.
- We don’t think the Maplewood LAP should apply here on the border between Blueridge and Seymour.
- We wish it could be less dense.
- We think the future residents would like centre-oriented layout.
- Could someone please do something about the Ironworkers Bridge?
If we deny, and Anthem chooses to replace, what happens with the sidewalk?

AMENITIES: SAFE ROUTE TO WINDSOR SCHOOL
Why do I care about this? (Community Shuttle)

• In my view, the future of Transit across the North Shore looks like this:

AMENITIES: ON DEMAND COMMUNITY SHUTTLE
Hello Mayor and Council,

I live on [redacted]. The live stream feed went down at 8:45 pm.

From the presentation I understand that there was a detailed traffic study on the development; however, the results of the study were not presented. What are the primary pedestrian safety risks this development presents?

My daughter attends [redacted] and plays for the [redacted]. From our experience, Lytton St is extremely busy and increased traffic could add to an already sketchy Pedestrian Safety concern.

The development appears to be well thought out; however, the district must consider public safety as primary above all other check boxes. My question is “Does the increased traffic create unacceptable risks to pedestrians along Lytton even with the proposed improvements?” That question was not answered nor safety was discussed in the presentations. When making a decision, it is our duty first to ensure the safety of the Windsor students, Seymour Dance students, young women from the North Shore Girls Soccer Club, pedestrians who access Ron Andrews, people with special needs and end users of the development are considered paramount. Safety is a concern both during and after construction. Just think about the amount of tandem dump trucks on Lytton while students are walking to school, many of them wearing earbuds and playing loud music and looking at their phones.

I’m supportive of the development if pedestrian safety has been addressed and reviewed in detail and approved by district engineers. If safety remains a concern, then increased improvements along Lytton St or a secondary access to the development should be considered. (Emerson St. extension or Broadway access).

I hope my input is helpful in your decision process and potentially improving the development.

Feel free to call me if you would like clarifications or to discuss my comments further.

Yours truly,

John R Taylor, PEng, CSAP
Evening.

Firstly, I want to acknowledge the Coast Sallish People, before I share words to and about their unceded land. To both the squamish and T'seilwatuuth I see and feel your presence over the land here in "North Vancouver" and for that I am honoured to share tonight.

I am registered to speak in the #40 spot this evening, but am having some tech. concerns at the moment, but wanted to ensure my voice and support for all affordable housing initiatives and creative ways to enter the real estate market be supported. As we (DNV) continue to move forward with the lack of affordable housing, not just rent, but for people looking to purchase "homes" is causing the loss of hard-working, educated and community minded people. As a result... the retention and recruitment of qualified staff will continue to plague our communities. I want to publicly support flexible/creative barrier removal, for people choosing/hoping to stay in the DNV- an example of this is the Anthem property project on the Park-Way. I do not understand nor would I be qualified to speak to all the unique pieces of this project, but I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the developer's vision to provide entry and access to members of our community supporting a few members who can afford the high mortgage cost, pay our taxes, but maybe not privileged to be in a place where 75,000-200,000 down payments are readily available.

I would like to volunteer to sit on any working groups or discussion panels to help projects like the Athem property development move forward.
Hello,

I am writing to express my support for Bylaw 8423.

My wife and I (currently in our early 30s) just moved into the neighbourhood, only two blocks away from the proposed development. We moved into a single-family home — the only reason we were able to do this was because we bought this house with my mom, creating a multi-generational home.

People in my age group, including those like myself who grew up in North Vancouver, cannot afford to live here unless they are lucky/privileged or get help (and oftentimes, both). Many people are not so lucky/privileged to get help like my wife and me.

I hope that the council moves forward with passing Bylaw 8423 so that other young families, couples, and individuals may have similar opportunities to build a life in this community.

Thank you,
Tae

Taehoon Kim
Hi my name is kellan hardisty. I would like to show my support in favor for the project. having been born and raised in north vancouver for over 30+ years i think this project would be a great fit for me to potentially get a foot in the door of being able to afford my own place in my community. i went to windsor secondary which is just behind the proposed project. and think it would be a great fit/ opportunity for the area. thanks
Additional comments with respect to the hearing and proposal.

Speak in favour of the proposal

Initially my interest in the development was partially to be aware of and interest in sufficient parking spots. The main reason was that I live essentially 2 blocks away, across the street and we did experience residents of the former Seymour estates parking on our neighborhood streets.

After watching the presentation I was so excited by all the positive aspects that I wanted to ensure I speak in favour of the proposal.

I am in favour of the wide variety of options for residents including rent to own, town houses, market and non-market rental units. I recognize that density increases often result in making transit options and business operations more viable and am in favour of the increase in living units.

I am impressed by the variety of transportation options including car share, e-bike share, parking and access to transit. I also appreciate the subsidy & encouragement in the proposal.

For perspective, I have lived in the area for over 30 years after living in downtown Vancouver blocks from work. After moving to Blueridge, I biked to work once or twice a week through the more pleasant seasons for 10 to 15 years alternating this with transit until the last few years where work from home became available. Several years ago, I investigated car share as we occasionally needed a second car but found that they stopped near Phibbs other than small area for Capilano University.

I recognize some options are intended for residents of the new complex, but hope the car share is or becomes available to other Blueridge residents in the area.

I did note the decrease in parking allocation (from 575 to 552?) with a bit of concern, but given all the EV, e-bike, car share and transit options and the trend especially but younger families & couples to be car free, I want to note that I am still in favour of the proposal.

Thank you

Steven Breakingbury
On Tuesday, November 17, 2020, 06:55:27 p.m. PST, Steven breakingbury wrote:

Attn: Municipal Clerk

I am in favour of redevelopment of the property.

However, I would like to provide input that there be sufficient parking for the living & business units.

I have lived across the busy Mount Seymour Parkway from the prior development for over 30 years.

The prior Seymour Estates appeared to have reasonably large parking lots. Yet our neighborhood, across a busy street experienced many vehicles parked along the streets near our house with the occupants/ drivers returning to & from the prior Seymour Estates.

I realize Council has had a goal of less parking/ vehicles and a more green experience and I share that goal, but not to the extent that surrounding streets are clogged with vehicles from blocks away.

Please ensure there is sufficient parking at the new development.

Steven Breakingbury
North Vancouver
From: Jason Sperger
To: DNV Input
Subject: Seymour Estates Support Letter
Date: November 17, 2020 8:49:48 PM
Attachments: Seymour Estates Jason Sperger & Jerusha Dunsmore.docx
Dear Mayor Little + Members of Council,

We hope to see the proposal for Seymour Estates (904-944 Lytton Street) move forward. This project is a good opportunity to build new homes without displacing anyone in a low rise building form that will fit in and complement the surrounding area. The townhouses that used to be there were getting very old. We’re pleased to hear that they will be replaced, and that the plan for renewal envisions a diverse range of housing, not just large, luxury townhomes.

Another excellent part of the development is the proposed coffee shop. Right now, options in the neighbourhood to go for some coffee or a pastry are extremely limited. It will be nice to have somewhere folks can walk down to on the weekends or on their way to work in the mornings. Neighbourhood shops like that are one of the best ways to bring life to a neighbourhood.

We hope that you will support this development when it comes before you for a Public Hearing next week.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Jason Sperger & Jerusha Dunsmore
I have been a resident of North Vancouver for all of my 62 years residing at for the past 30 years. Our overlooks the northeast corner of the site.

I respect the efforts that Anthem has taken to make this densification project as community friendly as possible. They have been responsive to public input. What I am unclear about from the plan is the status of the mature trees on the property. It appears that the units facing Mt seymour Parkway are 3 story units. I sincerely hope that the trees that have provided a visual break to the buildings and have been there since 1969 will be kept. I don’t want to have to wait 50 years to have replacements grow sufficiently to provide the coverage of the current trees.

Although I am not happy about the densification of North Vancouver, I do also understand that none of my adult children will be able to afford to live here on their own unless the housing market changes. I think this project meets the needs to diversify the housing stock in North Vancouver and would recommend approving it.

Thank you,
Doug Querns
Hello,

I am writing to voice my support for the Seymour Estates project as I realize the November 17th Public Hearing has come and passed. Having been raised in the area by a single mom who rented property and still does, it is crucial for me to support situations that allow for 'rent to town' and enable people with significant barriers to enter the real estate market.

Beyond this, projects like these offer young professionals like myself to continue living in the area I was raised.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeremy Harrison
Dear Mayor Little,

We would like to share our support in writing for the proposal to renew the Seymour Estates site on Lytton Street.

We’ve been residents of North Van District for several years and have chosen to raise our kids in this community. As parents, we think it’s extremely important to start building more diverse housing options - like condos, apartments and townhomes - so that our children will be able to stay in their community when it’s time for them to live independently.

It’s becoming increasingly difficult for those who live/work in North Van to find homes that are (relatively) affordable, secure, and large enough to accommodate families with children. This proposal offers a range of family-oriented housing options, including a number of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom homes for sale and for rent. I understand that the vacancy rate for 3 bedroom units is North Van is below 1%, so it’s clear that this project is responding to a critical need.

We are currently experiencing a housing crisis throughout the Lower Mainland, and we are happy to offer our support to projects like this one, which offers family-friendly housing options, a range of tenures at various price points, green space and a neighbourhood coffee shop. In form, this project will fit well with the existing neighbourhood character and context and is a much better alternative to the ageing townhomes that previously existed on the property.

We hope that this application will receive support from the Mayor and Council. Thank you for considering our comments.

Best regards,
Tom Dubowski & Nina Albrecht
North Vancouver, BC
Good morning,

I am emailing to submit my document which I was supposed to speak/present at last Tuesday's council hearing with Mayor Mike Little which was adjourned for a later date due to live streaming issues.

Please find attached my testimonial, in which I would like to present on behalf of Habitat for Humanity of Greater Vancouver.

Thank you for your time.
My name is Rowena and I am a Habitat for Humanity Greater Vancouver family living in our new Habitat Home in Richmond. I am speaking today to support the Anthem development at Seymour Estates and here is why.

Living in our Habitat for Humanity home has been a tremendous blessing for us.

Before moving here a year and a half ago, we were living in a small, one bedroom apartment, full of cockroaches and mice. My son got the bedroom and I slept in the living room. My car had been broken into a few times over the years in the basement garage. Year after year, the rent was increasing, meaning that I could not plan financially for our future.

These were all contributing factors to my stress as a single mom. I found it very challenging to anticipate ever breaking this sub-standard rental cycle or finding a home that was adequate for our basic needs.

But all that disappeared when we moved into our Habitat for Humanity home a year and a half ago.

The benefits we have experienced since moving here were definitely the warm feeling of community and safety. My son learned how to finally ride a bike here last summer. I learned how to grow our own vegetables right in our backyard. And, despite the current times, we had been able to invite our friends and families over.

Additionally, through the Habitat model, I pay a fixed amount of 30% of my income towards my home and with each payment I am building equity with Habitat that will allow me to eventually own a home in the open market with part of the monthly payments that I make. I can plan for the future of my son and myself and know that we are financially stable and self reliant in a home that is safe and healthy.

These are all experiences that one hopes to provide for our children, however the current housing crisis in Vancouver and lack of decent, affordable rentals and models that allow for eventual home ownership are few and waitlists are long.

I strongly encourage you to support this proposed development that will see numerous families in the Habitat home proposed and have their lives changed as mine has been. Having affordable rentals and rent to own options all within this development is fantastic and will mean a healthy mix of households living in the new community.

Over 300 families will feel as we do.

We are so grateful to finally live in a beautiful place we can finally call HOME.

Thank You.
Hello,

My name is Mackenzie Forge and I live at [redacted]. I received a letter in the mail today from a neighbour, providing information on Anthem’s proposed project at the above referenced address. This neighbour detailed all the potential negative impacts to our community and asked that we submit a letter council fighting this development.

I, however, am emailing to provide my SUPPORT of this development by Anthem Properties. I love the neighborhood we live in, but I understand the importance of residential development, densification, and providing alternative and more affordable housing options in the area to the existing single family homes. I understand there will be a commercial component to this development, which I strongly believe will benefit this neighborhood. This is an exciting development for this community! We haven’t seen anything like it in lower Blueridge in as long as I can remember, and we need to embrace this!

If there is anything further I can do to show my support, please let me know.

Kind regards,

Mackenzie (Leyland) Forge
I live on [redacted] and I am very concerned about the proposed development on Lytton, very close to my street. We simply do not have the infrastructure to be able to handle having so many more people living in this neighbourhood. Mt Seymour Parkway already suffers from congestion during rush hour, and also on weekends due to the millions of people going to Mt Seymour and Deep Cove. I hope you will take this into consideration. A development like this would greatly impact my wonderful neighbourhood and make our lives miserable! It must be much smaller.

Thank you,

Karen
Dear Mayor and Council,

My name is David Coles and I am writing this letter in support of the housing proposal at 904-944 Lytton Street in North Vancouver.

I grew up on the North Shore and left from 1999-2005 to live in NYC and Toronto to pursue my work as an artist. I recently returned home to North Vancouver and am currently living in a basement suite with my family at [redacted]. I hope to purchase a home for my family on the North Shore but haven’t had much luck getting into the market. I would love to own a home in the neighbourhood where I grew up.

I would like to lend my support to the housing application that Anthem has proposed for their site and Lytton Street and Mt Seymour Parkway; I think this project will help families on the North Shore - like mine - to access a variety of family oriented homes, includes options for rent to own homes and secured rental. I think the mix of housing types, coffee shop and shared amenities in this development will foster a vibrant, community feel.

I’m sure my story is not unique, and I hope that Council will use their power to help people like me to return and re-settle our families here on the North Shore by enabling the development of better housing options for people at different income levels.

Thank you,
David Coles
North Vancouver
Dear Mayor and Council,

A member of Council has requested that staff comment on the recommended mitigations (attached) from the traffic study of Anthem/Seymour Estates and if the recommendations are being considered/planned/paid for by Anthem. Staff have provided the following response.

The Development Engineering team has worked closely with Anthem on their 904-944 Lytton St application to set appropriate transportation system upgrades that will ensure the development impacts are mitigated. Please note that staff require developers to produce traffic studies to review a range of transportation concerns relating to a project, but the studies themselves do not necessarily describe works that will be provided.

It should be noted that the extract (attached) is not from the latest traffic study. The latest traffic study, dated Oct 30, 2020, can be found on page 201 of the public hearing binder, which is available on the “Council minutes, agendas, and notices” webpage at the following link:

Below are the staff comments (in blue font) on each point in Section 6.2.7 of the traffic study (previously Section 6.2.5):

**6.2.7 Summary of traffic impacts & recommended mitigations**

- **Unsignalized Intersections**
  - The unsignalized intersections will continue to operate at acceptable levels with minimum queues and delays for all the future horizon years for both Background and Total scenarios. **Considered acceptable.**
  - No mitigation measures or improvements will be necessary for these unsignalized intersections. **Considered acceptable.**

- **Berkley Road / Mt. Seymour Parkway**
  - Recommend that the southbound right turn lane be lengthened from 50m to 90m to accommodate the projected future traffic growth and development. The extra storage for both southbound right and left turn lanes are identified to manage general traffic growth and are not considered necessary to mitigate additional traffic from Anthem’s project. As
such, there is currently no plan to implement these changes.

- Recommend southbound left turn lane needs to be increased to 25m. See above.
- Signal timing coordination and optimization of signal timing plans may be required to improve v/c and LOS performance. This is considered an operational item and will be implemented by the DNV’s Traffic Operations staff as part of their day-to-day work.

**Lytton Street / Mt. Seymour Parkway**

- Recommend implementing a protected-permissive phase for the westbound left turn movement to accommodate projected future traffic growth and development in 2030. This is considered an operational item and will be implemented by the DNV’s Traffic Operations staff as part of their day-to-day work.
- Recommend the westbound left turn be extended to 50m to accommodate the future queuing for this movement. This will be implemented by Anthem at Anthem’s costs. The traffic signal will also be updated, at Anthems’ cost.
- Recommend a separate left turn lane (with storage of 35-40m) and shared through-right lane for the south approach. This will be implemented by Anthem at Anthem’s costs.
- Recommend a separate left turn lane (with storage of 15m) and a shared through-right lane for the north approach. This will be implemented by Anthem at Anthem’s costs.
- Recommend signal optimization of the splits. This is considered an operational item and will be implemented by the DNV’s Traffic Operations staff as part of their day-to-day work.

**Emerson Way / Mt. Seymour Parkway**

- Recommend the southbound left turn storage length be increased to 25m to accommodate the future demand. The extra storage for the southbound left-turn lane is identified to manage general traffic growth and is not considered necessary to mitigate additional traffic from Anthem’s project. As such, there is currently no plan to implement this item.
- Recommend signal optimization of the splits. This is considered an operational item and will be implemented by the DNV’s Traffic Operations staff as part of their day-to-day work.

**Broadview Drive / Mt. Seymour Parkway**

- Recommend the signal timing optimization of splits. This is considered an operational item and will be implemented by the DNV’s Traffic Operations staff as part of their day-to-day work.

Kind Regards,

**Adriana Reiher**  
*Council Liaison/Support Officer*

[District of North Vancouver logo]

355 West Queens Road  
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
reihera@dnv.org
D: 604-990-2204
C: 604-220-4156

Get the latest information on the District’s response to COVID-19 at DNV.org/COVID-19 or visit us on Twitter or Facebook at @NVanDistrict
Dear Mayor and Council,

A member of Council inquired whether on-site childcare was discussed with Anthem for their project at 904 - 944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates). Staff can provide the following response:

There are no community plan provisions or municipal policies specific to this site that would encourage a childcare facility as part of this development, so an on-site childcare was not discussed as part of this rezoning application.

Kind Regards,

Adriana Reiher
Council Liaison/Support Officer

355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
reihera@dnv.org
D: 604-990-2204
C: 604-220-4156
Hi there,

I have reviewed the plans proposed by Anthem Properties and I would like to know all the community amenity contributions that they will provide to the neighborhood for being granted so much additional density. There are many issues already in the community regarding traffic, limited child care, etc and I would like to know how this development will address the issues, instead of adding to it.

Please keep me informed of when the public hearing is.

Thanks,
Tanya
Dear Mayor and Council,

This email is to provide additional information in response to the Council inquiry below regarding child care at 904 – 944 Lytton Street.

At the November 23 workshop, staff presented the Draft Child Care Action Plan ("the Plan") to Council for feedback. The Plan identifies the Seymour neighbourhood as an area that is currently underserved for childcare spaces for infant/toddler, pre-school, and school-aged children. The draft and Plan appendices may be found at [https://www.dnv.org/programs-services/child-care-action-plan](https://www.dnv.org/programs-services/child-care-action-plan).

The Plan is scheduled for consideration at the December 7th Council meeting. If approved, the plan would set a 10-year framework for increasing access to child care and enhancing quality, affordability and partnerships. The Child Care Action Plan, together with the current Child Care Policy, recognize the need to prioritize the creation of new child care spaces in neighbourhoods with the greatest need. Key actions from the Child Care Action Plan that could help increase the provision of child care in higher need areas such as Seymour include:

- Supporting existing, and facilitating the creation of new non-profit and public child care sector spaces;
- Exploring opportunities to further leverage District-owned lands and facilities to support non-profit childcare;
- Continuing to work with partners to develop coordinated solutions to child care challenges (e.g., working with School District 44, NVRC, and others to facilitate child care); and,
- Lobbying senior governments for increased funding toward programs that lower costs, improve quality, and expand diversity of childcare options (e.g., support non-traditional hours of care).
As mentioned in the previous email, there are no community plan provisions or municipal policies specific to child care at 904 – 944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates).

However, the Maplewood Village Centre and Innovation District Implementation Plan and Design Guidelines identifies child care as an amenity and includes policy direction supporting the provision of child care services in the Village Centre. Maplewood Village Centre is located approximately 1.5 kilometers from the site.

Kind Regards,

Adriana Reiher

**Council Liaison/Support Officer**

From: Adriana Reiher  
Sent: December 02, 2020 8:40 AM 
To: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>  
Subject: Council Inquiry: Childcare at 904 - 944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates)

Dear Mayor and Council,

A member of Council inquired whether on-site childcare was discussed with Anthem for their project at 904 -944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates). Staff can provide the following response:

There are no community plan provisions or municipal policies specific to this site that would encourage a childcare facility as part of this development, so an on-site childcare was not discussed as part of this rezoning application.

Kind Regards,

**Adriana Reiher**  
**Council Liaison/Support Officer**

355 West Queens Road  
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5

reihera@dnv.org  
D: 604-990-2204  
C: 604-220-4156
Dear Sirs/Madams,

This letter is concerning the 904-944 Lytton Public Hearing that will discuss the proposed change to the zoning bylaw that will allow increase in occupancy of the current site. I reside [redacted] blocks away from this site at [redacted], and am entirely against this proposed change. Even with this property "unoccupied" for the time being, there is still a growing number of traffic concerns that affect our immediate surroundings. The originally proposed addition of 114 townhomes would have further affected this problem enough, but now with the change in proposal to increase that number to 341, you are looking at a theoretical increase of 300% in said would be problems/issues. Please consider the health of our small sub-urban community. Please don't let us become the Brentwood/Gilmore of Burnaby... relatively speaking of course. Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Lee
Hi there,

My name is Loksoon Lim, and I live in the neighborhood of Blueridge. I am writing this letter out of concern for the zoning bylaw meeting that will be happening on December 15 to increase the townhomes from 114 to 341. I understand for the developers this must be the best case to increase their profit. However, as residents of Blueridge, who chose to move to this neighborhood for the peaceful and not so overcrowded setting, this is couldn't be more worse. Already, there are townhomes being developed in Maplewood Farms area and along Mt Seymour Pkway near Parkgate. These developments stand to affect the density and traffic concerns we currently have negatively as is. Adding 114 townhomse will certainly add to this but if the zoning allows it then i suppose so be it. On the other hand, changing the bylaw just to accommodate the wants of the developers and increasing the affect by 300% seems like nothing other than pure greed. If they wish to build within the current bylaw then so be it, but don't change the law for the sake of maximizing the profit for the developers. Thank you sincerely,

Loksoon Lim.
To DNV Council,

We are strongly against the changing zoning bylaw, allowing triple occupancy on the new Seymour Estate Site, 904-944 Lytton St.

The current status of the traffic, the lack of infrastructure support like schools, recreational centers, areas for children's etc simply do not allow for such a dramatic increase of the population in this area.

The granting permit for the triple occupancy will be the continuation of the disastrous decision of the previous City Council allowing to build 30-floors apartment towers by the Second Narrow Bridge, just in the middle of the communication node.

Your Sincerely,

Anna Skalska, Eng, MSc, SC
Andrew Skalski, Eng, MSc, SSA

North Vancouver, BC
Dear Mayor and Council,

My name is Lacy Hawley and I’m writing to share my support for the Seymour Estates housing project. I was thrilled to hear it was moved forward to a Public Hearing in September, and I’m pleased to hear the public hearing is reconvening again too!

I’ve lived on the North Shore for several years now and am no stranger to the difficulties renters face when it comes to affordability and availability. This project looks ideal and would make a really wonderful long-term home for me and my family. I’d just like to add that I think the rent to own program associated with this project is phenomenal. I’ve not seen an opportunity like this before on the north shore and I think this will provide many first-time home buyers a real helping hand when it comes to affording a home in our City.

I really hope to see this project approved.

Thank you,
Lacy Hawley
Dear Mayor Little and members of Council,

My name is Zlatko Nisic and I live at [redacted] in Blueridge. I would like to take this opportunity to voice my concerns AGAINST the proposed bylaw zoning change for the Seymour Estates site owned by Anthem Properties at 904-944 Lytton St.

As a resident of this community, I believe that the tripling of occupancy on the site from 114 units to 341, and upwards of 900 residents, will have a very large, negative effect on the community. The inclusion of over 500 parking spaces will only make the existing traffic problems associated with Mt Seymour Parkway worsen. The increase of rush hour traffic at the Lytton light is anticipated to increase 600%; how is that good for my community?

The Seymour Estates site, while lovely, just cannot sustain that level of density or development. There are no jobs nearby, there is an inadequate supply of childcare spaces, and as every resident of Blueridge knows, cars are a necessity to complete the smallest of errands.

In conclusion, this development does not provide any added value to the liveability of my community. As a result of these negative impacts I must once again stress that I am unreservedly AGAINST this bylaw zoning change.

Sincerely,  
Zlatko Nisic  
Email Address: [redacted]

Sent from [Mail] for Windows 10
Hello,
I am a home owner and resident at [redacted] from the proposed development site of Seymour Estates.
I do not support the additional density plan! I am not interested in the additional traffic and congestion associated with this plan.
thx,
Mike Sherwood
Hello esteemed council,

I am North Vancouver born and bread. I have loved living here for many many years. Sadly due to the lack of affordable housing (rental OR buy). I have had to move over to Vancouver. I am a single female and I should to be able to own property in the city I grew up in. I plead with you that the Seymour Estate proposal is approved for those that wouldn’t have any other chance of affording to buy otherwise. Also, please allow dogs regardless of size and breed. I know smaller dogs that are more aggressive than bigger dogs. Maybe put in a better screening process for pet owners to allow that to happen. Meaning a letter from the vet or a character witness from a dog daycare. Breed has nothing to do with shitty dogs. Only shitty owners. I would love to move back into my old stomping grounds. I have faith that you will make the Seymour estates a reality.

Thank you for listening to my comments. I appreciate your time.

Denielle Griffiths
with you that this proposal is approved for those that wouldn’t have any other chance of affording to buy otherwise. Also, please allow dogs regardless of size and breed. I know smaller dogs that are more aggressive than bigger dogs. Maybe put in a better screening process for pet owners to allow that to happen. Meaning a letter from the vet or a character witness from a dog daycare. Breed has nothing to do with shitty dogs. Only shitty owners.

Thank you for listening to my comments. I appreciate your time.

Denielle Griffiths

Get Outlook for iOS
Dear Mayor, Little and DNV Council,

We are writing in support of the proposed redevelopment at 904-944 Lytton Street. The main reason we hope to see this redevelopment proposal go ahead is because of the rent to own program. I’m sure the rent to own homes will get filled up immediately, and for good reason.

Housing on the North Shore is very expensive, and it can be difficult to save up enough money for a down payment on a home. We are long term North Vancouver residents and hope to soon be homeowners. We have been keenly following this project and have registered our interest in the rent to own program. If we are one of the 25 families selected for the rent to own program, we will be able to soon realize our home ownership goal by applying two years of rent towards a down payment.

Me and my wife Emma are both working professionals and we still are struggling to save. Without this program, we may never be able to own a home, since more than half of our income is currently being allocated towards rent and utilities. Our situation is not unique – there are many people renting on the North Shore who would love to own, but saving a hefty down payment is not within reach.

Please approve this project.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Gary Campbell & Emma Patena

North Vancouver BC Canada

--

Gary J. Campbell
From: zamiha virjee
Sent: December 09, 2020 11:50 AM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>
Subject: Lytton Street development - density issue

Hello,

I am a resident at [redacted], near the proposed Lytton Street development site off Mt. Seymour Parkway. This letter is to raise my concern about increasing the density of this project from 114 to 341 residential units. I believe that an increase of this magnitude will cause too much congestion and jeopardize safety in the area.

I hereby request that the developer not increase the density of this residential project.

Please feel free to contact me if you would like further input or to discuss.

Thank you,

Zamiha Premji
Mayor and Council,

I am writing this email in support of the above noted application that is up for its continued public hearing.

I am a North Shore resident living at and have family that live in very close vicinity to the proposed development site.

I believe that Anthem has gone above and beyond with this application to ensure that they are providing an extremely well rounded project.

The application touches so many community focus requirements:

- **Rent to own housing** for the many people that want to reside on the North Shore that can’t afford housing and can use this as a means to enter the market.

- **promoting clean energy** to ensure that the environment is a focus for all residents

- Providing much needed **rental units** including **below market rental housing**

- Housing supported by:
  
  1. An excellent North shore based community services group **Hollyburn Family Services** who have a vision to **end social vulnerabilities**.
  2. **Habitat for Humanity** who are focused on building affordable housing and promoting homeownership as a means to **breaking the cycle of poverty**.

Looking around the Lower Mainland at other development applications, I can’t find one that ticks as many boxes as this project is proposing. I think it’s critical that this project receives council approval to set an example for not only North Vancouver but also other growing communities in the lower mainland.

Thank you,

McGregor Wark
Seymour Estates Development Concerns. 904-944 Lytton street.

1) Quarter of a billion-dollar development does not add to the quality of life of the neighbourhood; on the contrary, negatively affects it. Here are the main concerns:

2) Traffic Concerns:

a) based on the traffic assessment by BUNT, the Lytton corner will see traffic increase by 600% - from 30 cars per hour at peak to 185 cars per peak hour

b) 3 of the 4 lights assessed (Broadview, Emerson, Berkley) did not receive great ratings (C- grades) based on current conditions let alone the addition of the above mentioned increase; all lights require significant upgrades including timing and lengthening of turn/hold lanes — this means the centre boulevards will need to be shortened/reduced, thus reducing the green-space aesthetics of the neighbourhood

c) Increase of vehicle traffic to the 2" Narrows must be looked at based on all of the developments going on in this area of Seymour and Maplewood — Developments in Deep Cove plus 27 North on Seymour Parkway add 50 vehicles to the intersection. Darwin Properties is building 2 developments that will hold parking for nearly 700 vehicles; The North Shore Innovation District on a 45 acre site is also building 1100 homes plus various commercial/retail buildings. 2000 Homes are being added here without including Seymour Heights... nearly 2500 more cars will live in this area. If only 25% take the Narrows out that is over 600 more cars on the bridge; some reports state that 75% of the morning traffic on the 2nd Narrows flows out of the North Shore meaning that number could go up to 2000 more vehicles; PLUS the cars that go onto the highway deeper into the District or City of North Vancouver.

d) assessment did not include Browning which is a Stop sign only; those turning left from the south-side of the street will have to cross the median into the increased traffic making left turns extremely difficult if 185 more cars are driving through there at peak hours.

3) Issues which Contravene the Maplewood Town Centre Plan as presented under the Official City Plan:

a) The OCP and MTC plan call for a reduction in personal vehicle usage by 30+% but the Seymour Estates site forces people to drive everywhere for the smallest items.

b) The OCP and MTC seek for developments to include community services such as Seniors Living and Childcare — Seymour Estates does not have either of these in its
design — Darwin Properties is building both in MTC.

c) The OCP and MTC seek developments to be built around Co-Employment whereby 50% of the residents have the opportunity to work in their neighbourhood — Seymour Estates has no retail/service/commercial or any other kind of employment in it's design and as a suburban community, Blueridge/Seymour has next to no local employment for those who already live here.

4) Site Specific Concerns:

a) Only 2000 sq. ft. of Green-space is provided to the community on a 6.28-acre site that contains 15 buildings. That amount of green-space is extremely small for a community that will have 900+ residents

b) Lack of Childcare Spaces: the community will be largely built around townhomes which are homes for families. With no childcare spaces, families will be forced to drive long distances to find care spots for their children as there are not any significant care facilities in the area to serve those who already live here.

c) 6-Story Apartment right at Seymour Parkway may block views of residents on Bendale Place as the height will exceed the grade difference of their 2-story family homes.

Shlomo Friedman

[redacted], North Vancouver, BC, [redacted]. Canada [redacted].
Hello Mayor Little and Members of Council,

My name is Carlos Castellon. It is my pleasure to offer my comments in support of the rezoning application for Seymour Estates, which I understand is coming before Council for a Public Hearing on December 15th.

My wife and I were both raised in North Vancouver (District) and continue to reside here (in Lynn Valley), where we are raising our three kids. As a parent, I understand the need for greater housing diversity on the North Shore, which is why I am writing in support of Anthem’s application for Seymour Estates.

North Vancouver requires more housing choices which will allow a diverse group of people to make this beautiful city their home. When we grew up in North Vancouver, we had classmates whose families came from the entire socio-economic ladder. I believe we have lost most of that due to unavailable quality housing for middle class families. We need new projects that allow families of all social economic backgrounds to take root in our community.

I believe this project, with its quality housing, can be part of the solution to make North Vancouver more accessible to a larger portion of the population.

This project, should you choose to approve it, will allow an opportunity for some 350+ new residents to live in North Vancouver and includes options for secure rental and below market rental housing. As a resident, I welcome the addition of multifamily and rental housing options, which I think are critical to the health and vitality of the community. This will ensure opportunities for all individuals to live in, and access high quality amenities and schools, in our community.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Carlos Castellon
North Vancouver, BC
Re: proposed bylaw zoning change at 904-944 Lytton St

Dear Mayor Little and members of Council,

My name is **Rolf J. Reichert** and I live at [redacted] in Blueridge.

I would like to take this opportunity to voice my concerns **AGAINST** the proposed bylaw zoning change for the Seymour Estates site owned by Anthem Properties at 904-944 Lytton St.

As a resident of this community, I believe that the **tripling** of occupancy on the site from 114 units to 341, and upwards of 900 residents, will have a very large, negative effect on the community. The inclusion of over 500 parking spaces will only make the existing traffic problems associated with Mt Seymour Parkway worsen. The increase of rush hour traffic at the Lytton light is anticipated to increase 600%; how is that good for my community?

The Seymour Estates site, while lovely, just cannot sustain that level of density or development. There are no jobs nearby, there is an inadequate supply of childcare spaces, and as every resident of Blueridge knows, cars are a necessity to complete the smallest of errands.

In conclusion, this development does not provide any added value to the liveability of my community. As a result of these negative impacts I must once again stress that I am unreservedly **AGAINST** this bylaw zoning change.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Name: **Rolf J. Reichert**

Email Address: [Redacted]
Dear Mayor Little and Council,

My name is Rob Wilson & I am writing to you in support of the Seymour Estates development proposal at Lytton St near Mt Seymour Parkway. As a resident of the area, I believe this development will be good for the neighbourhood as it provides housing choice for our community!

North Vancouver is a great place to live, but we aren’t building enough homes for the people who want to live here. This development will provide 341 new homes for people to rent or purchase. Of these, 33 will be affordable homes managed by Hollyburn Family Services. This is an excellent addition to the project, and will be a great benefit to the neighbourhood.

I also can appreciate the inclusion of the neighbourhood coffee shop. There isn’t much commercial space in the neighbourhood today, so it will be good to have a coffee shop here for both those that live on site, and in the area too. The new residents will help support the business far into the future.

I hope you agree with me that this project provides significant benefit. I hope you approve this project and allow more like it to pass in the future.

Yours truly,
Rob Wilson
Dear Mayor and District Council,

My name is Connor Falls, I’m a North Vancouver resident and I am writing to make known my support for the development proposal for 904-944 Lytton Street, also known as Seymour Estates.

This development will be good for the community not only because it provides 341 new housing units, but also because it provides a number of community benefits.

For example, the Rent to Own program will allow 25 households to affordably access homeownership. This is increasingly difficult to achieve on the North Shore, so I am happy to see something being done about that. Another benefit is the unit being donated to Habitat for Humanity, which will help families in need!

Overall, I think this is a really good development and I hope that it gets approved.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Connor Falls
To whom it may concern,

I am a long-time resident of North Vancouver. I am supportive of the Seymour Estates project because I believe it is a well-rounded proposal that will work to revitalize this part of the District, while also addressing the pressing housing issues our community faces.

As a local business owner who does a lot of work on the North Shore, I am confronted daily with the harsh realities of the ongoing housing crisis. There is simply not enough housing supply for working people, especially in the District, and a lack of good quality options. With a construction business, it can be challenging to find people to work in North Vancouver because often our tradespeople live in areas like the Fraser Valley because they can't find suitable accommodation here. It is very unsustainable for folks to commute from so far because there are of course congestion issues on the Lionsgate and Second Narrows bridges.

If we want to ensure the District remains within reach for working families and young adults, we must do a better job at creating more housing options. Otherwise, we might see our neighbourhoods age and become disconnected from regular, working people.

Thanks
John Polglase
Dear DNV Mayor & Council,

I would like to express my support for the Seymour Estates development. I am a District of North Vancouver resident and believe a project like this will be a great addition to the area.

The Rent to Own program is a forward-thinking scheme which will allow first time buyers the opportunity to get on the property ladder by putting rent money towards an eventual purchase. The lack of initiatives like this on the North Shore is a real hindrance to young people looking to stay in the area. This project would be a great first step towards addressing the affordability issue in a municipality that needs to be more proactive in addressing the lack of housing supply that is compounding affordability.

The development looks fantastic and a significant amount of forethought has clearly gone into the design. I encourage the Mayor and Council to approve this proposal when they vote on December 15, 2020.

Many Thanks,
Wayne Procter
Please find attached, my comments regarding the above noted development proposal.

Sent from my iPad
December 10, 2020

Dear Mayor and Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Anthem’s redevelopment proposal at 904 – 944 Lytton Street and lend my enthusiastic support for their diverse plan to rejuvenate this beautiful site and provide much needed transportation upgrades in the District of North Vancouver.

In late 2019, I took advantage of the opportunity to attend Anthem’s open house to review what they were proposing and was very excited to see a variety of housing options to suit a wide demographic of residents. The North Shore like much of the lower mainland is in desperate need of various types of housing options and unfortunately see the valley as their only option to secure what they need.

On a personal note, I work as a first responder here on the North Shore and consider myself lucky that I call the DNV home. Such is not the case for a majority of those I work with and I feel if they had more housing options to grow their families, they too would opt to live in the community they faithfully serve.

I feel that Anthem’s proposed mix of condos and townhomes, rental housing at market and below market rates that includes a rent to own option will appeal to wide range of residents, be they first time renters or buyers, young and growing families or folks looking to down size and stay on the North Shore. This proposed community will be perfectly situated in walking distance to the Ron Andrews Rec Centre, schools and childcare facilities. The proposed coffee shop is a perfect addition for this community setting, and will provide a meeting place not only for the residents, but for all those who use the existing amenities in the area.

I understand that current zoning for this site supports a market townhome development and I respectfully request that the Mayor and Council consider Anthem’s enhanced proposal for a diverse mix of housing options.

Sincerely,

Marianne Beck

North Vancouver
Dear District of North Van Council;

My name is Carla and I am writing in support of this project, because I believe this development will be an excellent addition to the neighbourhood for its amenities and productive Rent to Own aspect. I would have liked to attend the Public Hearing, both in November and now night two on December 15th, but I have existing work commitments.

As someone who already works two jobs in our community, I see first hand how the housing affordability issues confront young people like me throughout the North Shore. I would like to stay on the North Shore as a home owner, and the opportunity to participate in a Rent to Own program makes this possible. The ability to pay rent while saving for a down payment can seem like an impossible feat with the rental prices throughout North Vancouver and for this reason, Rent to Own programs are refreshing to hear about. Individuals like me would no longer have to believe home ownership may not be possible without leaving the District. I would be personally interested in this program at Seymour Estates if this project were to proceed.

The North Shore needs to continue its momentum towards creating more housing choice for young people, and this project would be a great step in that direction. It makes sense for renters to be able to apply their monthly payments towards an eventual purchase after two years. This would incentivize young people from North Vancouver to stay rooted in the District, rather than turning to less expensive suburbs for lack of a better option.

I also appreciate the mix of housing proposed. This way, families, couples, roommates and seniors can all be accommodated through this project. Paired with a coffee shop on site, I think this should do great things to build a sense of community around the development. Speaking for myself and many individuals who would greatly benefit from this progressive project at Seymour Estates I am asking you to please approve this project!!

Best regards,
Carla Kadi
Mayor and Council,

I live in the Blueridge community and am in support of Anthem Properties Seymour Estates proposal. I would like to see more housing choices in the area, as many young families cannot afford to stay on the North Shore, and have limited options available to them and this proposal from Anthem provides these options.

Thank you for your consideration.

Walter Thorneloe
Dear District Council,

I am writing to you because I am excited about a proposed development happening in the District of North Vancouver at 904-944 Lytton Street, near Mt Seymour Parkway. I understand the application will be considered at a Public Hearing on December 15; I’d like to share my encouragement to see this project approved.

I was born and raised in North Van District and continue to live there (east of Seymour, in fact now past Deep Cove via boat access only) along with my wife and 3 kids. I have worked across the North Shore as a licensed Realtor since 1995 which has given me great insight into the housing challenges our community faces.

Projects like the one brought to you by Anthem are exactly what our community needs, and wants to see, more of. A range of housing options in one place, centered around communal space for socialization and shared amenities that foster community. I think the proposal put forward really delivers on what the District strives to be – a welcoming place for all ages, incomes and housing needs.

Looking forward to hearing your discussion and decision on this important project for the District.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mark Rasmussen
Dear Mayor Little and Council,

I am writing to you as a 32 year old working professional, wife, and new mom who hopes one day to purchase a home in North Vancouver. I recently read about the rent-to-own program, proposed for the land at Mount Seymour Parkway and Lytton and I would like to give my strong support to this development application. My husband and I have lived in the District for a few years now and want to stay here and raise our kids here. Our family would like to invest in our local economy, but our hands are tied by a housing market that makes it nearly impossible to buy. I also work in the District and currently have a very short commute to work. We love living in this community, and it is amazing how we can walk everywhere. That all changes if we have to move to buy – and I don't want to be another car on our already clogged roads. This is a no-brainer for council if they want to be progressive and ensure the people living here and paying taxes here, can stay here. I hope I can follow up this email with another in celebration of our rent-to-own purchase, not too far in the future.

Thank you for your time,

Sylvia Pedevilla
My husband and I and our three children have lived on the North Shore in the BlueRidge area for over 36 years. What I have witnessed in the building contracts that have taken place in the last 5 or so years is too much. The traffic situation is intolerable and there is no need for a complex of this magnitude to be built at this old condominium site. Even before the increase in size it was too much, but to ask for the increase in density they are asking is not complimenting our community plan. To go from an original 114 units to over 340 units is out of the question. I don’t know who all the investors are in this Anthem Building organization but they have not lived in this community or they would realize that it does not fit here. It is not even affordable housing for most people and would be much better built in an outlying community with more green space available to it and the occupants who purchase.

We are in full agreement with the letter attached by Mr. Ron Haines

Thanks kindly for listening

Regards
Bonnie and Heinz Richter
Dear Blueridge/Seymour Neighbours,

My name is Rob Haines and I live on [obfuscated] in Blueridge. I am writing to you to bring up an issue about a development application that has been brought to the District of North Vancouver Council with regards to the Seymour Estates site at 904-944 Lytton St.

The developer, Anthem Properties, is asking for a zoning bylaw change that would *TRIPLE* the occupancy of the site. The original site had 114 townhomes and they are requesting to change that to 341 units, including a 94 unit 6-story condominium.

Additionally, the proposed parking on the site will be 573 spots. As you can imagine, the increased traffic in our neighbourhood will be immense from this development alone. Traffic forecasts based on the assessment done state a 600% increase in traffic at the Lytton corner, from 30 cars per peak hour to 185. As residents of this community, we all understand that a vehicle is necessary to perform daily tasks. Two similar developments in Maplewood will also see 680 units plus 750 parking spots. Combined, that is over 1200 new cars.

Attached is some of the research that I have done to better understand the development and the impact it will have on our community. In the end, the developer is asking Council to give them permission to make over $250 million on the development while adding nothing to the fabric of our community; on the contrary, it will only add to the problems that we already face as a suburban community.

However, we can still fight this by informing Council of our concerns. Currently, there is no proposed date for the public hearing, but Council welcomes letters to be submitted. You can write and submit a letter to Council at [input@dnv.org](mailto:input@dnv.org) Please reference 904-944 Lytton Public Hearing as the subject heading.

If you would like to learn more or want suggestions on letter writing, please contact me at [obfuscated]

Sincerely,

Rob Haines
Seymour Estates Development Concerns
Prepared by Rob Haines

1) Quarter of a billion-dollar development does not add to the quality of life of the neighbourhood; on the contrary, negatively affects it

2) Traffic Concerns:
   a) based on the traffic assessment by BUNT, the Lytton corner will see traffic increase by 600% - from 30 cars per hour at peak to 185 cars per peak hour
   b) 3 of the 4 lights assessed (Broadview, Emerson, Berkley) did not receive great ratings (C-grades) based on current conditions let alone the addition of the above mentioned increase; all lights require significant upgrades including timing and lengthening of turn/hold lanes – this means the centre boulevards will need to be shortened/reduced, thus reducing the greenspace aesthetics of the neighbourhood
   c) Increase of vehicle traffic to the 2nd Narrows must be looked at based on all of the developments going on in this area of Seymour and Maplewood – Developments in Deep Cove plus 27 North on Seymour Parkway add 50 vehicles to the intersection. Darwin Properties is building 2 developments that will hold parking for nearly 700 vehicles; The North Shore Innovation District on a 45-acre site is also building 1100 homes plus various commercial/retail buildings. 2000 Homes are being added here without including Seymour Heights… nearly 2500 more cars will live in this area. If only 25% take the Narrows out that is over 600 more cars on the bridge; some reports state that 75% of the morning traffic on the 2nd Narrows flows out of the North Shore meaning that number could go up to 2000 more vehicles; PLUS the cars that go onto the highway deeper into the District or City of North Vancouver
   d) assessment did not include Browning which is a Stop sign only; those turning left from the southside of the street will have to cross the median into the increased traffic making left turns extremely difficult if 185 more cars are driving through there at peak hours.

3) Issues which Contravene the Maplewood Town Centre Plan as presented under the Official City Plan:
   a) The OCP and MTC plan call for a reduction in personal vehicle usage by 30+ but the Seymour Estates site FORCES people to drive everywhere for the smallest items
   b) The OCP and MTC seek for developments to include community services such as Seniors Living and Childcare – Seymour Estates does not have either of these in its design – Darwin Properties is building both in MTC
   c) The OCP and MTC seek developments to be built around Co-Employment whereby 50% of the residents have the opportunity to work in their neighbourhood – Seymour Estates has no retail/service/commercial or any other kind of employment in its design and as a suburban community, Blueridge/Seymour has next to no local employment for those who already live here.

4) Site Specific Concerns:
   a) Only 2000 sq ft of Greenspace is provided to the community on a 6.28-acre site that contains 15 buildings. That amount of greenspace is extremely small for a community that will have 900+ residents
   b) Lack of Childcare Spaces: the community will be largely built around townhomes which are homes for families. With no childcare spaces, families will be forced to drive long distances to find care spots for their children as there are not any significant care facilities in the area to serve those who already live here.
   c) 6-Story Apartment right at Seymour Parkway may block views of residents on Bendale Place as the height will exceed the grade difference of their 2-story family homes.
I support the development of this site and believe the parties involved have put forward a very positive development proposal that addresses all MAJOR concerns. There appears to be number of persons living in the area that have a NIMBYism attitude to the development. Not unexpected; their arguments focus on minor details being both weak and inflammatory without any true basis for their statements. The usual suspects have all been brought forward – density, traffic, parking, the robber barons lining their pockets.

Enough; get on with it council and approve this project so we can all benefit from the positives it will bring.

Greg Gardner
North Vancouver, BC

e-mail:

Following is information sent to me recently regarding the proposed development:

The information provided by Eric and Rob is very informative. But, in addition to the information they provide about the Lytton Project consideration must also be given to the overall increase in traffic that will affect the residents of Blueridge, Mount Seymour, Indian River and Deep Cove. This increased traffic will not only come from the Lytton Project but from the opening of the road from Raven Woods to the Parkway, the apartments being constructed along the Parkway and the eventual development of the Maplewood Flats.

No matter what your personal thoughts or beliefs on this issue are…I thought you should have the information from Eric and Rob. What you do, if anything, is up to you.

Eric explains in the second to last paragraph how you can sign up to speak or where you can send an email to – but it has to be prior to the close of the meeting on Tuesday.
If you send an email please use Reference 904-944 in the heading

Hello all (everyone has been blind-copied),

As most of you will have seen or heard, the Public Hearing for the Seymour Estates on Lytton Street off Mount Seymour Parkway was adjourned for technical reasons in November after that a dozen people had spoken.

The Public Hearing has been rescheduled and will continue this Tuesday, December 15, at 7 PM.
During the first Public Hearing only parties in favour of Seymour Estates spoke. Most of them were not living in the Seymour area, but wanted to live here, or they had ties to organizations and businesses that would gain from this development proceeding as proposed (e.g. associates from Modo carsharing, a local daycare and Hollyburn Family Services).

I have had a chance to discuss this project with a local resident, Rob Haines on [redacted] who is strongly opposed to this project. He worked many hours on finding out much information about the proposal which he has summarized in the attachment. Rob is included in this msg.

Both he and I never got a chance to speak in November, but like everyone else, who did not get to speak, we are still on the speakers’ list for Tuesday night.

I share many of Rob’s attached concerns and I will personally focus on:

Too high density (the number of units would triple the density from 114 units to 341 units)

Out of this there will only be 56 market rental units, 25 Rent To Own units and 33 below market rental.  
This is not enough rental (let alone social housing) for such a large project.  
It can hardly be considered affordable housing.

There will be 581 parking stalls for the residents (including visitors) which far exceeds the number of units  
Therefore, the Seymour traffic will undoubtedly be affected.  
Although it is positive that the developer, Anthem, last-minute agreed to make this a fossil-free development, it will be negated to a large extent by the added traffic resulting from the tripling in density.

This is proposed for a location outside of the town centres where the large developments were to take place as per the DNV’s OCP.

It is too compact with 15 buildings – some of these are six storeys which is higher than any other buildings in Seymour (with one exception)

In addition it is not clear at the moment how Darwin and the Tsleil Waututh may decide to develop the land in the Innovation District and other parts of Seymour. From the sounds of it, Council may have no control at all over these future developments.

Councillor Muri has suggested that the Seymour Estates land should be swapped with DNV land in or closer to town centres. This would probably end up giving Anthem more density (always what developers want), but it would give the DNV the Seymour Estates land next to Ron Andrews. Since this rec centre has to be replaced entirely in the foreseeable future, this could be done on the Seymour Estates land – and remain close to Canlan, so all the sporting activities could remain close to each other.

After the building of the new rec center on Seymour Estates land, the current Ron Andrews land (which is, of course, owned by the DNV) could then be used for social housing based entirely on the DNV’s criteria (and not what a developer wants to achieve). I think it is a great idea which has merit and definitely ought to be considered.
I am writing you all this, because I am hoping that some of you will take the time to let your views be heard at the Public Hearing on Tuesday. Attached you will also find the DNV’s notice about the Public Hearing and how you can sign up to speak on Tuesday night (by contacting the municipal clerk: gordonja@dnv.org prior to noon in order to speak), which is the best. Alternatively you can e-mail your comments to: input@dnv.org BEFORE the closure of the Public Hearing, which is likely to be later on Tuesday night.

I really hope that you will be able to help with your comments, since it would be important for Council to hear from parties, who are likely to be affected by this tripling of density – and not just from friends of Anthem who will, of course, only have good things to say about the project.

Pls drop me a line, if you have any questions or wish to discuss this further with me.

Stay safe,

Eric
Dear Blueridge/Seymour Neighbours,

My name is Rob Haines and I live on [redacted] in Blueridge. I am writing to you to bring up an issue about a development application that has been brought to the District of North Vancouver Council with regards to the Seymour Estates site at 904-944 Lytton St.

The developer, Anthem Properties, is asking for a zoning bylaw change that would TRIPLE the occupancy of the site. The original site had 114 townhomes and they are requesting to change that to 341 units, including a 94 unit 6-story condominium.

Additionally, the proposed parking on the site will be 573 spots. As you can imagine, the increased traffic in our neighbourhood will be immense from this development alone. Traffic forecasts based on the assessment done state a 600% increase in traffic at the Lytton corner, from 30 cars per peak hour to 185. As residents of this community, we all understand that a vehicle is necessary to perform daily tasks. Two similar developments in Maplewood will also see 680 units plus 750 parking spots. Combined, that is over 1200 new cars.

Attached is some of the research that I have done to better understand the development and the impact it will have on our community. In the end, the developer is asking Council to give them permission to make over $250 million on the development while adding nothing to the fabric of our community; on the contrary, it will only add to the problems that we already face as a suburban community.

However, we can still fight this by informing Council of our concerns. Currently, there is no proposed date for the public hearing, but Council welcomes letters to be submitted. You can write and submit a letter to Council at input@dnv.org Please reference 904-944 Lytton Public Hearing as the subject heading.

If you would like to learn more or want suggestions on letter writing, please contact me at [redacted]

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Rob Haines
Good morning, all.

Allow me to introduce myself. I am 67, a long-standing citizen of North Vancouver, having attended Ridgeway end Fromme Elementary Schools, Argyle High School and then completed two degrees at UBC. I left BC and worked for 34 years in Ottawa, NYC and Washington, DC in the areas of infrastructure planning and financing. I am now retired and a citizen of the District.

I have reviewed the plans for Subject Development and am, frankly appalled at the absent planning. Allow me to enumerate the absent elements.

1). Absent integrated planning- Unlike the developments currently occurring in Lynn Valley and Edgemont Village, this does not seem to be near anything; with at least three malls (Parkgate, Dollarton Village and Northwoods Village) east of the Seymour River and land in short supply, one would have expected a more integrated development with the existing malls and existing infrastructure.

2) Excess consideration for cars- It may be time to put parking needs underground; the surface land needs could be better used for integrated planning (see above) or for the underprivileged classes in our society.

3) Absent consideration of the Underprivileged- The current allocation is laughable. An increase could be had, and definitely this points towards integrated planning which would reduce the need for a car. Single mothers and the seniors would find this particularly welcome.

4) Excessive and Inconsistent Demand on the Existing Infrastructure- The current development is 2.5 km from Parkgate Mall and 1.7 km from Northwoods Village and, save a gas station across the road, entirely in a residential neighbourhood. As noted above, this 300+ unit development would only tax the existing structure forcing the District to once again, expand the infrastructure well before its time. This would also place an undue dependence on cars.

5) Demands on the Natural Environment- The above noted demands on the car, will inevitably mean more, and not less, hydrocarbons being burned. This does not bode well for NVD,BC or Canada. A closer situation to any one of three malls would reduce the need for fuel, reduce the need for additional buses and reduce public stress and aggravation (fewer cars means fewer accidents).

The above are but some principal considerations which come to mind. I would therefore like to attend any and all public hearings, as I feel the above represents something that needs to be said.

Do let me know.

Cheers

Mauro Chiesa
North Vancouver, BC.
District of North Vancouver planners and council:

I lived for many years on [redacted]. My Ex and kids currently live on [redacted] and the kids also live with me now on [redacted].

Both kids went to Blueridge and both now attend Windsor.

I was a Zone coordinator for Block Watch overseeing 24 block captains and hundreds of households, until relocating further west.

Regarding the proposal for Seymour Estates, please know that I and many of my neighbours are against this project as proposed.

I learned of the suggestion to offer a land swap for the development project at Seymour Estates. I think this is an excellent idea. I’m not normally in favour of land swaps as I know that there were some very suspect deals done in the city of Vancouver, but in this case I think it would address many important issues around this development project:

1. Windsor School has an unfortunate location behind this land, and I have heard very little discussion around the issues of the large number of students that cross at Lytton and Seymour Parkway. Also the many drop offs and pickups that must occur on that street (d/o’s are not allowed at the front of the school). This in itself is a problem currently. Imagine the further safety issues this new development and added traffic would create.
2. We know that Ron Andrews is slated for replacement. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to have this land available to facilitate the rebuilding of RA. I think a community center is a much more appropriate project to have adjacent to the school. Perhaps the school could benefit from the amenities in an agreement with the District and NVSD44. What a bonus.
3. This project as proposed has many issues that should make it unable to move forward. Unprecedented density, unprecedented building heights, and increased cost to the district taxpayers to facilitate the additional traffic (turn lanes, new lights, reduction of the parkway medians, pedestrian over pass, etc.) being the first that come to mind.
4. This would address the issue of high density introduction into this area, and relocate it to one of the already announced urban centers that CNV and DNV have planned. This could stop the densification of this area that would be begun with this substantial and unprecedented project. I’m sorry to say that I do not have a particular parcel in mind and I also do not know of any parcels available in District possession. I however assume there are options.
5. It has been determined that traffic will be significantly impacted by this project. I believe this will be mitigated, again, with a land swap to relocate the developers project to a more suitable space.
Lastly, I strongly believe the original residents of Seymour Estates received a very bad deal, and unfortunate subsequent results, stemming from the original failed land deal. This of course was not the DNVs fault. These poor people got a very raw deal and I feel for them. I think this (land swap) proposal would give many of them much comfort about the appropriate final use of the property.

Thanks for reading. I am in support of a responsible land swap proposal. I am against the project as currently proposed.

Robert Esaw
To Mayor and Council,

I'd like to state my support for the new development proposed at 904 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates property). I'm a District of North Vancouver resident and homeowner, and I'm in the neighbourhood quite often (on my way to the golf course, mountain biking, or to grab a coffee at United Strangers).

This is a great spot for a new family-friendly community like the one that Council is considering. It's close to amenities, public schools, and green space - what more could you ask for? All the different types of housing being offered are great, too. I feel very fortunate to be a single-family homeowner in my 30s, but most of my friends (including many who grew up in the District and are trying to either stay here or return to raise their young families) won't be able to. Some are looking for townhomes, others condos, and many are just hoping to find a decent quality rental - all of which are going to be offered at this new development. I also really appreciated that there will be an affordable rental option, too. Seems like all the possible choices will be on offer in one well thought out development.

I hope Council will genuinely consider the need for new and diverse housing options in this area, which has for too long been dominated by single family homes, despite the changing housing needs of the community at large. Please support this project and move it forward to the next stage.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Sincerely,

Gavin Soye
-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Bigwood
Sent: December 13, 2020 8:59 PM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>
Subject: Seymour Estates

Dear Council,
Thank you all for all you do. I just wanted to voice my opposition to changes to the original plan for the Seymour Estates land. I have been a home owner in the neighborhood for almost 20 years and will be sending my last of 4 children to Windsor this fall. I am well aware of the traffic situation at the intersection of Mt. Seymour Parkway and Lytton. We cannot add to this situation for the safety and comfort of all involved. I recognize we do need more housing options but this particular location cannot support the amount of traffic the proposed changes to this development will bring. Please take this in to consideration when making changes to any bylaws or zoning concerning this project. I appreciate you reviewing my thoughts.
Sincerely,
Jennifer Bigwood
North Vancouver

Sent from my iPhone
Re: proposed bylaw zoning change at 904-944 Lytton St

Dear Mayor Little and members of Council,

Our names are Leanne and Larry LeBel. We have lived at [REDACTED] in Blueridge for 30 years. We would like to take this opportunity to voice my concerns AGAINST the proposed bylaw zoning change for the Seymour Estates site owned by Anthem Properties at 904-944 Lytton St.

As a resident of this community, I believe that the tripling of occupancy on the site from 114 units to 341, and upwards of 900 residents, will have a very large, negative effect on the community. The inclusion of over 500 parking spaces will only make the existing traffic problems associated with Mt Seymour Parkway worsen. The increase of rush hour traffic at the Lytton light is anticipated to increase 600%; how is that good for my community? Recently, it took us almost 2 minutes to turn left off the Parkway to enter Park Gate.

The Seymour Estates site, while lovely, just cannot sustain that level of density or development. There are no jobs nearby, there is an inadequate supply of childcare spaces, and as every resident of Blueridge knows, cars are a necessity to complete the smallest of errands.

In conclusion, this development does not provide any added value to the liveability of my community. As a result of these negative impacts I must once again stress that I am unreservedly AGAINST this bylaw zoning change. Not that long ago, we remember Mike Little and 2 other people canvassing for support in our neighbourhood, when they advocated reducing development in the DNV. The proof is in the pudding!

Signed,

Leanne and Larry LeBel

Email Address: [REDACTED]
Please see my attached letter,

Regards

JP Zambo
Re: proposed bylaw zoning change at 904-944 Lytton St

Dear Mayor Little and members of Council,

My name is Jean-Paul Zambo and I live at [address redacted] in Blueridge. I would like to take this opportunity to voice my concerns AGAINST the proposed bylaw zoning change for the Seymour Estates site owned by Anthem Properties at 904-944 Lytton St.

As a resident of this community, I believe that the tripling of occupancy on the site from 114 units to 341, and upwards of 900 residents, will have a very large, negative effect on the community. The inclusion of over 500 parking spaces will only make the existing traffic problems associated with Mt Seymour Parkway worsen. The increase of rush hour traffic at the Lytton light is anticipated to increase 600%; how is that good for my community?

The Seymour Estates site, while lovely, just cannot sustain that level of density or development. There are no jobs nearby, there is an inadequate supply of childcare spaces, and as every resident of Blueridge knows, cars are a necessity to complete the smallest of errands.

In conclusion, this development does not provide any added value to the liveability of my community. As a result of these negative impacts I must once again stress that I am unreservedly AGAINST this bylaw zoning change.

Sincerely,

Name: JP Zambo
Email Address [email redacted]
Dear Mayor and District Council,

My name is Jonathan Silcock and I am writing to express my support for the rezoning and development application of the Seymour Estates project at 904-944 Lytton Street. North Vancouver needs more housing options for families and the Anthem proposal delivers a diverse mix with over 300 new homes including condos, rentals, rent to own and affordable rental options. This is the type of housing project that North Vancouver needs and I hope that this Council will support it to move forward.

As a District of North Vancouver resident and property owner, I feel we need more housing diversity and choice in North Vancouver. We need to support density in the right locations, or else we will continue to push away our current residents. This location along Mt. Seymour Parkway next to transit is one of those locations. Currently, this vacant lot is providing zero new homes to the community and I am looking forward to seeing construction activity starting on this site in the near future.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my input.

Regards,

Jonathan Silcock
DNV Resident
Good morning, again.

In reflecting on my e-mail, I realised that I could add a few more elements. Do let me know if I can attend your upcoming meeting.

In a message dated 2020-12-14 9:08:24 AM Pacific Standard Time, input@dnv.org writes:

Thank you for your email with respect to the proposed redevelopment of Seymour Estates at 904-944 Lytton Street. Please be advised that your email has been circulated to Council and staff.

Louise Simkin
Administrative, Information & Privacy Coordinator
District of North Vancouver
604-990-2413

Good morning, all.

Allow me to introduce myself. I am 67, a long-standing citizen of North Vancouver, having attended Ridgeway end Fromme Elementary Schools, Argyle High School and then completed two degrees at UBC. I left BC and worked for 34 years in Ottawa, NYC and Washington, DC in the areas of infrastructure planning and financing. I am now retired and a citizen of the District.

I have reviewed the plans for Subject Development and am, frankly appalled at the absent planning. Allow me to enumerate the absent elements.

1). Absent integrated planning- Unlike the developments currently occurring in Lynn Valley and
Edgemont Village, this does not seem to be near anything; with at least three malls (Parkgate, Dollarton Village and Northwoods Village) east of the Seymour River and land in short supply, one would have expected a more integrated development with the existing malls and existing infrastructure.

2) Excess consideration for cars- It may be time to put parking needs underground; the surface land needs could be better used for integrated planning (see above) or for the underprivileged classes in our society.

3) Absent consideration of the Underprivileged- The current allocation is laughable. An increase could be had, and definitely this points towards integrated planning which would reduce the need for a car. Single mothers and the seniors would find this particularly welcome.

4) Excessive and Inconsistent Demand on the Existing Infrastructure- The current development is 2.5 km from Parkgate Mall and 1.7 km from Northwoods Village and, save a gas station across the road, entirely in a residential neighbourhood. As noted above, this 300+ unit development would only tax the existing structure forcing the District to once again, expand the infrastructure well before its time. This would also place an undue dependence on cars.

5) Demands on the Natural Environment- The above noted demands on the car, will inevitably mean more, and not less, hydrocarbons being burned. This does not bode well for NVD, BC or Canada. A closer situation to any one of three malls would reduce the need for fuel, reduce the need for additional buses and reduce public stress and aggravation (fewer cars means fewer accidents).

The above are but some principal considerations which come to mind. I would therefore like to attend any and all public hearings, as I feel the above represents something that needs to be said.

Do let me know.

Cheers

Mauro Chiesa

North Vancouver, BC.
Dear Mayor and Council,

I live at [redacted], North Vancouver and our family live in Blueridge in the Seymour area. We have been Seymour residents for over 30 years.

I am writing in support of this application for this virtual DNV Public Hearing on December 15, 2020 for Seymour Estates located at 904-944 Lytton Street in North Vancouver.

I have participated in several public information meetings and as a member of CHAC I have also attended several meetings with the applicant to discuss this development proposal. There have been many positive changes made over the past few years.

This proposal has many positive features which I will briefly list as follows:

1) 341 residential units which are needed in DNV.
2) 33 non-market housing units – this includes a mix of studio, one, two and three bedroom suites. The rents are 15-25% below DNV median rents which makes a positive difference for these tenants.
3) 56 rental units in perpetuity – with the low vacancy rate in DNV these units are needed.
4) Habitat for Humanity 3 bedroom home for a family – an innovative addition to our housing stock in DNV.
5) 25 rent to own units - innovative and to be encouraged in future DNV projects.
6) A mix of larger three and four bedroom family suites is a positive feature.
7) There are significant community benefits noted in the staff report.
8) Included in this application are three car share vehicles, a transit pass subsidy and EV parking ready parking stalls. Further, there is bike parking and two electric bikes provided for residents. All items to make this a good residential development for future residents.

I feel that this development proposal will be a positive addition to the Seymour area providing a good mix of housing options for future residents.

Thanks for the opportunity to participate in this virtual DNV Public Hearing.

I am writing in support of this proposal.

Barry Fenton
Hi there

Please find attached my comments to be conveyed to the DNV Council at tomorrow’s meeting at 7:00 pm to discuss the property development at 904-9944 Lytton Street. Please let me know that you have received this document and that it will be conveyed at the meeting. Thank you.

Zamir K. Punja, PhD
To : District of North Vancouver
355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, B.C.

RE: DNV Council Meeting Tuesday December 15, 2020 and Public Hearing

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

I wish to submit comments concerning the upcoming Council meeting where the Proposed change to By-Law RM3 (Multi-Family Residential Zone 3) to Zone CD118 (Comprehensive Development Zone 118) will be discussed. The proposed address is 904-944 Lytton Street (Seymour Estates) by the developer Anthem.

As a long-term resident on the North Shore (since 1994), living in the Northlands area, I have witnessed considerable change due to commercial and residential developments, many of which have made the area more accessible for housing and community activities. Previous Councils have seen to it that growth is moderate and tempered by consideration of maintaining quality living standards and reducing congestion, while providing improved access to recreational facilities, activities and shopping. Some developments include, among others, the Northlands Golf Course, the Superstore site, and Northwoods Village on Dollarton Hwy. These have changed the feel of the North Shore, in many cases for the better. Of more concern are the numerous other developments of residential communities that have sprung up (and continue to spring up) along Mount Seymour Parkway, changing it from a parkway to a highway, and the large high-rise tower apartments and additional residential units developing on Main Street and Mountain Highway, and the soon to be built Maplewood Village Centre. These have increased traffic and congestion and placed stresses on existing facilities and infrastructure.

The proposed revisions of the By-laws for 904-944 Lytton Street from a Multi-Family Residential Zone 3 to a Comprehensive Development Zone 118 will add to the rapid growth in the same geographic region that has seen unprecedented recent growth as described above. One has only to view the traffic congestion on Mount Seymour Parkway during rush hour and while trying to access the Second Narrows Bridge all day to realize that the approved growth by DNV Councils has created bottlenecks and increased aggravation for its North Shore residents. The feel has changed from that of a residential community to one of a commercial zone.

The proposal by Anthem to build 341 units housed in 15 buildings, some with 6 storeys, with 581 parking spaces, qualifies as “excessive development” that surpasses previously approved residential properties, especially those along Mt. Seymour Parkway. It is not in keeping with the low and mid-rise form, character and scale of previous residential growth approved by Council, which ensures moderate and tempered growth. This maintains quality living standards and reduces congestion, while still providing improved access to recreational facilities, activities and shopping. The developers do what they do best – develop and achieve commercial profit. DNV Council needs to balance that request with the concerns of residents and achieve a balance. Economic growth drives property development requests, which in turn generate tax revenues, and the cycle perpetuates. But a balance must be sought.
May I offer two suggestions for DNV Council to consider, as follows:

1. Reduce the approval of residential units on 904-944 Lytton Street to 240 units, housed in 10 buildings, with no buildings exceeding 3 storeys in height, and with 275 parking spaces. This allows moderate growth to continue that would not significantly strain the current infrastructure of roads and other facilities in the area. It would allow the development to proceed while recognizing the need to stay tempered.

2. Relocate the proposed development site to another of DNV’s region in “Innovation District” that can be supported by access to existing infrastructure and facilities. If this were done, the site of 904-944 Lytton Street could then be used to provide improved facilities for North Shore residents. This location would be ideal for a replacement of the currently deteriorating Ron Andrews facility, which I regularly use with my family. A recreational facility that can provide a swimming pool, indoor recreational sports, weight rooms and yoga training rooms, basketball courts, a Seniors activity room, a community centre, outdoor fields, and many other facilities for the rapidly expanding North Shore community would be a win-win. What a great central location just off Mt. Seymour Parkway that is easy to access. And with great visibility. It would alleviate the maximum capacity we are seeing at the Parkgate Community Centre at the present time. The facility would be along the lines of the Delbrook Community Recreational Centre and would be the pride and joy of all residents. What a masterpiece of a facility the Delbrook community centre is, which residents get to enjoy. And this could be paralleled by the approval from the DNV for a new “Seymour Community Recreational Centre”.

I urge the DNV Council to create a historical precedence that would set the pace for North Shore residents by conversion of the 904-944 Lytton Street property from a Comprehensive Development project to a Recreational Community Centre for all its residents to enjoy. Together with an adjoining Ron Andrews Park.

I remain humbled by the task facing the councilors on DNV Council and hope that due consideration will be given to other opportunities for this centrally located piece of land. Creativity, thought and action that benefits a majority of the population far exceeds those of a few. It will be remembered for many generations to come.

Respectfully yours,

Zamir K. Punja, PhD.
Dear Mayor and Council,

I was registered to speak for the November 17th public hearing for 904 Lytton Street, but unfortunately the hearing ended due to technical difficulties before my name was called. Unfortunately, I’m unavailable on December 15th when the hearing resumes, so I won’t have the opportunity to share my feedback with you directly, something I’m disappointed about. Nevertheless, I wanted to make sure I conveyed my support for the Seymour Estates development proposal, so I’m writing this email instead. My husband and I live in the District in the Calverhall area. I work as a local elementary school special education assistant – I love my job and I feel fortunate to have housing close to work.

What gets me down is that so many of my colleagues and a lot of our friends who’d love to own or rent a decent home in North Van simply can’t afford to with what they’re paid. I think this project is brilliant. I realize that it’s still just proposed and totally up to council to say yes or no. I hope you’ll vote in support of this great project before you this evening.

Within our friend group alone I could give you half a dozen names of standup people who might end up moving away because they can’t afford a place in North Van, many of whom would love to live at this development if you permit it to proceed.

Council, too many young people are leaving North Van because of the housing situation and we need your help make sure this doesn’t continue. I hope that you will support this project – and others coming before you.

Best Regards,
Sarah Higgerty
Dear Mayor and Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the housing application for Seymour Estates at 904 Lytton Street. I hope to see this project move forward, and I'd like to tell you why.

I grew up in Deep Cove. I went to the Parent Participation Preschool at Seycove, then Cove Cliff, followed by Seycove, then Capilano College (before it was a University). Apart from a 6-week stint in Tofino, I have never lived anywhere else. My dad was killed in a boat crash up Indian Arm on December 5th, 1994 - he was delivering Christmas trees. 20 days before Christmas my mom was left as a single parent of three girls. I'm sure you can imagine how devastating it would be to explain to three girls aged 7, 4, and 15 months that their dad wouldn't be coming home - but to add insult to injury, because of the nature of his death, his bank accounts had been frozen until his autopsy could be completed.

Please don't think I'm including this for sympathy or because we're nearing Christmas and I'm feeling nostalgic - it's a HUGE part of the explanation for why I love this area - for on Christmas day, 1994, we woke up to a Christmas tree, with presents stacked higher than my sister Caitlin could reach, a fridge full of groceries, and countless letters and phone calls from people we didn't even know telling us that we'd be taken care of and not to worry. Before 'GoFundMe' was even a twinkle in someone's eye - the people of Deep Cove had started a fundraiser to keep us on our feet. They raised enough money (in early 90s dollars) that my mom didn't have to worry (about money anyway) while they sorted out the banking situation. I found a box of those letters this year. I read through every single one of them - most of them from people we didn't know in the community - some people that I eventually met; parents of my friends, teachers I later had, and even cards signed by full classes of children I eventually went to high school with.

Deep Cove is my home - always has been and I hope always will be - however, I'm finding that goal to be less and less realistic. Unless you have help from a well-off parent, designed the world's trendiest backpacks or are a couple of successful business lawyers- your likelihood of being able to buy in this community is small. I work for a film rental house and my husband is a landscaper - we have a one-year-old daughter. We'd like her to have a sibling eventually and we're constantly worrying about where we're going to end up raising these kids. As I’m sure you know, it’s near impossible to save up for a down payment, even with a good salary, and especially as home prices keep quickly escalating. We keep saving, but don’t seem to be getting any further ahead. The chance to have our rent go towards a down payment is an absolute game changer.

If Council approves this project, we plan to apply for the rent to own program. This program represents an incredible opportunity for families like mine to become home-owners in the District. Not only that, but the inclusion of market rental and below market rental homes means this will truly be an inclusive and diverse community. One that I'm proud to have been raised in, and one that I would be truly ecstatic to raise my children in.

I think this development is a great project, and I hope you’ll vote in support of moving it to
construction.

Sincerely,
Alex Seymour
Attached is my letter advising that I am against the proposed zoning changes.

Ann Duncan
Re: proposed bylaw zoning change at 904-944 Lytton St

Dear Mayor Little and members of Council,

My name is Ann Duncan and I live at [redacted] in Blueridge.

I would like to take this opportunity to voice my concerns AGAINST the proposed bylaw zoning change for the Seymour Estates site owned by Anthem Properties at 904-944 Lytton St.

As a resident of this community, I believe that the tripling of occupancy on the site from 114 units to 341, and upwards of 900 residents, will have a very large, negative effect on the community. The inclusion of over 500 parking spaces will only make the existing traffic problems associated with Mt Seymour Parkway worsen. The increase of rush hour traffic at the Lytton light is anticipated to increase 600%; how is that good for my community?

The Seymour Estates site, while lovely, just cannot sustain that level of density or development. There are no jobs nearby, there is an inadequate supply of childcare spaces, and as every resident of Blueridge knows, cars are a necessity to complete the smallest of errands.

In conclusion, this development does not provide any added value to the liveability of my community. As a result of these negative impacts I must once again stress that I am unreservedly AGAINST this bylaw zoning change.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Name: Ann Duncan
Email Address: [Redacted]
To whom it may concern, please ensure this information is presented at the Dec. 15th 7 p.m. Public Hearing.

As long standing owners at [redacted], we have observed significant land development/condo housing on the increase. Mt Seymour Parkway is already a speed way, constant traffic flow in both directions at all times of the day! It becomes a major safety risk to try and turn from Northlands onto Mt Seymour Parkway without risking an accident due to flow and speed. New developments are in progress from Strathaven to Parkgate...and more to come by the look of it with houses being demolished....where are the DNV Planners??? This area has extremely limited entry and exit points, further density is dangerous for all as we only have either Mt Seymour Parkway or Dollarton. Do you remember the fires in Deep Cove 2 years ago???...people were stranded/boxed in for hours, emergency vehicles had an impossible task getting through...what a scare we had!!!!..

We believe that this proposed development fails to meet the DNV OCP framework that reported developments would be near Town Centres!! The developer proposes 6 storey condo, a total of 341 units where formerly there were 114...not only is this an outrageous density, it also calls for 581 parking spots...isn’t this an exaggerated amount of congestion that would all pile onto Mt Seymour Parkway, again adding to traffic flow overload....this development would triple density!!

We are located across from McCartney Park, close to Mt Seymour and Deep Cove, under normal conditions additional visitors also traverse the Parkway for pleasure visits to these locations which again add to added traffic congestion. We ask that the DNV Council travel and monitor these problem areas with an intent to fix issues before additional problems occur with anymore new developments.

We also understand that there may be a connector from Dollarton via Apex to Mt Seymour...if this is approved we have yet more traffic flow, less and less safety to exit from Northlands.

We believe that this proposal does not serve the best interests of the community and do not support it going ahead.

Respectfully submitted
Victoria MacMillan
To whom it may concern,

I live in [redacted] and I'm writing to inform my disagreement for bylaw to permit the creation of a 341 units at 904-944 Lytton St. I believe it's not a good idea to build a huge complex which needs parking spaces and for sure cause a lot of traffic problem in Seymour parkway which is the only way for them to exit their building.

This neighborhood really does n't accept this density.

Thank you for consideration
Arezou Mohammadbeygi

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
Hello

I live in the area which the complex will take place. I work on Tuesday December 15 when the hearing is happening and just want to say that I don't agree to this due to the increase in population in the neighborhood causing more conflicts with traffic. This is going to affect the parking spaces, shopping centers and schools.

I hope the district will consider these problems and concerns.

Thank you,

Peiman

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
Dear Mayor Little and Members of Council,

My name is Anita Dalakoti and I live at [redacted] in Blueridge.

I would like to take this opportunity to voice my concerns AGAINST the proposed bylaw zoning change for the Seymour Estates site owned by Anthem Properties at 904-944 Lytton St.

As a resident of this community, I believe that the tripling of occupancy on the site from 114 units to 341, and upwards of 900 residents, will have a very large, negative effect on the community. The inclusion of over 500 parking spaces will only make the existing traffic problems associated with Mt Seymour Parkway worsen. The increase of rush hour traffic at the Lytton light is anticipated to increase 600%; how is that good for my community?

The Seymour Estates site, while lovely, just cannot sustain that level of density or development. There are no jobs nearby, there is an inadequate supply of childcare spaces, and as every resident of Blueridge knows, cars are a necessity to complete the smallest of errands.

In conclusion, this development does not provide any added value to the liveability of my community. As a result of these negative impacts I must once again stress that I am unreservedly AGAINST this bylaw zoning change.

Sincerely,

Anita Dalakoti
Genevieve, please find attached my letter signed AND with my address. Please destroy the prior one.

Mauro
The District of North Vancouver
North Vancouver, B.C.

To: Whom it may concern.

From: Mauro Chiesa Dec. 14, 2020

Re: 904-944 Lytton Street Development

I am a long-time, if intermittent resident of North Vancouver District. I went to Fromme Elementary School and then Argyle Secondary School in 1966-1972, and then attended UBC for two degrees. Then I went off to Ottawa, New York City and Washington, DC focusing primarily on infrastructure finance, much of which involved cities. Now at 67, I am retired and have returned to North Vancouver District.

In reviewing the referenced development, I found myself perplexed as the District is essentially an island with mountains, water and two borders to contend with, and not much land left to develop. The emphasis, I would have thought, would have now been on intensive land use and multi-use, so that the growing population might be better accommodated. Said development above, seems to go in the opposite direction and I would strongly advise the District to reconsider its options, as so many more options are available. Allow me to explain my position.

1. Integrated Town Planning- Said development of 341 units, will easily house 1,000 or more. Such a population impact would be better aimed at a town or shopping centre for superior integrated planning. The current site on Lytton is 2.5 km from Parkgate shopping centre and 1.7 km from Northwoods Village, thus constraining the population to either bus or car to these two centres to meet their shopping and/or medical needs.

By moving the development closer to either mall or to the Dollarton Village would better facilitate the lifestyles for the 1,000+ inhabitants. This would be similar to the steps already taken in Edgemont Village and Lynn Valley. The advantages to the seniors or to the single parents would also be noted, as they would not need cars to achieve their daily service, food or medical errands. The advantages for the District would be numerous as well. With fewer cars needed, there would be fewer parking spaces required and more space for tax-paying citizens. Additionally, having a residential hub near a shopping centre, it would be easier to attract some faster transit arrangements with Translink.

2. Parking- The proposal calls for 580 parking spaces for 341 units, or 1.7 parking spots per unit. Again, the development is far away from the main two shopping centres, and a disproportionate amount of land would have to be set aside for parking. Given the shortage of land, as indicated by the high real estate prices, one should consider either underground parking and more units to live in above ground, or moving the development closer to a shopping centre where either a car is not needed and/or public transit may be had.

3. The Marginalised- The set-aside of 33 units for sub-market rents is odd as it is marginally less than 10% of the total units. Surely one could at least have considered 15-20% to take account of the elderly or the single parents who may no longer be able to otherwise afford living in North
Vancouver. Again, by moving the development to a shopping centre, one could free up more land for the marginalised.

4. The BANANNA Rule- In infrastructure, this stands for “build absolutely nothing, absolutely nowhere near anything”. It would seem that this project contradicts this rule, as it is nowhere near anything, save for one gas station across the Parkway, leaving the residents to travel everywhere by car. The development will essentially create a mini-village of over 1,000 people. This in turn would require that ample new infrastructure be supplied, either by the District or by Translink or by another public agency.

5. The Green Commitment- Canada and BC have directly and indirectly undertaken the Paris Accord which looks to reduce the burning of hydrocarbons over time. By forcing the residents to remain so car dependent, the District is not exactly enhancing this objective.

The green commitment brings direct benefits to the District as well. Fewer cars means less pollution, more tourism and fewer breathing issues, especially for seniors. Fewer cars also means less accidents and therefore less demands on the health infrastructure. Fewer accidents also means needing fewer ambulances and/or fire trucks that need to be deployed.

Indirectly, when it comes time for Ottawa or Victoria to enhance the infrastructure commitment for North Vancouver, the two may have ample basis to withhold such commitments when they see the District commit such flagrant variances. Again, a more focused situation on a shopping centre, and reminding both Victoria and Ottawa of this commitment, may invite a more open approach and budgets from both for the supply of either renewal or new infrastructure.

In summary, the District has shown that in Edgemont Village and in Lynn Valley, it has demonstrated the expertise required for a more integrated approach, which has taken residents out of their cars and able to conduct their daily tasks on foot. The reduction in car dependency and the reduction in car associated costs, is well known. This in turn has allowed the residential neighbourhoods to thrive. Because of the size of this development, it behooves the District to consider relocating the development towards one of the three shopping centres east of the Seymour River, so that similar benefits may be had as well. To approve the development as it stands in a helter-skelter fashion reminiscent of earlier years, would be a tragic step backwards and simply defer the advanced development of the District east of the Seymour River.

Thank you.

(Signed)
Mauro Chiesa

North Vancouver, B.C.
Re: proposed bylaw zoning change at 904-944 Lytton St

Dear Mayor Little and members of Council,

My name is Peggy Hung and I live at [redacted] in Blueridge. I would like to take this opportunity to voice my concerns AGAINST the proposed bylaw zoning change for the Seymour Estates site owned by Anthem Properties at 904-944 Lytton St.

As a resident of this community, I believe that the tripling of occupancy on the site from 114 units to 341, and upwards of 900 residents, will have a very large, negative effect on the community. The inclusion of over 500 parking spaces will only make the existing traffic problems associated with Mt Seymour Parkway worsen. The increase of rush hour traffic at the Lytton light is anticipated to increase 600%; how is that good for my community? The traffic concerns are a 7-day/week problem as this community faces heavy local tourism and the increase of vehicles brought on by this development will only make that more severe.

The Seymour Estates site cannot sustain that level of density or development. There are no jobs nearby, there is an inadequate supply of childcare spaces, and as every resident of Blueridge knows, cars are a necessity to complete the smallest of errands. We need responsible development, and this is not an example of it.

In conclusion, this development does not provide any added value to the liveability of my community. As a result of these negative impacts I must once again stress that I am unreservedly AGAINST this bylaw zoning change.

Sincerely,

Peggy Hung
Dear Mayor Little and Members of Council,

My name is Rob Haines and I live at [redacted] in Blueridge. I would like to take this opportunity to state that I am **OPPOSED** to the rezoning of the Seymour Estates development.

I have many concerns about this development, some of which are outlined below.

1) **TRAFFIC:** Over 500 new cars in this neighborhood is not sustainable. An increase of the traffic at the Lytton light of 600% during peak hour, plus the increase in weekend traffic of 150 cars per peak hour is ridiculous.

2) **Contravention of the Official City Plan and the Maplewood Town Centre Plan:**
   a) The OCP and MTC call for reduction in personal vehicle usage by 30% but the Seymour Estates site REQUIRES residents to have vehicles. As any resident of Blueridge knows, you need to drive to get the smallest of items
   b) The OCP and MTC seek developments to include community services such as Seniors living and Childcare - Seymour Estates has neither of these in their designs, while in comparison, the Darwin Properties proposals for Maplewood have both;
   c) The OCP and MTC seek Co-Employment whereby 50% of residents have the opportunity to work in their neighbourhood - Blueridge has virtually NO local employment and certainly no new retail/commercial/service is coming soon to Blueridge.

3) **Site Specific Concerns:**
   a) Only 2000 sq ft of Greenspace on a 6.28 acre site that contains 15 buildings. That's the equivalent of 5 2-car Garages. For 900 residents?
   b) Lack of Childcare Spaces: the community will be largely built around townhomes which are homes for families. With no childcare spaces, families will be forced to drive long distances to find childcare spots for their children; there isn't enough childcare capacity here at the moment. The demand could increase costs in childcare spots (upward economic pressure) pricing some families out of spots they have. Low income earners would feel this the most, whether new to Blueridge, or long time residents.

As you can see, there are a great number of reasons why this development would have a negative impact on the liveability of my community. This developer is asking us to give them permission to make a Quarter-Billion dollars yet they are not adding value to this community at all - in fact, it is quite the opposite.

When considering this development, we must also consider decisions and developments that are coming online shortly, including the two Darwin Properties at Riverside and Old Dollarton, Dellbrook Lands site with Hollyburn Family, and the recently approved change to the site next to Phibbs Exchange. The compounding of traffic issues alone when added together is immense.

For the above reasons, and more, this zoning change cannot occur. To reiterate, I am **OPPOSED** to this change.

Sincerely,
Hello,

Please see my letter to Council speaking to the Seymour Estates rezoning application.

Regards,

Nick Belmar
To Mayor and Council,

I’m writing to share my comments in support of the Seymour Estates rezoning application that you will be considering at a public hearing next week on November 17.

I’m a longtime North Vancouver resident: My mom and I moved here when I was 5 years old. I haven’t called anywhere else home since. I went to school here, met all of my friends here, I had my first job here, met my wife and had our first child here. I’m proud to call North Vancouver home and I don’t plan on leaving.

North Vancouver has changed a lot over the decades, and we need to embrace that change. Encouraging community oriented multi-family developments like the one that Anthem has proposed is the right thing to do. When I think of the people that I grew up with that “can’t” afford to live here and the younger generations who have grown up in North Vancouver, I wonder how they will ever be able to stay here. We need things like market rental, below market rental, and Rent-to-Own programs so that the youth of today are not pushed out. The same goes for young families: condos and townhomes are in high-demand, and the fact that this development includes all these different housing options should be applauded. We must continue to look forward and adapt to how the composition of our communities are changing. The idea that North Vancouver should remain a sleepy suburb of single-family homes is just not realistic. The Seymour Estates development is a smart, forward thinking community planning which will present life changing opportunities to people that need it the most.

Thank you for considering my opinion and I hope you will vote to approve this development.

Regards,

Nick Belmar
This email is for input for the Public Hearing on Tuesday December 15, 2020 regarding the Seymour Estates development:

1. I am concerned about the capacity of the development and the resulting impact on traffic in the immediate area and in the “east of Seymour” area in general. In terms of the consequences of the impact at the intersection of Lytton and Mt. Seymour Parkway, there will be considerably more risk to the young students (including my daughter) who walk to Windsor every day through that intersection, not to mention the other residents and users of the Rec Centre. As to the impact of the “east of Seymour area in general, we are already seeing increases in traffic along Mount Seymour Parkway.

2. I am concerned also about the lack of retail space offered in the new development. If we truly want to develop a walkable society, we need to provide option retail options that are within walking distance from neighbourhoods (e.g. Seymour/Blueridge).

3. I support the suggestion put forward by Councillor Muri to switch the location of the Seymour Estates land with DNV land in or around town centres and use the site as a new site for the Ron Andrews Rec Centre. I also support as part of that suggestion that the current Ron Andrews land (following rebuild of the rec centre) be developed as rental/social housing.

Thank you for considering my input as a resident of DNV for 21 years.

Heather Gall
Hello,

I missed getting on the list for tonight's Public Hearing so I would like to comment by email on the development proposal by Anthem for the Seymour Estates - 904-944 Lytton St. I live in Deep Cove.

I would like to refer to a letter submitted by a resident living near this site, Rob Haines (see attached), who has provided clear arguments that I support completely. In particular, I believe that this type of proposed density belongs in the designated town centres, not elsewhere, and would result in a lot of negatives in that area, as indicated by Mr. Haines. In addition, I am VERY strongly opposed to the lack of real affordability in this type of development proposal, as well as inadequate numbers of rental units.

I understand there has been a suggestion by one of the councillors to propose a swap with that property and DNV land in or near a town centre. In this way, the DNV would be able to determine what is best for people themselves living at and around this site, instead of what is best for the developer. For instance, that area already includes sports facilities and a seniors' housing complex. Why not also include housing that actually addresses the needs of young families, including a daycare centre, and even retail or other development that creates jobs, and especially, creates community. This development, on the other hand, does the opposite, providing less than minimal green space, encouraging more cars and more driving, discouraging real opportunities for young families to afford a home or for creating community.

Thank you,

Chris Sallis
Dear Blueridge/Seymour Neighbours,

My name is Rob Haines and I live on [redacted] in Blueridge. I am writing to you to bring up an issue about a development application that has been brought to the District of North Vancouver Council with regards to the Seymour Estates site at 904-944 Lytton St.

The developer, Anthem Properties, is asking for a zoning bylaw change that would **TRIPLE** the occupancy of the site. The original site had 114 townhomes and they are requesting to change that to 341 units, including a 94 unit 6-story condominium.

Additionally, the proposed parking on the site will be 573 spots. As you can imagine, the increased traffic in our neighbourhood will be immense from this development alone. Traffic forecasts based on the assessment done state a 600% increase in traffic at the Lytton corner, from 30 cars per peak hour to 185. As residents of this community, we all understand that a vehicle is necessary to perform daily tasks. Two similar developments in Maplewood will also see 680 units plus 750 parking spots. Combined, that is over 1200 new cars.

Attached is some of the research that I have done to better understand the development and the impact it will have on our community. In the end, the developer is asking Council to give them permission to make over $250 million on the development while adding nothing to the fabric of our community; on the contrary, it will only add to the problems that we already face as a suburban community.

However, we can still fight this by informing Council of our concerns. Currently, there is no proposed date for the public hearing, but Council welcomes letters to be submitted. You can write and submit a letter to Council at [input@dnv.org](mailto:input@dnv.org) Please reference 904-944 Lytton Public Hearing as the subject heading.

If you would like to learn more or want suggestions on letter writing, please contact me at [redacted]

Sincerely,

Rob Haines
Seymour Estates Development Concerns
Prepared by Rob Haines

1) Quarter of a billion-dollar development does not add to the quality of life of the neighbourhood; on the contrary, negatively affects it.  

2) Traffic Concerns:  
   a) based on the traffic assessment by BUNT, the Lytton corner will see traffic increase by 600% from 30 cars per hour at peak to 185 cars per peak hour  
   b) 3 of the 4 lights assessed (Broadview, Emerson, Berkley) did not receive great ratings (C-grades) based on current conditions let alone the addition of the above mentioned increase; all lights require significant upgrades including timing and lengthening of turn/hold lanes – this means the centre boulevards will need to be shortened/reduced, thus reducing the greenspace aesthetics of the neighbourhood  
   c) Increase of vehicle traffic to the 2nd Narrows must be looked at based on all of the developments going on in this area of Seymour and Maplewood – Developments in Deep Cove plus 27 North on Seymour Parkway add 50 vehicles to the intersection. Darwin Properties is building 2 developments that will hold parking for nearly 700 vehicles; The North Shore Innovation District on a 45-acre site is also building 1100 homes plus various commercial/retail buildings. 2000 Homes are being added here without including Seymour Heights… nearly 2500 more cars will live in this area. If only 25% take the Narrows out that is over 600 more cars on the bridge; some reports state that 75% of the morning traffic on the 2nd Narrows flows out of the North Shore meaning that number could go up to 2000 more vehicles; PLUS the cars that go onto the highway deeper into the District or City of North Vancouver  
   d) assessment did not include Browning which is a Stop sign only; those turning left from the southside of the street will have to cross the median into the increased traffic making left turns extremely difficult if 185 more cars are driving through there at peak hours.  

3) Issues which Contravene the Maplewood Town Centre Plan as presented under the Official City Plan:  
   a) The OCP and MTC plan call for a reduction in personal vehicle usage by 30+% but the Seymour Estates site FORCES people to drive everywhere for the smallest items.  
   b) The OCP and MTC seek for developments to include community services such as Seniors Living and Childcare – Seymour Estates does not have either of these in its design – Darwin Properties is building both in MTC.  
   c) The OCP and MTC seek developments to be built around Co-Employment whereby 50% of the residents have the opportunity to work in their neighbourhood – Seymour Estates has no retail/service/commercial or any other kind of employment in it’s design and as a suburban community, Blue Ridge/Seymour has next to no local employment for those who already live here.  

4) Site Specific Concerns:  
   a) Only 2000 sq ft of Greenspace is provided to the community on a 6.28-acre site that contains 15 buildings. That amount of greenspace is extremely small for a community that will have 900+ residents.  
   b) Lack of Childcare Spaces: the community will be largely built around townhomes which are homes for families. With no childcare spaces, families will be forced to drive long distances to find care spots for their children as there are not any significant care facilities in the area to serve those who already live here.  
   c) 6-Story Apartment right at Seymour Parkway may block views of residents on Bendale Place as the height will exceed the grade difference of their 2-story family homes.
Your Worship & Members of Council,

Attached is my presentation for this evening's Public Hearing.
Kindly do not redact any of the material.

Yours truly,
Corrie Kost
2851 Colwood Dr.
N. Vancouver, BC, V7R2R3
I have lived in the same home in the DNV for the last 46 years. I declare that I have no direct pecuniary interest in any existing properties in the subject area. Specifically I have not signed any agreements, subject to rezoning, with the existing homes in the subject area. As well, I wish to declare that my comments on this issue are my own and not of any committee or organization that I may belong to.

Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

**Attachment 1** of DNV Dec 15 **2014** Administrative and Operational Policy states the current specifications for EV outlets in new multifamily developments.

20% are EV Ready Level 1 charging with 100% wired for Level 1 charging

As shown in **attachment 2** this is lower than most municipalities in the lower mainland and certainly lower than DNV and DWV which require 100% EV ready with Level 2. The DNV “standards” are dated and needs urgent updating.

As noted in the 2016 report (attachment 3) by CNV retrofitting later can be very expensive – as much as $11,000 per outlet while when installed in new development high-rise it is $805 (no load sharing) or $275 (optimal load sharing).

Should this development be approved I urge council to specify Level 2 EV ready for 100% of the parking spots (excluding visitor spots). IMHO it would be wise for the proponent to do this.

On the related issue of the environmental and human rights violations associated with the mining of some rare-earth elements -particularly cobalt- it should be noted that the major builder of EV – namely TESLA – will soon be switching to lithium-iron-phosphate (LFP) – which has the added benefit of significantly lowering the price of EV’s. In the meantime TESLA will use Cobalt coming from regions that “meet social and environmental standards”.

It should also be noted that many countries are committed to phasing out the production and sale of new fossil fuel based vehicles by 2030, and some by 2024. It
thus behoves council to support this endeavour by providing appropriate EV charging capabilities in all new residential housing.

**Parking**

The [electric] car, in one form or another, is, IMHO here to stay. Any development needs to accommodate at least 1 stall for every unit, and an extra stall for units of 2 bedrooms or more. To encourage EV use, charges for a stall could be discounted for EV’s. Any future parking surplus could even be leased to other nearby building tenants or repurposed for other uses. It need not be a lost asset.

**DNV Registered Vehicles → More Parking**

See page 34 of [https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/climate-change/z-orphaned/ceei/cnv-ceei-metrocomparison.pdf](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/climate-change/z-orphaned/ceei/cnv-ceei-metrocomparison.pdf) and page 25 of [https://www.dnv.org/sites/default/files/edocs/transportation-plan.pdf](https://www.dnv.org/sites/default/files/edocs/transportation-plan.pdf)

The former shows the graph below...
In the latter [page 25 of the DNV Official Community Plan | Transportation Plan] the Insurance Company of British Columbia (ICBC) reports car ownership rates for the District and City of North Vancouver combined. Between 1999 and 2009, the number of cars registered in North Vancouver grew significantly from 75,000 to 85,000, a rate higher than population growth. In 2009 in North Vancouver, car ownership per capita was higher than the regional average at 0.62 vehicles per capita compared to the regional average of 0.58. Considering factors like the different land use and income attributes of the District compared to the City, car ownership rates are likely higher than 0.62 per capita within the District.

In addition, considering the fact that the average DNV household income and the cost of housing are both above the lower mainland average, automobile ownership, which is becoming relatively more affordable with time, will likely increase even more into the future.

**Shadow Studies**

Sunlight is an important part of the liveability of any housing project. A key element is that children should be able to play in sunny designated play areas. Notwithstanding our 2011 OCP report on recommended shadow study specifications, at the very least shadow studies should be presented over broader hours in the summer and include some times for December 21st.

As an example of a great set of shadow study standards see attachment 4.

**Parkland**

With 341 units x 2.3 (average family size per unit in DNV) ~ 800 people housed in this complex, we should ask if “is growth paying its own way” in terms of parkland.

The added park space per 1000 people (see page 32 of https://www.dnv.org/sites/default/files/edocs/parks-and-open-space-strategic-plan-draft.pdf) is 4 hectares or about 10 acres.

The additional parkland required conservatively – prorated to 800 people would cost about $40,000,000. How much CAC was paid? $3,386,385
So no – **this development is not paying its own way** - it is simply absconding the surplus existing parkland in the area. So let’s just admit that growth is not paying its own way in this regard.

### Pandemics and Covid-19

First it should be noted that these title words are nowhere to be found in this proposal. Steps, both in building design and operation – particularly for the two six-storey apartment (208) units, will need to be put in place. Sadly design changes take some time – but are much more costly to retro-fit. I had hoped for at least some changes– say in elevator designs and related safety features – especially in public and high traffic areas and mechanical systems design. The 700 sq-ft indoor shared amenity space needs carefully designed safety features. I hope we learn from related best-practices before we build more\(^{(1)}\) multi-family units of any kind.

I do want to note that the ever shrinking size of apartments does not bode well for disease control.

\(^{(1)}\) [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7313520/pdf/main.pdf](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7313520/pdf/main.pdf) (also attached as attachment 5)

### Transportation

Disruptive technology is going to rapidly change transportation. A highly recommended video to watch can be found at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y916mxoio0E](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y916mxoio0E)

I agree that in 5 years all new cars will be electric, and that within 10 years only self-driving cars will be on the roads.

It is obvious to anyone who lives in the area (I do not) that traffic in the area is congested – especially during rush hours. Note that adding only a few more cars to the queue has a **disproportionate** impact on traffic that is already congested or nearing congestion. This element is rarely revealed in “transportation studies” of a development proposal.
I guess this is just another aspect of growth NOT paying its own way. A solution, which is not without its controversy – is congestion pricing\(^{(2)}\). Which usually impacts lower income groups the most.


**OCP Directives**

Finally I want to emphasize that the 2011 OCP puts a far great emphasis on rental (as opposed to ownership) of affordable housing. I urge council to examine how this project fits into those directives in their decision making process.

**Summary**

Note that the developer has stated only a fixed order for development NOT a fixed (or even preliminary) time schedule for the full development.

Very little progress in affordable housing has been made for private land developments since a council approved on June 15/2015 the 360 market residential units and provided only 6 affordable rental units.

Also note that **up-zoning is a privilege, not a right**, I have always expected this council to bargain for much more affordable rental units in any future development.

It is my firm belief that significant improvements can be made to the proposal and urge council to reject it and send it back to staff for significant revisions.

**The true measure of our community**, now and in the future, is NOT how well we housed our wealthy members, but is **how well we housed our most disadvantaged**!

Thank you.
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Implementation of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure with Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Engineering and Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY

It is staff policy that electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure is implemented with development.

Policy approved on: December 15, 2014
Policy amended on:

PROCEDURE

The District’s guideline is that the following electric vehicle charging infrastructure is to be provided with new developments:

1. For multifamily developments:
   - 20% of parking stalls are EV-ready, wired for level 1 charging
   - Conduit is in place so that 100% of parking stalls can later be wired for level 1 charging
   - Allocation of EV parking spaces is the responsibility of developers and/or strata organizations

2. For commercial and industrial development, in the range of 10% of parking stalls are EV-ready, wired for level 2 charging. The following criteria will be used to determine on a case-by-case basis the appropriate amount of level 1 and level 2 charging to be provided:
   - Proximity to regional roads and highways; and
   - Expected length of stay based on long term land use tenure (e.g. more charging infrastructure will be needed where the stay is longer).

3. All secure bicycle storage is to include level 1 electrical outlets for electric bicycle charging.

Requirements are to be revisited based on implementation experience and input heard through developer consultation in Fall 2015.
Electric Vehicle Policies.

Electric vehicle policies can benefit the continued and increasing adoption of electric vehicles in BC and across Canada. Below is a list of policies that various levels of government (municipal, regional, provincial, and federal) have taken to support EVs. This is not to be confused with EV incentives such as point-of-sale vehicle incentives. This list is not exhaustive.

Federal

**Canadian Tax Code Capital Cost Allowance Classes.**

EV charging stations can be classified at a higher rate than previous allowances. The new rates are:

- Class 43.1 with a CCA rate of 30% electrical vehicle charging stations (EVCSs) set up to supply more than 10 kilowatts but less than 90 kilowatts of continuous power. This is for property acquired for use after March 21, 2016, that has not been used or acquired for use before March 22, 2016.

- Class 43.2 with a CCA rate of 50% electrical vehicle charging stations (EVCSs) set up to supply 90 kilowatts and more of continuous power. This is for property acquired for use after March 21, 2016, that has not been used or acquired for use before March 22, 2016.

This is useful for businesses that wish to claim depreciation expenses for Federal income taxes.

**British Columbia**

**Zero-Emission Vehicles Act**

This act requires automakers to meet an escalating annual percentage of new light-duty ZEV sales and leases, reaching: 10% of light-duty vehicle sales by 2025, 30% by 2030, and 100% by 2040.

**Ministerial Order M104**

This order allows persons who are not otherwise public utilities, as well as landlords and strata corporations, to provide EV charging services for compensation. Please note that payment for electricity by kWh still requires a device approved by Measurement Canada, but charging stations have not yet been approved. Rates by the hour, or a flat fee, to use a station are still the conventional methods of placing a rate on charging station use.

**HOV Lane Access**

This policy allowing EVs access to high occupancy vehicle lanes regardless of the number of passengers. See more details and order the required HOV lane decal on the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure site.

**Provincial Building Act**

The building act was revised in 2016 to define EV chargers as matters ‘out of scope’ under the Building Act. ‘Out of scope’ is defined as “matters… local government can regulate… if they have authority to do so in other statutes.” This gives local governments greater flexibility in making decisions regarding the use of EV charging in new developments.

**BC Strata Property Act**

The act was revised in March 2017 under regulation 6.9 to clarify that variable user fees are permitted for the use of strata common property. A consumption based rate may be charged to users to recover expenses as long as it is reasonable and in a bylaw or rule. Examples include electricity usage for those charging electric vehicles.
The act was revised in March 2017 under regulation 6.9 to clarify that variable user fees are permitted for the use of strata common property. A consumption based rate may be charged to users to recover expenses as long as it is reasonable and in a bylaw or rule. Examples include electricity usage for those charging electric vehicles.

**Strata Property Act**

**Municipal**

**City of Burnaby**

[Zoning Bylaw 13903, Amendment Bylaw No. 24, 2018](#) includes provisions for electric vehicle charging requirements for new residential developments.

- All parking spaces for dwelling units shall include an energized outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging or higher
- Includes single-family homes and multi-family buildings of all sizes
- Exceptions include visitor and secondary suite parking, and parking for existing units
- Bylaw is in effect starting September 1 2018.

**City of Coquitlam**

The zoning bylaw has been amended to include EV parking spaces. See Part [714 of the bylaw](#).

- July 30th 2018. See the requirements guide.
- All new constructions must have one energized outlet capable of L2 charging for every dwelling unit (includes single family and MURBs).

**City of Kamloops**

Council authorized the adoption of the Electric Vehicle (EV) and Electric Bike (E-Bike) Strategy on August 25, 2020 with the understanding that only action items with no costs attached will move forward in 2021. Other actions identified within the strategy will be revisited as funding becomes available. [See the strategy here](#).

**Targets include:**

- By 2023, all newly constructed off-street residential parking will be EV-ready.
- By 2030, all residential parking in existing apartments will be EV-ready.
- By 2030, most households without access to on-site parking for “at-home” charging will have access to EV charging, through a mix of workplace, on-street, and other forms of public charging (to be measured via surveys and/or other analysis).

**City of Kelowna**

The city provides a parking [Eco Pass](#) for electric vehicles. Electric vehicles, including plug-in hybrids, can receive a one year eco pass which allows two hours of free parking a day in paid parking areas.

**City of Nelson**

The city has [amended its zoning bylaw](#):

- One stall per dwelling unit is required to be EV ready in new single family and multi-unit residential.
- Two stalls per 10 required stalls of new commercial builds are required to be EV ready.

**City of New Westminster**

Bylaw 8040 in 2018 amended [zoning bylaw 6680](#).

- Amended October 1, 2018
- For new buildings that contain at least one dwelling unit, all residential parking spaces and spaces for co-operative vehicles, shall feature an energized Level 2 outlet or higher to the parking space. Energized Level 2 outlets will not be required for visitor parking spaces.

**City of North Vancouver**
The zoning bylaw has been amended to include 100% EV ready parking in multi-unit residential buildings:

- This applies to development or building permit applications accepted for review on or after June 1, 2019.
- All parking spaces in new residential buildings must have a labelled, energized outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging for an electric vehicle.
- This includes all new single family, coach houses, duplexes, triplexes and apartments, as well as parking spaces for shared vehicles.
- Secondary suites are not included.
- EV energy management systems or “load sharing” can be used to meet the requirements

**District of North Vancouver**

Implementation of EV Charging Infrastructure with Development policy requiring multi-family, commercial, and industrial builds, document 2380934.

- Multi-family in District of North Vancouver:
  - 20% of parking stalls are EV-ready (wired for L1 charging)
  - Conduit in place for 100% of parking stalls to be wired for L1 in the future
- Commercial/Industrial in District of North Vancouver:
  - Approximately 10% of parking stalls are EV-ready (wired for L2 charging)

**City of Port Coquitlam**

Zoning Amendment Bylaw 4035 requires EV charging in new builds (residential and mixed use):

- In effect Jan 23 2018
- For a residential building other than a building with a common parking area, one parking space per dwelling unit shall be provided with roughed-in electric vehicle charging infrastructure including an electrical outlet box located within 3 metres of the unit’s required parking space.
- For a residential building with a common parking area, a separate single utility electrical meter and disconnect shall be provided in line with the electrical panel(s) intended to provide for charging of electric vehicles located within 3 metres of the unit’s required parking space.
- In a mixed-use building including residential uses and a common parking area, a separate single utility electrical meter and disconnect shall be provided in line with the electrical panel(s) intended to provide for charging of electric vehicles located within 3 metres of the unit’s required parking space.

**City of Port Moody**

EV ready requirements appear in bylaw 2937 Section 6.11 March 1, 2019.

- See the technical bulletin [here](#).
- All spaces in new residential constructions require an energized outlet capable of L2 charging.
- 20% of spaces in new commercial constructions require an energized outlet capable of L2 charging.

**City of Richmond**

Zoning Bylaw 8500 requires EV charging in new builds (residential only), revising bylaw 9756.

- October 15, 2017.
- 100% of new residential parking spaces, excluding those provided for visitors use, shall have access to an adjacent energized outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging.

**District of Saanich**

Development and Building Permit applications for new buildings applied for on or after September 1, 2020 will need to demonstrate compliance with the following Bylaws related to Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure requirements:
• **Zoning Bylaw [PDF – 17 MB]** 8200, section 7: Off-Street Parking, which establishes electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure requirements for parking in new residential, institutional, commercial and industrial buildings.

• **Electric Vehicle Off-Street Parking Bylaw [PDF – 24 KB]**, 2020, No. 9644, which establishes requirements for performance of Electric Vehicle Energy Management Systems and building and occupancy permit requirements.

• **EV Infrastructure Requirements Technical Bulletin, [PDF – 276 KB]**

See more on District of Saanich’s EV Infrastructure Requirements page.

**District of Squamish**

**Zoning bylaw 2200, 2011,** has been amended to require:

• 30% of the required off-street parking spaces in any shared parking areas for multiple unit residential use shall have shared access to Electrical Vehicle Charging Receptacles. Electric Vehicle Charging Receptacles provided at visitor parking spaces will not contribute towards this requirement.

• 100% of the required off-street parking stalls in any shared parking areas for multiple unit residential use shall be provided with Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure. (Bylaw 2610, 2018)

**City of Surrey**

The zoning bylaw was amended on February 25, 2019 to require Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure in ALL new residential and commercial developments.

• February 25, 2019. See the technical bulletin [here](#).

• 100% of residential parking spaces in new residential developments must each have an installed energized electrical outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging for an electric vehicle. This requirement applies to both single-family and multiple unit residential dwellings.

• 50% of visitor parking spaces in multiple unit residential developments must each have an installed energized electrical outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging for an electric vehicle.

• 20% of parking spaces in new commercial developments must each have an installed energized electrical outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging for an electric vehicle.

**City of Vancouver**

**Building Code Bylaw 10908** requiring EV charging in new builds (commercial and residential), revised bylaw Electric Vehicle Charging s 10.2.3.

• This [bylaw was updated](#) on March 14, 2018 to increase the percentage of EV-ready stalls in multi-unit residential buildings from 20% to 100%

• For new buildings current bylaw requires:
  
  o 1 EV-ready stall in single-family homes with garages
  o 10% of stalls be EV-ready in commercial buildings
  o 100% of stalls be EV-ready in multi-unit residential buildings

**District of West Vancouver**

**Sustainable Buildings Policy 02-80-386** requires EV ready parking spaces:

Effective April 23, 2018. New buildings should demonstrate that all residential parking spaces, excluding visitor parking spaces, include a labeled and energized outlet capable of providing at a minimum of Level 2 electric vehicle (EV) charging as defined by SAE International’s J1772 standard. Any energy management system that controls the rate and timing of EV charging shall be certified to be sufficient for this purpose
The Corporation of THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER
ENGINEERING, PARKS AND ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

REPORT

To: Mayor Darrell R. Mussatto and Members of Council
From: Julie Lowry, Environmental Sustainability Specialist
SUBJECT: ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUPPLY EQUIPMENT GUIDELINES FOR NEW MULTI-FAMILY AND MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT
Date: September 7, 2016

File No: 11-5280-14-0001/2016

The following is a suggested recommendation only. Please refer to Council Minutes for adopted resolution.

RECOMMENDATION:

PURSUANT to the report of the Sustainability Specialist, dated September 7, 2016, entitled “Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment Guidelines for New Multi-family and Mixed-Use Development”:

THAT the electric vehicle supply equipment provisions in the Sustainable Development Guidelines be amended as follows (Option 1):

- 20% of all residential parking spaces include an electrical outlet, a receptacle or electric vehicle supply equipment, and are supplied by a branch circuit rated not less than 40 A at the nominal voltage of 208 V or 240 V as applicable;

- Adequate space in the electrical room or electrical vault to support future electric vehicle charging for the remaining 80% of parking spaces.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Letter from Anne McMullin, Urban Development Institute Pacific Region, September 1, 2016 (CD # 1440404)
PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to present Council with options regarding updating the electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) provisions in the City’s Sustainability Guidelines for new multi-family and mixed-use buildings.

BACKGROUND:

Electric vehicles (EVs) produce 80% fewer lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions than the average gasoline-powered vehicle. Electric vehicles also improve local air quality and health through the reduction of harmful nitrogen oxides, sulphur oxides, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter and are quieter than internal combustion vehicles.

EV ownership in Canada has steadily increased since 2012. From 2012 to 2014, registrations for battery electric vehicles (BEV) in the City of North Vancouver increased by 91%. In 2016 a number of new EVs, ranging from long-range sedans to compact commercial vans, are expected to come on the market, providing more options for consumers at lower price points.

Over the past four years, the City has encouraged EV ownership by installing publicly accessible charging stations, advocating for provincial purchasing incentives, and providing guidance and information on our website. The City’s DC Fast Charge (DCFC) station on East 1st Street receives the highest use of any DCFC in British Columbia, likely due to escalating local EV ownership combined with the absence of charging facilities in multi-family buildings.

Challenges with Retrofitting Buildings for Electric Vehicle Charging
The majority (70%) of all households in the City are apartment or condominium style multi-family dwellings. Unlike internal combustion cars which fuel up at gas stations, the majority of EVs charge at home overnight. Existing multi-family buildings can be retrofit to include electric vehicle charging, however retrofitting can be expensive and challenging.

A study completed by the Condominium Home Owners Association of BC (CHOA) found that once a building is built, the installation of one Level 2 charging station can cost as much as $11,000. These costs include upgrading the building’s electrical system, coring, and running electrical cord, as well as purchasing and installing the charging station. Another challenge faced by strata dwellings is the assignment of parking spaces, which could require resolutions to approve parking re-allocation.

There is also a perceived concern about electrical energy costs, but these can be easily addressed by the strata through charging a flat monthly fee to EV owners. The average electric vehicle uses approximately $30 a month of electricity.
It is prudent to consider including vehicle charging facilities in new construction given the significant costs and challenges associated with retrofitting older construction.

**Charging Levels**
There are three different types of charging stations:
- **Level 1**: uses 120 volts and will provide a full charge in 8-18 hours;
- **Level 2**: uses 240 volts and will provide a full charge in 3-6 hours (e.g., stations in the City Hall Library parkade and off the West 13th Street lane near City Hall);
- **Direct Current Fast Charge (DCFC)**: uses 200-500 volts and will provide a full charge in 15-40 minutes (e.g., DC Fast Charging station currently leased from BC Hydro on East 1st Street).

Though DCFC provides the fastest charging, the stations are not suitable for home charging because they are expensive and have the potential to wear out car batteries when used regularly. Some vehicles can be charged at home using a Level 1 charger, however as technology improves electric vehicles will have larger battery capacity to allow for further travel between charges. Level 1 charging would be insufficient for these larger batteries. Therefore, Level 2 is the most appropriate residential charging option when considering the demands of future larger battery capacity.

**DISCUSSION:**

**20% Level 2 Charging**
Staff recommend that a minimum number of residential parking spaces include provisions for Level 2 charging. The suggested wording for the Sustainable Development guidelines is as follows:

- “20% of all residential parking spaces include an electrical outlet, a receptacle or electric vehicle supply equipment, and are supplied by a branch circuit rated not less than 40 A at the nominal voltage of 208 V or 240 V as applicable.”

This language allows the developer or residents flexibility to choose the specific charging station they prefer, while ensuring the building is resilient to changes in EV technology such as greater vehicle battery capacity. For example, the developer could split the connection between parking stalls, allowing for electrical service for two stalls with less infrastructure.

**EV Readiness**
The City's existing Sustainability Guidelines include a reference to 100% of the parking spaces to be constructed as EV-ready. Staff recommend that this provision remain, with a revision to define EV readiness. The suggested wording is as follows:

- “Adequate space in the electrical room or electrical vault to support future electric vehicle charging for the remaining 80% of parking spaces.”

Given that most buildings are designed to last many decades and it is expected that EV ownership will continue to increase, designing a building with extra space in the electrical room or vault for future build out is necessary. Retrofitting an electrical room to
gain space to support future EV infrastructure, such as additional panels, is difficult because of space limitations in buildings and the strict requirements of the Canadian Electrical Code.

These two provisions for EVSE (20% Level 2 charging and EV readiness for the remaining 80% of stalls) are consistent with the current City of Vancouver building bylaw which has been in place since 2013.

Cost of Providing EVSE in New Development
The City commissioned a cost study to estimate the potential incremental costs to developers of the recommended EVSE provisions. For each scenario, the incremental cost increase included the recommended provisions of 20% of residential parking electrified for Level 2 charging and adequate space in the electrical room to electrify the remaining 80% stalls. Costs are summarized in Table 1 as incremental costs per parking stall in the building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Optimal Load Sharing</th>
<th>No Load Sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-rise</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-rise</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Load sharing
Load sharing is the ability to tie a number of charging stations together to share one circuit in the electrical room. Load sharing allows for a reduction in the electrical capacity of a building when installing multiple EVSE, thus reducing development and construction costs. In the case of the cost study, optimal load sharing was defined as having no more than four stations sharing one circuit. No load sharing assumes that each charging station has its own circuit in the electrical room. Load sharing was recently permitted under the Canadian Electrical Code, which was adopted by the Province of BC in early 2016.

Consultation with the Urban Development Institute
Staff consulted with the Urban Development Institute (UDI) to receive input on the proposed EV provisions. UDI has expressed support for the recommended approach in a letter dated September 1, 2016 (Attachment 1).

UDI supports the recommendation because it is flexible and allows for developers to choose the charging configuration that best suits the building.

UDI suggested that the City may wish to explore allowing for developers to split the connections between stalls, thus reducing infrastructure costs and alleviating challenges related to parking allocation. As mentioned, this configuration would be consistent with the recommended policy and would be supported.
OPTIONS:

In this report, staff provide two options for Council's consideration:

Option 1. Amend the City’s Sustainable Development Guidelines to include more specific provisions for EVSE as detailed in the report (Recommended)

Under this option, Council would direct staff to amend the EVSE provisions in the Sustainable Development Guidelines to require the following as included in the recommended resolution:

- 20% of all residential parking spaces include an electrical outlet, a receptacle or electric vehicle supply equipment, and are supplied by a branch circuit rated not less than 40 A at the nominal voltage of 208 V or 240 V as applicable;
- Adequate space in the electrical room or electrical vault to support future electric vehicle charging for the remaining 80% of parking spaces.

Staff recommend this option as the provisions are consistent with the City of Vancouver’s bylaw which has been in place since 2013. The provisions are also supported by the Urban Development Institute (Attachment 1).

Option 2. Refer the matter to a Policy Committee Meeting (Not recommended)

Under this option, Council would refer the matter to a Policy Committee meeting. A Policy Committee meeting would include a presentation from staff and an opportunity to hear from members of the public with regards to the proposed amendments to the Guidelines.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Some additional administrative staff time for Planning and Building staff is expected as a result of the implementation of the recommended guidelines.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL IMPLICATIONS:

The guidelines were developed in collaboration with Community Development and will be incorporated into existing planning and development procedures. This report was reviewed and endorsed by the Major Projects Committee on February 23, 2016.
CORPORATE PLAN AND/OR POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

The EVSE guidelines support the City's goal of reducing community-wide greenhouse gas emissions by 15% below 2007 levels by 2020 and 50% below 2007 levels by 2050.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:  

[Signature]  
Julie Lowry, MRM (PI.)  
Environmental Sustainability Specialist
September 1, 2016

Caroline Jackson  
Section Manager, Environmental Sustainability  
City of North Vancouver  
141 West 14th Street  
North Vancouver, BCV7M 1H9

Dear Ms. Jackson:

RE: Proposed Guidelines for Electric Vehicle Equipment for New Multi-Family/Mixed-Use Development

Thank you for contacting the Urban Development Institute (UDI) regarding the City of North Vancouver’s proposed Rezoning Guidelines for Electric Vehicle (EV) Equipment for new multi-family and mixed-use projects. UDI supports the City’s efforts to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and we recognize the benefits of electric vehicles.

We have also been in discussions with BC Hydro, the Condominium Home Owners Association (CHOA) and other municipalities about the implementation of EV equipment in new buildings. UDI believes that several outstanding issues (outlined below) need to be resolved as local governments move forward with EV charging By-laws.

However, the steps proposed in your Rezoning Guidelines are reasonable – especially since as guidelines there will be some flexibility in their implementation. We believe the industry can accommodate in most projects having:

- “20% of all residential parking spaces include an electrical outlet, a receptacle or electric vehicle supply equipment, and are supplied by a branch circuit rated not less than 40 A at the nominal voltage of 208 V or 240 V as applicable;

- Adequate space in the electrical room or electrical vault to support future electric vehicle charging for the remaining 80% of parking spaces.”

The City may wish to explore allowing the option for developers to split connections between stalls (if electrical load management technology would be employed). The City’s objective of having an electrical outlet available in 20% of parking stalls in new buildings would still be achieved. At the same time, this approach could potentially reduce the amount of electrical infrastructure our members would need to install inside and outside of buildings (although more discussion is needed with electrical inspectors, B.C. Hydro, the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of British Columbia, and the B.C. Safety Authority).
As noted above, there are still numerous issues that need to be resolved before local
governments take further steps than what the City of North Vancouver is proposing. They
include:

- Electric vehicle charging equipment costs can be quite high – especially for charging
  above level one;
- Part of the cost increase is due to how loads are calculated under the Canadian
  Electrical Code, as frequently, it is assumed that each charging station will be used
  100% of the time, so projects can surpass thresholds beyond which the hydro
  infrastructure servicing requirements will then need to be substantially increased;
- There is an unfairness with current B.C. Hydro policies because people who live in
  mutli-family buildings have to pay for additional electrical infrastructure to
  accommodate EV charging, while those living in single family homes do not;
- If a municipality's minimum parking standards are quite high, EV infrastructure costs
  will further increase – unless local governments consider caps in these cases;
- It has not been decided how energy efficiency benchmarks in future updates to the
  Building Code and “stretch codes” will take into account electricity charging for EVs,
  which may lead to these standards being more difficult to meet;
- It is also not clear whether homeowners or stratas will be pushed into higher hydro
  rate classes because of electric vehicle charging;
- There is no clearly established way for developers or stratas to pass capital or
  electricity costs onto those plugging in their cars;
- As a result, some stratas may disconnect the EV chargers; and
- It is difficult to change parking spaces in stratas, so a person with an electric vehicle,
  may not be able to connect to a charging station.

We believe progress is being made in resolving these issue through industry discussions
with BC Hydro, municipalities, CHOA and others, and we hope that clearly established
solutions will be in place soon.

In the meantime we are supportive of the proposal by City of North Vancouver staff, and
look forward to working with them and others to further improve EV charging opportunities
across the region.

Yours sincerely,

Anne McMullin
President and CEO
STANDARDS FOR SHADOW STUDIES

August 2011
STANDARDS FOR SHADOW STUDIES

Shadow Studies illustrate the impact of development in terms of sun and daylight access to the surrounding context including surrounding buildings, the public realm, public and private open space.

Shadow Studies may be required in support of development applications to demonstrate that the location and height of a proposed building if greater than 10.7m, will not cause undue shade on the subject lands, and on surrounding context including building facades, private and public outdoor amenity and open spaces, public parkland, sidewalks and other components of the public realm.

Shadow Studies and Analyses will be conducted for the following dates:

- **June 21**
- **September 21** (similar to March 21, and therefore, criteria for Sept. 21 are deemed to apply to March 21)
- **December 21**

At the following times:

- **Solar Noon (SN)**
- Hourly intervals before and after Solar Noon (SN), up to and including 1.5 hours after sunrise and 1.5 hours before sunset

**Hourly solar data are specified for each date**

See Tables 2, 3 and 4: Mississauga Sun Angle Data

**Sun Angles:**
Sun Angles are based on the latitude and longitude of the Mississauga Civic Centre at 300 City Centre Drive, Mississauga ON L5B 3C1

- Latitude: 43 deg. 35' 20" N
- Longitude: 79 deg. 38' 40" W

**Time Zone:** Eastern
**Standard Time:** UT - 5 hours
**Daylight Time:** UT - 4 hours
**UT** denotes Universal Time i.e. Greenwich Mean Time

**Shadow Length (SL) = Building Height (H) x Shadow Length Factor (SLF).** See Fig. 1

**Fig. 1: Determining Shadow Length**

\[ \text{Building Height} = H \]

\[ \text{Shadow Length Factor (SLF)} = \frac{1}{\tan(\text{Alt})} \]

\[ \text{Shadow Length (SL)} = H \times \text{SLF} \]
Ensure Adequate sunlight on the following:

1. Residential Private Outdoor Amenity Spaces

To maximise the use of private residential amenity spaces during spring, summer and fall, shadow impacts from proposed developments should not exceed one hour in duration on areas such as private rear yards, decks, patios and pools of surrounding residential dwellings on each of the following dates:

- **June 21**
- **September 21** (Mar. 21 shadow patterns are similar but occur 14 minutes later)

This criterion is met if there is shadow impact for no more than **two consecutive hourly test times** within the space between the exterior wall of the dwelling that abuts the amenity space and the line of impact assessment ("No Impact Zone").

The line of impact assessment shall be a line **7.5m** minimum from the rear wall or other appropriate exterior building wall of the dwelling that abuts the private amenity space. See Fig. 2 and 3.

New shadows shall not result in less than 2 hours of direct sunlight. Where less than 2 hours of sunlight already exists within the "No Impact Zone", no new shade may be added.

Balconies are not considered "residential private outdoor amenity spaces" unless they are the only outdoor living area available to the dwelling unit, are unenclosed, and project **4m** or more from the exterior wall of the building.
Ensure Adequate sunlight on the following:

2. Communal outdoor amenity areas including, children’s play areas, school yards, tot lots, and park features such as sandboxes, wading pools etc., and outdoor amenity areas used by seniors and those associated with commercial and employment areas during spring, summer, fall and winter.

Shadows from proposed developments should allow for full sun on the above places at least half the time, or 50% sun coverage all the time, on each of the following dates:

- June 21
- September 21
- December 21

This criterion is met if the “sun access factor” is at least 50% or 0.5 on each of the test dates \( \frac{A_{S(ave)}}{A_T} = 0.5 \) or more

See 2a for Calculation of Sun Access Factor

This criterion applies to public amenity areas and common outdoor amenity areas that are part of a proposed or existing development.

3. Public realm including sidewalks, open spaces, parks and plazas to maximize their use during the shoulder seasons (spring and fall)

a) Low and Medium Density Residential streets

Developments should be designed to allow full sunlight on the opposite boulevard including the full width of the sidewalk on September 21 as follows:

For a total of at least 4 hours between 9:12 a.m. and 11:12 a.m. and between 3:12 p.m. and 5:12 p.m.

This criterion is met if there is no incremental shade from the proposed development at 9:12 a.m., 10:12 a.m. and 11:12 a.m., and at 3:12 p.m., 4:12 p.m. and 5:12 p.m.
See Fig. 4, 5, 6 and Table 1.
b) Mixed Use, Commercial, Employment and High Density Residential streets

Developments should be designed to allow full sunlight on the opposite boulevard including the full width of the sidewalk on September 21 as follows:

For a total of at least 5 hours that must include the 2 hour period between 12:12 p.m. and 2:12 p.m., and an additional 2 hour period from either 9:12 a.m. to 11:12 a.m. or from 3:12 p.m. to 5:12 p.m.

This criterion is met if there is no incremental shade from the proposed development at 12:12 p.m., 1:12 p.m. and 2:12 p.m., and three consecutive times either 9:12 a.m., 10:12 a.m. and 11:12 a.m. or 3:12 p.m., 4:12 p.m. and 5:12 p.m.

See Fig. 4, 5, 6 and Table 1 for angular planes that will achieve this criterion for Hurontario Street, Eglinton Avenue and streets with a similar alignment.

c) Public Open Spaces, parks and Plazas

Developments should be designed to provide a sun access factor of at least 50% on public open spaces, parks and plazas on September 21.

See 2a for calculating Sun Access Factor

Please note the following:

- Solar Noon in Mississauga on September 21 is 1:12 p.m.
- Shadow Patterns for September 21 and March 21 are similar
- Criteria for September 21 are deemed to apply to March 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Criterion 3a Low and Medium Density Residential Streets</th>
<th>Criterion 3b Mixed use, Commercial, Employment and High Density Residential Streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Angular Plane</td>
<td>Maximum Angular Plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglinton Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed building on north side of Eglinton Ave.</td>
<td>38.6 degrees</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed building on south side of Eglinton Ave.</td>
<td>22.7 degrees</td>
<td>48.9 degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurontario Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed building on west side of Hurontario Street</td>
<td>23.4 degrees</td>
<td>47.4 degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed building on east side of Hurontario Street</td>
<td>44.6 degrees</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1. Angular planes given above apply to the alignment of Eglinton Avenue and Hurontario Street and streets with equivalent orientation.
2. Angular planes are measured from the closest edge of the opposite curb (see Fig.5).
3. Angular planes are measured beginning at grade.
4. Angular planes are measured perpendicular to the street.
5. See Figures 4, 5, 6 for graphical representations of the angular plane limits.
FIG. 4: MAX. ALLOWABLE ANG. PLANES TO PROTECT OPPOSITE BOULEVARDS AND SIDEWALKS

Criterion 3a
low and medium density residential streets

Criterion 3b
mixed use, commercial, employment and high density residential areas with pedestrian traffic

ANGULAR PLANE SECTION VIEWS

Criterion 3a
Closest edge of curb on opposite side of street

Criterion 3b
Closest edge of curb on opposite side of street

FIG. 5: EGLINTON AVENUE

Criterion 3a
low and medium density residential streets

Criterion 3b
mixed use, commercial, employment and high density residential areas with pedestrian traffic

FIG. 6: HURONTARIO STREET
Ensure Adequate sunlight on the following:

4. Turf and flower gardens in public parks

Proposed developments should allow for adequate sunlight during the growing season from March to October by allowing for a minimum of **6 hours of direct sunlight on September 21**.

This criterion is met if full sun is provided on any **7 test times** on September 21, from 1.5 hours after sunrise to 1.5 hours before sunset.

5. Building faces to allow for the possibility of using solar energy

Shadow impacts from proposed developments should not exceed **one hour** in duration on the roofs, front, rear and exterior side walls of adjacent low-rise (one to four storeys) residential buildings including townhouses, detached and semi-detached dwellings on **September 21**.

The line of impact assessment shall be a line at grade, 3m from the front, rear and exterior side wall of the adjacent low-rise residential building.

This criterion is met if there is shadow impact for no more than **two consecutive hourly test times** in the “No Impact Zone” i.e. the space between the front, rear and exterior side walls of the adjacent low-rise residential buildings and the respective lines of impact assessment.

See Fig. 7 and 8

Incremental shadows do not necessarily represent adverse or undue impacts, and each proposal will be assessed on its own merits.
Material to be submitted with Development Application:

1. Complete set of shadow drawings for the dates and times shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4: Mississauga Sun Angle data, from 1.5 hours after sunrise to 1.5 hours before sunset

2. Base mapping must include a minimum coverage area as follows:
   a) 4.0 times the building height to the north, east and west
   b) 1.5 times the building height to the south

3. Shadow drawings may be based on 2D mapping or air photos showing shadows from only the proposal, or they may be based on 3D mapping and include shadows from the proposed building and all buildings within the coverage area.

4. Shadow drawings shall include the following:
   a) North Arrow and scale bar
   b) Reference bearing for at least one street adjacent to the subject site
   c) A scale suitable to show the entire shadow coverage area
   d) Existing and incremental shadows differentiated by hatching or colour
   e) Approved but not yet constructed buildings identified in contrasting colour.
   f) The name of the individual who has prepared the shadow drawings

5. Shadow drawings must be submitted with a written analysis which shall include the following information:
   a) Confirmation of site latitude and longitude used in shadow drawings
   b) A statement describing how astronomic north was determined
   c) Origin/source of base plan
   d) Description of all locations/uses of areas not meeting the shadow impact criteria (include a key plan for reference)
   e) Quantification and assessment of the impact in the areas listed in 5(d)
   f) Summary outlining how the shadow impact criteria have been met and describing any mitigating features that have been incorporated into the site and building design

6) The shadow drawings and reports shall be prepared by individuals qualified and/or experienced in this field.

Additional study times and analyses may be required to properly determine the degree of impact.

The intent and objectives of the Standards For Shadow Studies are as interpreted by the Development and Design Division of the Planning and Building Department.
## TABLE 2: MISSISSAUGA SUN ANGLE DATA (JUNE 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE: JUNE 21</th>
<th>SHADOW DIRECTION AND LENGTH</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Az (deg)</strong></td>
<td><strong>SLF (ratio length/height)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL TIME EDT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:37</td>
<td>235.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:07</td>
<td>250.48</td>
<td>4.1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>252.58</td>
<td>3.5045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>262.02</td>
<td>2.0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>272.04</td>
<td>1.3106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>283.79</td>
<td>0.8976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>299.52</td>
<td>0.6203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>323.67</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.3670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20</td>
<td>36.32</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>60.47</td>
<td>0.6203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:20</td>
<td>76.21</td>
<td>0.8975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:20</td>
<td>87.96</td>
<td>1.3105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:20</td>
<td>97.98</td>
<td>2.0047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:20</td>
<td>107.42</td>
<td>3.5042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:33</td>
<td>109.41</td>
<td>4.0852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:03</td>
<td>124.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3: MISSISSAUGA SUN ANGLE DATA (SEPT. 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE: SEPTEMBER 21</th>
<th>Az (deg)</th>
<th>SLF (ratio length/height)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TIME EDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:05</td>
<td>268.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35</td>
<td>284.22</td>
<td>3.6329</td>
<td>Rise + 1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:12</td>
<td>291.23</td>
<td>2.5132</td>
<td>SN - 4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>304.14</td>
<td>1.6445</td>
<td>SN - 3 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12</td>
<td>319.68</td>
<td>1.2181</td>
<td>SN - 2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:12</td>
<td>338.54</td>
<td>1.0011</td>
<td>SN - 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9329</td>
<td>Solar Noon (SN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:12</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>1.0022</td>
<td>SN + 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>40.28</td>
<td>1.2205</td>
<td>SN + 2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:12</td>
<td>55.79</td>
<td>1.6495</td>
<td>SN + 3 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:12</td>
<td>68.68</td>
<td>2.5255</td>
<td>SN + 4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:48</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>3.6493</td>
<td>Set - 1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:18</td>
<td>91.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE: DECEMBER 21</td>
<td>LOCAL TIME EST</td>
<td>SHADOW DIRECTION AND LENGTH</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Az (deg)</td>
<td>SLF (ratio length/height)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:49</td>
<td>302.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:19</td>
<td>319.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:17</td>
<td>331.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:17</td>
<td>345.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:17</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>41.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>57.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.
Antivirus-built environment: Lessons learned from Covid-19 pandemic

Naglaa A. Megahed\textsuperscript{a,*}, Ehab M. Ghoneim\textsuperscript{b}

\textsuperscript{a} Professor, Architectural and Urban Planning Department, Faculty of Engineering, Port Said University, Egypt
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\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

Before developing medications for an epidemic, one solution is to go back to the physical and built environment to reduce its impact. Epidemics have transformed our built environment because of the fear of infection. Consequently, architecture and urbanism after the Covid-19 epidemic will never be the same. Although the current global pandemic poses a challenge at all levels in the built environment, it will take time to develop an antivirus-enabled paradigm to reduce the potential risks or stop the virus from spreading. This study imagines what the antivirus-built environment looks like based on the lessons learned and the importance of designing a healthy and sustainable built environment. Many unanswered questions require further interdisciplinary studies. We aim to search for answers and learn from this forced experiment to add additional security layers to overcome future virus-like attacks.

1. Introduction

COVID-19 affects physical health most directly and has alarming implications for emotional and social functioning, the coronavirus has proven that a disaster doesn’t fight with a known opponent. The enemy can simply be invisible with devastating consequences (Goniewicz et al., 2020; Pfefferbaum & North, 2020). The real world is fragile, and this virus is frighteningly causing massive disruptions across the globe (Budks, 2020; Sandel, Rawlini, & Hussen, 2020). Moreover, the digital world is fragile regarding cyberattacks. This could be a teachable moment to apply lessons from the cybersecurity world to protect our built environment during the COVID-19 pandemic. The coronavirus is quickly spreading and causes significant damage, mimicking the spread of computer viruses within a network (Kindervag, 2020). In the digital world, it is common practice to design and incorporate solutions that can help overcome virus attacks; for every new generation, a new security layer is added to ensure the ever-mutating computer viruses do not harm the digital structure (Ahtefeldt, 2020). Could policymakers, planners, and architects inspired by the digital world learn from its cybersecurity to make our built environment more resistant to the virus? Could we design and build our cities to stop the virus from spreading? If so, could we install an antivirus-built environment ready to help in the protection from coronavirus or other pandemics?

Infectious disease has already transformed our places through architecture, design, and urban planning. Previously, many trends in architecture and urbanism that we see today were derived from similar measures taken before to ensure the health, hygiene, and comfort of urban residents. Our built environment has always exhibited the capacity to evolve after the crisis (Chang, 2020; Dejleri, 2020; Muggah & Ermacara, 2020). This study encourages the search for suitable design ideas, trends, and planning theories to provide the required protection from virus attacks and continue to add more layers in the defense system of our built environment. To cope with this pandemic, professionals in architecture, urban planning sectors, and design agencies have already switched their focus to visualize the post-pandemic era. However, there is inadequate research conducted to imagine how the antivirus-built environment would look. To address this gap, this study reviews architecture and urban story developments from the past centuries. We then review research areas affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and highlight their related questions. We then analyze the social distancing and quarantine as a design problem in the post-pandemic era. Subsequently, some lessons learned from the pandemic are presented to visualize and introduce the study’s vision about the antivirus-built environment.

2. Historical background: dramatic change developments

During pandemics, the form has always followed the fear of infection, just as much as the function (Ellin, 1999). From interiors to city planning, our built environment is shaped by diseases. Previously, to minimize the risk of infectious diseases, people redesigned interior design, architecture, cities, and infrastructure. Considering historical
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2.1. Urban renewal

In the 14th century, the bubonic plague motivated the fundamental urban improvements of the Renaissance. Cities cleared overcrowded living quarters, expanded their margins, developed early quarantine facilities, and opened large public spaces. In the 20th century, infectious disease was one of the drivers of urban renewal. Modernist architects saw design as a cure to the sickness of overcrowded cities, where tuberculosis, typhoid, polio, and Spanish flu breakouts encouraged urban planning, slum clearance, tenement reform, and waste management (Chang, 2020; Lubell, 2020).

2.2. Sanitary reform

During the industrial era, cholera and typhoid influenced the sanitary reform movement. These epidemics contributed to developing water and sewage systems to fight the pathogens, eventually leading to a sanitary innovation and required the streets to be straighter, smoother, and wider to install underground pipe systems. Furthermore, the third plague pandemic in 1855 changed the design of everything from drainpipes to door thresholds and building foundations (Budds, 2020; Klaus, 2020; Wainwright, 2020).

2.3. Building and housing reform

The wipe-clean esthetic of modernism can be partially attributed to tuberculosis. The modern architectural designs were inspired by an era of purity of form, strict geometries, modern materials, and a rejection of ornamentation. Modernist architects designed these curative environments as cleansed (physically and symbolically) from disease and pollution. Beyond their esthetic appeal, these features embodied modernist preoccupations with the healing effects of light, air, and nature. These buildings included large windows, balconies, flat surfaces that would not collect dust, and white paint, emphasizing the appearance of cleanliness (Budds, 2020; Chang, 2020). Against this background, the current health crisis should develop our built environment to increase the security layers that help to prevent the spread of infections and diseases. In this context, there are multiple areas of research needed regarding COVID-19.

3. Research areas and questions

When the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the fast-spreading COVID-19 as a pandemic, citizens around the globe hastened to go home. This global pandemic significantly influenced our personal and professional lives and has a direct bearing upon the very foundations of urban planning and architecture theory and practice (Allam & Jones, 2020; Haleem, Javaid, Vaishya, & Deshmukh, 2020; Saadat et al., 2020). Consequently, the pandemic has led to questions of how architects and planners could present and install antivirus-related ideas or update the existing spaces, as well as at what stage can the pandemic affect our physical and built environment. To extend the scope of research needed from the academic community, Table 1 reviews certain required research areas affected by COVID-19 and highlights their related questions. Professional and extensive research is required on all levels and scales in these areas to prevent the virus from spreading. The answers to these questions could help in predicting the post-pandemic style and visualizing the required antivirus system.

4. Social distancing and quarantine as a design problem

In the absence of a specific vaccine to the coronavirus, physical distancing and the lockdown of the population are among the most immediate and precautionary measures to be taken. The WHO introduced these measures, which were practiced at both institutional and individual levels to become a universal mainstream strategy (Hishan, Ramakrishnan, Qureshi, Khan, & Al-Kumaim, 2020; Salama, 2020).

4.1. Potential transmission dynamics of COVID-19

Since most humans spend most of their daily lives inside the built environment, it is essential to understand the potential transmission dynamics of infection. As individuals move through the built environment, COVID-19 can be transmitted both by air and via direct and indirect contact. Viral particles can be directly deposited on surfaces or suspended due to natural and mechanical airflow patterns, or other sources of turbulence in the indoor environment (Cirrincione et al., 2020; Dietz et al., 2020; Horve et al., 2020). The WHO has prescribed maintaining an inter-personal distance of 1.5 or 2 m (about 6 feet) to minimize the risk of infection. However, more recently published studies support the hypothesis of virus transmission over 2 m from an infected person (Bourouiba, 2020; Setti et al., 2020). In addition, Oklahoma State University researchers simulated different environmental and movement conditions to see if a six-foot social distancing policy is enough. Their results indicate this policy is enough if the ambient air is static (Oklahoma State University, 2020). Other factors and wearing protective clothes affect the transmission dynamics of infection. However, WHO is continuously changing and updating all the mentioned distances based on the latest information and researches conducted by professionals.

4.2. Design problem and challenges

Based on the potential transmission dynamics of COVID-19 and the required measures, several competitions, conferences, and leagues have been cancelled or postponed. The coronavirus has motivated authorities to restrict access to most public spaces and large shopping areas. This pandemic could fundamentally change the way they operate in the future and requires further analysis (Honey-Roses et al., 2020). Architects, planners, and built environment professionals are keen to examine many social and spatial implications to generate new patterns and configurations of use (Paital, 2020; Salama, 2020). Architectural and urban spaces, as they relate to infectious disease epidemics, are not only about quarantine based on immediate and precautionary measures but also refer to design and planning problems and challenges in all building types and urban spaces as illustrated in Fig. 1. The pandemic of COVID-19 has caused serious consequences that can be an opportunity to review individual and collective choices and priorities. Most architecture today shows evidence of how humans have responded to infectious diseases by redesigning our physical spaces. Thus, social distancing could change the design and planning process (Budds, 2020; Chang, 2020), specifically with the increased acceptance of distance learning, online shopping, and the cultural connection of online entertainment. The use of media for information sharing, and webinars for sharing knowledge and expertise have seen widespread adoption during the COVID19 pandemic (Chick et al., 2020; Goniwicz et al., 2020). Although new technologies can create additional difficulties, opportunities have emerged to apply innovative solutions to more smart and virtual world applications in the built environment. When we increasingly work from a remote location, learn and upgrade skills online and shop for necessities from e-commerce sites, we reduce the need of traditional physical spaces by virtual digital ones which can be accessed from smart devices (Goniwicz et al., 2020; Hishan et al., 2020; Papu & Pal, 2020). According to the affected lifestyles, the increased reliance on digital channels in the built environment may endure long after the pandemic and affect in every design and urban aspects. Humanity is facing a global crisis, perhaps the greatest of our generation. Many measures adopted during the emergency will become part of daily life,
changing habits, and behaviors, they may be a positive or negative intervention in architecture and urban planning approaches.

While there are many potential impacts of COVID-19 on built environment, our focus in the following points is on how post-architecture may change. Although social distancing and quarantine measures are extensively adopted as the first preventive measure, other factors increase the risk of contracting the virus, as discussed below.

**Population density.** In our current health crisis, certain densely populated cities have proved to be particularly vulnerable to the risk of infection (Chang, 2020).

**Household size.** A big household, large, or extended families will have a higher chance to bring the virus home (Saadat et al., 2020). This will need special consideration in design solutions to prevent infection.

**Social distancing level.** Working from home might reduce social contact but is only available to some people focused on jobs linked to a higher socioeconomic status. Moreover, stay-at-home regulations would be more than a challenge for those who live in smaller and crowded houses or without outside spaces (Saadat et al., 2020).

**Shared facilities.** Shared housing includes a broad range of settings with special considerations. People living and working in this type of building might have challenges with social distancing to prevent the spread of COVID-19 (CDC, 2020).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Research Areas</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-pandemic urbanism</td>
<td>• Digital transformation and telecommuting</td>
<td>• The COVID-19 crisis has changed the face of many of our cities and questioned how we should manage urban life in the wake of a pandemic. Would the pandemic inspire more urban improvements? Can we design cities that reduce infections? Would the post-pandemic era generate new urbanism based on social distancing? More specifically, could COVID-19 be a catalyst for decentralization and walkable cities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Centralization and decentralization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Density of cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Walking, cycling, and public transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-pandemic public spaces</td>
<td>• Design, use and perceptions</td>
<td>• There is no doubt about how COVID-19 will impact future public buildings and spaces. However, how long will these impact and reflection last for future? What about their furniture materials, shared facilities and services? What is the future of commercial buildings? Can air-conditioned shopping malls continue? Will the pandemic teach us new lessons to incorporate into our public buildings and spaces designs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Design and disease transmission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Street design and furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shared facilities and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flexibility and transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-pandemic housing</td>
<td>• Housing layout</td>
<td>• What is the future of our houses? Should they adapt to better accommodate workspaces? Should they be self-sufficient? Should our terraces, balconies, and roofs be planted? More specifically, could COVID-19 be a catalyst for healthy housing and sustainable buildings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Space and density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shelter and safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Indoor air quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-pandemic office space</td>
<td>• Layout and design solutions</td>
<td>• What is the future of co-working spaces and open-plan offices? Could COVID-19 alter their design? Would they need new design criteria? What is the future of high-rise buildings? Can skyscrapers continue? What happens when nobody wants to use elevators?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working and waiting spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shared facilities and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Density in offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and construction technology</td>
<td>• Modular construction</td>
<td>• What is the future of construction strategy? Could COVID-19 alter its techniques? Should we adopt a more modular construction strategy? If so, will the future witness more prefabricating and standardized components? Could the pandemic speed up the digitalization and automation of our cities? Will our smart devices control everything around us?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prefabricating standardized components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lightweight and adaptable structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Artificial intelligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2. Post-pandemic office space

Remote working consists of a relatively new mode of alternative work arrangements developed in the 1970s. Several firms have been adapting their measures as the spread of Covid-19 increases (Belzunegui-Eraso & Erro-Garcés, 2020; Papu & Pal, 2020). Even firms that were resistant to the concept of remote working have been forced to allow working from home. However, working from home all the time is not for everyone; many will want to return to their physical offices. As the pandemic continues or remote working becomes the new norm, office space might have to be altered to create greater spacing and fewer seating options (Marr, 2020; Molla, 2020). Based on this transformation, the density in offices might probably change and firms will not need more space because of work from home policies. Consequently, high-rise buildings would become more expensive to build and become less efficient. Depending on how productive remote work proves to be in this pandemic, it is hastening the shift from structured office environments to more flexible, virtual, and home-based work arrangements, which could mean a reversal of the open-office trend and the search for better other natural ventilation and healthy design options (Altar, 2020; Muggah & Ermacora, 2020). Regarding cleaning policies, certain firms could even use ultraviolet germicidal irradiation to deeply disinfect offices at night or meeting rooms between uses; a practice that is increasingly common in hospitals to combat the spread of infection (Beggs et al., 2000; Kovach et al., 2017; Molla, 2020).

5. An opportunity to reset and reshape our built environment

While it is uncertain how much change will follow COVID-19, mechanisms increasing its spread will not be forgotten or ignored (Priday, 2020). The pandemic has highlighted the lack of how we manage our built environment and presented certain lessons from this forced experiment. In this context, how should architects, planners, and policymakers react and learn? Beyond helping to design medical spaces limiting the spread of infections (Acuto, 2020; Betsky, 2020), the pandemic will allow them to reset and reshape our built environment. However, the time to reset and reshape our built environment is now, and not after the next pandemic. This study analyzes the lessons learned based on two approaches, namely, look step back to nature and look step forward to advanced technology.

5.1. Look step back to nature

A key lesson that we are going to learn is the requirement to return to nature with its healing effects. Although the situation is still unfolding, the COVID-19 pandemic has already highlighted the importance of certain design concepts and reassessed fundamental assumptions in urban and architecture approaches.

5.1.1. Urban approaches

To accommodate work from home situations, we could even reexamine old urban typologies. Many urban approaches might increase the protection and defense system of our cities and avoid high density and overcrowding. Policymakers and planners should use the current crisis to review planning theories and, based on the results, they should take a step back in searching about how past cities are structured.

Expanding horizontally. During a pandemic, the human proximity of heavily populated cities poses further risks. The larger the population, the higher the concentration of COVID-19 in cities. Regarding the impact of social distancing, planners and architects might design according to expanding horizontally approaches with more available open spaces, which could be essential to prevent the spread of infections and diseases (Liu, 2020; Novakovic, 2020).

Fewer density cities. Because social distancing measures are essential to the containment effort, some have blamed the density of cities for the rapid spread of the infection and considered suburbs to be the safest places. Urbanization might take a step back to enhance villages and city suburbs, particularly with the increased acceptance of digital transformation (Makhno, 2020; Nicola et al., 2020; Wainwright, 2020). However, the impacts of higher density on social interactions and sustainability are still controversial issues (Mousavinia, Pourdehimi, & Madani, 2019).

Decentralization. The pandemic highlights the importance of distributing smaller units such as health facilities, schools, and services across more of the urban tissue and strengthen local centers (Altar, 2020; Wainwright, 2020). As more and more e-commerce models, the shopping malls may eventually lose their aspirational value, we would have to remodel traditional market in mixed use neighborhoods (Papu & Pal, 2020). In addition, the decentralized network of smaller green spaces will make it easier for residents to breathe nature that has important physical and mental health benefits (Velarde, Fry, & Tveit, 2007). Decentralization approach could probably encourage horizontal expansion, requiring a review of planning theories to maintain sustainable development and adequate city planning (Madanipour, 2001; Taylor, 2000).

Urban farming. The notion of a self-sufficient community is the answer to protect the environment and ecological systems (Ali, Dom, & Sahrum, 2012; Martinez et al., 2010; Priday, 2020; Tait, 2003). It is urgent to rethink how land is used with landscapes and urban farming integrated approaches (Proksch, 2017). Urban farming has been recently growing, strengthening self-sustaining communities to become more resilient to the epidemic. Farming could improve food security...
Table 2
Construction strategies used in healthcare systems during the pandemic. The authors after (Allam & Jones, 2020; CNA, 2020; Constable, 2020; Hatcher, 2020; Lubell, 2020; McGinn, 2020).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modular construction</td>
<td>Vic hospital, Melbourne, Australia</td>
<td>A semi-permanent resuscitation unit has been built at the hospital. The unit comprising a prefabricated semi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leishenshan hospital, Wuhan, China</td>
<td>containerized two-story COVID-19 specific-purpose hospital in its car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURA prototype, Milan, Italy</td>
<td>A 1,600-bed hospital constructed on a parking lot from prefabricated modules placed into steel skeletons above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>concrete foundations. Italian architect and professor designed intensive-care pods within a shipping container called CURA. The pods connected by inflatable corridors and fitted with biocontainment systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive reuse</td>
<td>Temporary hospital, Javits Center, New York</td>
<td>New York City's Javits Convention Center turned into a 2,910-bed temporary field hospital for COVID-19 patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Nightingale Hospital, London, UK</td>
<td>Excel Exhibition Centre turned into a 500-bed hospital equipped with ventilators and oxygen with the capacity increased to fight COVID-19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightweight architecture</td>
<td>Inflatable emergency hospital, Pachuca, Mexico</td>
<td>The hospital designed to be the quickest response to an immediate care center. A 1,000-square-meter structure prepared to see up to 80 COVID-19 patients daily. The hospital sets up two outdoor tents to prep for possible influx of COVID-19 patients which employed as triage and emergency room extensions, waiting and treatment areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCSF Medical Center, San Francisco Bay, USA</td>
<td>The hospital sets up two outdoor tents to prep for possible influx of COVID-19 patients which employed as triage and emergency room extensions, waiting and treatment areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fewer cars, more cycling, and walking. One of the key lessons that we are going to learn is having a network of cycling and walkable streets. Walking, as a primary mode of transportation and physical activity, has proven both environmentally friendly and beneficial for residents’ physical and mental health (Dreessen, 2020; Zhou, He, Cai, Wang, & Su, 2019). In the fight against infection and maintaining social distancing, cities should offer more safe paths and small roads for walking and micro-mobility than depending only on mass public transportation. While considered a good environmental solution to reduce pollution, public transportation is not ideal during a pandemic as it might contribute to the spread of diseases among users (Campisi, Acampa, Marino, & Tesoriere, 2020; Constable, 2020; Gonzalez, 2020; Musselwhite, Avineri, & Susilo, 2020). The pandemic has emphasized that efficient multi-modal transport is more robust and thus essential to sustainable growth. No single mode of transport is in the long run superior (Capolongo et al., 2020; Hishan et al., 2020). Streets might need to be re-designed to meet multi-modal transport needs, which succeed in transforming streets to become healthier, safer, greener, and more livable (Honey-Roses et al., 2020).

5.1.2. Architecture approaches

Previously, many architecture approaches were related and increased the healthy spaces of our buildings and enhanced sustainability.

Self-efficient strategies. In future, a high priority will be placed on self-sufficient buildings and lifestyles (Ali et al., 2012; Greer, 2009; Friday, 2020). In addition to all the energy-efficient strategies with heating and cooling systems, architects might inspire additional methods of thinking concerning water supply and food production.

Refoocusing on green spaces. We require physical interaction with living plants for our mental health, and to grow what we eat to reduce risk, specifically during self-isolation (Constable, 2020; Makhno, 2020). Consequently, planting our gardens, terraces, and implementing green roof systems have multiple advantages for sustainability (Hui, 2011; Specht et al., 2014; Thomaier et al., 2015) and can solve most of the self-isolation problems. The challenge for the roofs is to consider them as the buildings’ fifth façade to be the place of green roofs. However, during the design process, green roofs designed for food production might require additional calculations and requirements (Abd-Elhafeez, Elmokadem, Megahed, & El-Gheznawy, 2016; El-Gheznawy, 2016).

Low-rise buildings. High-rise buildings were designed to organize as many people as possible in one place. During a pandemic, it is necessary to reduce contact with everything in multi-story buildings such as elevators, elevator buttons, door handles, and surfaces (Capolongo et al., 2020; Makhno, 2020). This new fear of infection and fear of being trapped in the elevator should take future consideration in post-pandemic architecture with other psychosocial problems.

Better air quality. After forced self-isolation and spending more time indoors, an approach to improving health through strategies such as greater natural light, improved ventilation, fewer toxic substances, and incorporating plants and other natural materials is necessary (Constable, 2020; Lubell, 2020). In this context, it is critical to design buildings with skylights, large windows, rooftop terraces, balconies, and court yards to avoid sick-building syndrome and enhance air quality (Guy & Farmer, 2001; Roaf, Crichton, & Nicol, 2010).

5.2. Look step forward to advanced technology

To receive the maximum benefits from the previous approaches, the antivirus-enabled paradigm requires advanced technology in the construction sector and a tool to quicken the pace of digital transformation. This approach requires using techniques outside the mainstream to secure our built environment by running alternatives, exploring, and inspiring new ways of constructing more sustainable and safe buildings.

5.2.1. Construction strategy

The post-pandemic emphasizes the importance of look step forward of the innovations in construction techniques that speed the creation of emergency architecture.

The COVID-19 pandemic represents an unprecedented challenge for healthcare systems internationally. Medical facilities and their human resources are usually overwhelmed (Robbins et al., 2020; Scarfone et al., 2011). The sheer scale of the pandemic puts enormous stress, most countries built field and temporary hospitals in a matter of a few weeks or reused other building types and spaces in a matter of days. Table 2 reviews the most construction strategies used in constructed additional healthcare systems to prevent further COVID-19 infection.

Modular construction. Increasingly popular before COVID-19, the modular construction strategy is effective to face pandemics or natural disasters and to create less expensive and more quickly constructed buildings (Smith & Quale, 2017). It is important for meeting health services’ diverse requirements with prefabricated standardized components. These components could help buildings adapt to requirements or enlarge their spaces for treatment and quarantine (Hatcher, 2020).

Adaptive reuse. This strategy is a sensitive and sustainable approach to create emergency facilities. During a pandemic, sports...
facilities, parking lots, and other buildings are converting into medical facilities and temporary hospitals. There will be a requirement for more efficient, effective, and flexible reuse plans for future crises (Lubell, 2020). This strategy is beneficial when integrated with other advanced technologies in the construction sector.

**Lightweight and adaptable structures.** When responding to the pandemic, lightweight and adaptable structures are often preferable for their speed and portability. Designers are developing and assembling these temporary structures to create field hospitals that can be easily transported and erected for COVID-19 patients (Constable, 2020; Lubell, 2020).

**Hygienic building materials.** There will be a special effort to consider and think about every possible place within the built environment touched by people and the possibility of that being a source of infections. Like the modernists who rejected ornament in service of hygiene, contemporary designers are likely to use hygienic and antibacterial materials that can be easily sanitized (Kashdan, 2020; Molla, 2020). Post-pandemic architecture might apply more cleaning strategies based on new technologies. For applying a strategy based on nanotechnology, we should consider other potential risks associated with nanomaterials (Megahed, 2013).

5.2.2. Digital transformation

The global pandemic has forced us into an entirely new world and has increased digital transformation in all our activities. After the crisis, we will have entered a new digital normal. In a few months, the pandemic has offered virtual and augmented reality alternatives, which are expected to continuously increase (Gracy, 2020; Muggah & Ermacora, 2020).

**Ability to work from home.** As a lesson learned, this pandemic brought to light the possible reduction of air pollutant emissions by increasing expand remote working. During the quarantine, most people have been forced to work from home (Nakada & Urban, 2020). More consideration will be given to the arrangement of the workplace at home. The spatial organization will change. It will be a separate room with large windows, blackout curtains, and comfortable furniture. It will be technically equipped, and sound insulated (Allam & Jones, 2020; Capolongo et al., 2020). While working from home is a benefit many employees value and reduces pollution, the long-term impact is unclear and requires further investigation.

**Artificial intelligence and touchless technologies.** Automation, voice technology, and facial recognition-based in artificial intelligence could influence post-pandemic architecture. With 80 % of infectious diseases transmitted by touching polluted surfaces, touchless technology could become a new interface and remove the requirement for physically pushing or touching a surface. Post-pandemic principles search for more contactless pathways, such as lifts being called from a smartphone, avoiding the need to press any buttons, and doors to open automatically (Molla, 2020; Wainwright, 2020). These technologies could include other programs to both control space temperature and automatically clean it to kill harmful organisms, viruses, and bacteria. Although there is an added cost, it might be an amenity that will gain popularity to be integrated into future buildings (Kashdan, 2020; Makkno, 2020).

6. Discussion: antivirus-built environment

One positive impact of the current pandemic is the time it offers to the built environment professionals to reflect on past events and learn what can be improved for future responses (Geniewicz et al., 2020). Although pandemics have long been catastrophic, they have forced architecture and city planning to cope with it. Covid-19 might have similar effects on architecture and urban planning developments (Budds, 2020; Chang, 2020; Saadat et al., 2020). Life after the pandemic will never be the same; values, lives, and habits will change, and our architecture will change under that influence. In all these circumstances, we might enter a completely post-pandemic style in which form follows fear of infection. Cities are currently being tested to the extreme with the pandemic and multiple questions are arising in terms of how cities are planned and managed. Its impact is showing the extent to which each city can function, or not, especially during times of crisis (Lubell, 2020; Wahba & Vapaavuori, 2020). Our built environment is not designed or built to effectively help limit the effects of pandemics, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. However, we are learning fast and there are already lessons worth learning and remembering. The pandemic will not last forever, but our response to it will shape our future built environment (Ahlefeldt, 2020; Novakovic, 2020).

The significance of adding human health as one of the sustainability development goals can be seen through the current pandemic. From a conceptual perspective, adding human health as the fourth pillar to the overall definition of sustainability is a logical step (Hakovirta & Denuwara, 2020). Many architecture and urban approaches might increase the protection of our cities and avoid overcrowding. In normal times, there might be many attributes attempted by the built environment to achieve sustainability. The pandemic’s influence in the densest areas raises questions about sustainable development and fundamental assumptions of past theories. However, the future is still unclear; perhaps we hope to see a shift towards a greener, smarter, and a more sustainable built environment. Alternatively, distance communication and digital transformation could change our long-term habits and dramatically cut traffic and pollution. What if we harnessed telecommuting and digital city strategy as a way of social distancing and to help employees and citizens achieve work-life balance? Based on the feasibility of working continuing remotely after the pandemic passes, our cities might require fewer spaces for highways and parking lots. In this case, we could recover these spaces for use as safe cycling and walking networks. It sounds utopic but this vision might encourage people to take their bikes to work and give more space to pedestrians (Gonzalez, 2020; Muggah & Ermacora, 2020). Post-pandemic design and planning strategies must reflect this change. The right design and planning strategies now could help to position our built environment in the post-pandemic era. However, there are many other social effects beyond the pandemic; however, the long-term impact is unclear, requiring further studies. Let us hope we do not encounter this scenario; however, if it comes again, at least we can understand the risks and be better prepared in the prevention and quickly react in mitigation.

As shown from the lessons and the complexity of the pandemic, it is no longer safe to solely rely on a strategy to protect our architecture and urbanism. Instead, we must install an antivirus-built environment that incorporates a multi-layered approach of protection into its defense system. Architects and planners should design our built environment such as to stop the virus from spreading by creating an antivirus-enabled paradigm. This paradigm must improve new tools, options, and strategies that are more flexible, holistic, and responsive to better address the pandemic response at all levels and scales from interior design to city planning. Based on the lessons learned from this crisis, Fig. 2 shows the proposed vision about how nature and advanced technology approaches help in visualizing antivirus-built environments to stop the virus from spreading. However, selecting the best antivirus strategy depends on many factors, posing new challenges to choose that could be used or planned as long-term reforms. We must be proactive, not reactive, and continue to update this antivirus-enabled paradigm and install new approaches within its framework. Many questions still require further multidisciplinary studies. This study does not present answers; it originates insights for areas where future research will be critically required to update the proposed vision.

The proposed vision in this study does not have an expiration date, when the Covid-19 pandemic ended, most of healthy architecture and urban approaches could be applicable to the pandemics to come. We could imagine all housing buildings as self-sufficient, independent and healthy neighborhoods and making smart use of the available technologies. It is crucial to make urban areas more resilient to emergencies.
response, to face epidemics and other possible future emergencies of every kind.

7. Conclusion and outlook

There is no end in sight to the COVID-19 pandemic, but it has helped us predict what post-pandemic architecture and urbanism might look like. Although we are not going to overhaul how we have been building architecture and cities before, based on the current circumstances and emergency measures, we should review our design strategies and planning theories. We could more effectively use healthy design and planning strategies to face pandemics and create a less pullulated, more sustainable architecture, and urbanism in general. Moreover, if we harnessed the security layers not only to prevent ever-mutating virus attacks but a healing approach that could be implemented in the post-pandemic era, it could help build a sustainable environment. Therefore, is this transformation in our physical and built environment a temporary reaction or the new normal? With spread of the COVID-19 pandemic, additional questions will undoubtedly arise, and additional security layers should be added to update an antivirus-enabled paradigm. This study does not present answers; it only provides insights for areas where future research will be critically required to extend the scope of research required. Based on the lessons learned from this crisis, this study introduces a vision about the required antivirus-built environment that can be updated to stop the virus spreading or mitigate its impacts. However, selecting the best antivirus strategy depends on many factors such as the abilities and capabilities of each community and environment. The global pandemic has highlighted the limitations of how we manage our built environment regarding how we should design, build, and run our built environment; however, it has given us a chance to learn. Nevertheless, certain questions remain such as will we regard these unique lessons? If so, we should think more specifically about the benefits of this forced experimentation and implement further developments to select which could be used or planned as long-term reforms from a transformative viewpoint. In this context, the pandemic increased the requirement for policymakers, planners, and architects to think more out of the box, trying to reshape our physical spaces, and reset the existing build environment or develop more ideas to face future virus attacks. These changes give us a glimpse at how our cities could change for the better, and the worse, in the long-term. However, it is too early to judge how responses to COVID-19 will affect design and urbanism theories. These results call for urgent efforts to further explore our built environment and not wait for another pandemic to serve as a reminder. This approach must be parallel to other sustainable approaches embracing not impinging natural resources and not harming our environment. If we can manage that, our present architecture and cities will continue to serve us well. However, the post-pandemic era will see multiple challenges that require a better understanding of COVID-19 and its socioeconomic effects on society. The future remains uncertain and thus future multidisciplinary studies are required.
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Dear sir

There are many developments all along Mt. Seymour Parkway.

The number of vehicles using this major route is set to hugely increase.

What steps have been taken to ensure that the traffic levels are safe? Many children cross the parkway to get to school. Many elderly people walk along this route. Many people follow this route to get to and from work. The traffic volume will without doubt impact this community negatively.

Sincerely

Geraldine Gill
Dear Mayor and councillors,

I am alarmed that the idea of a town centre, the focus of development and densification in the Plan, has become so elastic that the Parkway is now a target. The proposal is too dense, too tall (in part) and wholly out of place. I say out of place because developments of this density are supposed to be "live, work, shop and walk". There are no jobs within walking distance. Any shops are found down steep hills either to the south or the west or a fair bit along the Parkway.

But of more concern is that the already woefully inadequate medical and ambulance services will be overburdened. There is a "clinic", a disgraceful imitation of a medical service at Superstore. Need treatment after banker's hours? Well you have to go to Lolo. Require an ambulance? You better hope that it is not rush hour. They come from Burnaby. Got a toothache? Well there are two dentists.

Those who celebrate density always focus on bars, restaurants and trolleys, never on essentials like doctors, dentists (there are two east of Seymour). These are never thought to be important parts of a "vibrant" communities.

Dennis Bevington (whose dentist is in Edgemont and who does not have a family doctor like many many in BC)
From: Elmira Nazar
Sent: December 15, 2020 8:08 PM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>
Subject: Seymour Estates- 904-944 Lytton Street Proposal

Dear Council,

I appreciate the public hearing in regards to Seymour Estates- 904-944 Lytton Street for the Proposed Multi-Family Residential Project. I want to start off by saying I grew up in the former development of the Seymour Estates and enjoyed the location as it was accessible to my school, to the corner store (now United Strangers), Ron Andrews Recreational Centre and Mount Seymour just to name a few. I now live in Blueridge. I love this area and it is my home. One of the main reasons I love it so much is the fact that it is not very busy and generally speaking I can get to most places I need to go to within 5 minutes of driving, or a 20 min bike ride.

I am against the proposed project at its current condition. I agree with development as the Seymour Estates I grew up in was old and required upgrading. But I don’t agree with the massively increased density. This will not only cause increased traffic, but also pollution and of course the battle for going over the Second Narrows bridge. What I am asking for in this hearing is a revised project proposal that considers this development for low density. In this area, we do not have high rises for a reason and the proposed project would be six stories, which is higher than what is available in the entire area at this time. I am not against the entire project, but I think a revision is required. With its current proposal, we as residence of Blueridge and Seymour will have to put into account our traffic time for a basic task, as a biker I have to consider the number of cars that will be speeding up Mount Seymour and breathing in the exhaust fumes and increasing my chances or getting hit by one.

I hope you consider these factors before making your final decision.

Thank you,

-Elmira Nazar
Blueridge Resident
Hello,

Please see attached my letter AGAINST the Seymour Estates Development proposal.

Sincerely,

Kayley Hollyer

Kayley Hollyer
BEnv, Resource and Environmental Management
Simon Fraser University
Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I stand firmly against the proposed Seymour Estates development.

I strongly support Councillor Muri’s idea that the Seymour Estates land should be swapped with the Ron Andrews DNV land, in order to promote community health and activities, alongside social housing.

The proposed development is too tall, would negatively impact current residents, is inharmonious with what exists today, and would disrupt future developments.

This proposal would increase the congested conditions of an already busy and high trafficked area. Currently, this part of the Seymour Parkway has many properties and these developments are causing a highly concentrated population, a large density of cars, lots of noise, and increased air pollution. A large development would cause these problems to increase.

The proposed development does not answer the needs of the current residents. These people need more green space, greater access to gyms and pools, and less noise. The proposal runs against residents’ requirements.

The proposed development does not respectfully follow what exists today. Currently the Seymour area is being developed at a high rate and this proposal is unacceptably higher again. The current upper development limit has already been drawn and if changed today, should be to decrease the rate of development.

If the Seymour Estates proposal is realized, its influence on future change in this area would be negative. New changes would be large and unattractive, and the quality of life we know today would decrease dramatically. I support Councillor Muri’s suggestion.

Thank you for your careful and respectful attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kayley Hollyer
Hello,

Please see attached my statement against the Seymour Estates Development proposal.

Sincerely,

Geoff Hollyer
December 15, 2020

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I stand firmly against the proposed Seymour Estates development and support Councillor Muri’s proposal.

The proposed development is too big, negatively impactful on current residents, inharmonious with what exists today, and would have a negative impact on future developments.

This proposal would make development in this busy area larger than it already is. Currently, this part of the Seymour Parkway has many properties that already house a large population, an important density of cars, lots of noise, and significant air pollution. Large development would cause these problems to increase.

What is being proposed does not answer the needs of the current residents. These people need more green space, greater access to gyms and pools, and less noise. The proposal runs against their requirements.

This proposed development does not respectfully build upon what exists today. Currently the Seymour area is being developed at a high rate and this proposal unacceptably increases this rate. The current high limit has already been drawn and if changed today should be in order to see the rate of development decrease.

If the Seymour Estates proposal is realized, its influence on change in this area would be very negative. The area would become very large, busy, noisy, and unattractive. The quality of life we know today would become less tomorrow.

I support Councillor Muri’s proposal to swap the Seymour Estates land with the DNV land in order to address the community issues of quality of life and development.

Thank you for your careful and respectful attention to this matter.

Geoff Hollyer
Dear DNV Council:

I have been listening in on the public hearing tonight and echo the views of Mr Slade and others particularly with regard to traffic on the parkway and through the exchange at highway 1. The increases in traffic should all be considered together. This is not a walkable neighbourhood so most new residents will most certainly have vehicles - likely 2 as the cost of living in this area requires 2 incomes. I am against this project as it is proposed.

Thank you for listening.

Michael Madill
Blueridge resident.
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Mayor and Councillors,

Please find attached, my input for tonight’s public hearing regarding the Seymour Estates planned development.

Sincerely,

Julie Hollyer

North Vancouver, B.C.
December 15, 2020

Public Hearing: AGAINST Seymour Estates

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I stand firmly against the proposed Seymour Estates development for the following reasons:

- Too high density: people, cars, noise, air pollution
- Buildings too tall
- Does not fit with other developments- lots of unpredictable change
- I Support Councillor Muri with idea of moving project to centralize development
- impact on future developments

The proposed development is too big, negatively impactful on current residents, inharmonious with what exists today, and would have a negative impact on future developments.

This proposal would make development in this busy area larger than it already is. Currently, this part of the Seymour Parkway has many properties and these developments are causing a highly concentrated population, a large density of cars, lots of noise, and increased air pollution. Large development would cause these problems to increase.

What is being proposed does not answer the needs of the current residents. These people need more green space, greater access to gyms and pools, and less noise. The proposal runs against their requirements.

This proposed development does not respectfully follow what exists today. Currently things are being developed at a high rate and this proposal is unacceptably higher again. The current high limit has already been drawn and if changed today should be in order to see the rate of development decrease.

If the Seymour Estates proposal is realized, its influence on future change in this area would be very negative. New changes would be very large and unattractive. The quality of life we know today would become less attractive tomorrow.

Thank you for your careful and respectful attention to this matter.

Julie Hollyer

North Vancouver, B.C.
Dear Mayor and Councillors,

My name is Khia Hollyer, and today is my 21st birthday. I am taking the time to write you because I strongly believe that going forwards with the Seymour Estates Development is a mistake. Doing so is not only sacrificing nature; it is taking away a forest beloved to Windsor students, and the community alike.

I cannot imagine North Vancouver without the Windridge forest. It has played a role at every stage of my life. When I was young and attending swimming lessons at Ron Andrews, I would frequently walk through the trails afterwards with my father. When I was in high school, the trails were my go-to destination for exercise, offering cool respite from the heat of open ground. As you probably know, the forest is an important rite of passage for any Windsor student, who must complete the 3km duke run through the forest! After suffering a spinal injury to my back, the trails provide a place to go walking that is gentle on my back, and close to home. On these trails I frequently bump into community members, and we exchange hellos and a smile. These may seem inconsequential, but they are invaluable to my quality of living.

Forests are not commodities. We cannot destroy forests when viable, economical, and environmental alternatives exist (such as Councillor Muri’s proposal.) As a resident of North Vancouver, I am disheartened to write that my local forest is thinning. Many say that it is a lost cause. While it may be, Windridge forest is not. The trees are lush with greenery, the foliage is thick. When you walk in Windridge, the air is fresh with that smell unique to forests; and it is cool against your cheek. You can also hear the birds in the trees. My mother and I frequently see piliated woodpeckers and eagles.

Mayor Muri and Councillors, please protect the quality of living of your residents, the environment, and the wildlife that depends on Windridge. Please choose Councillor Muri’s suggestion that the Seymour Estates land be swapped with the Ron Andrews DNV land.

Thank you,
Khia Hollyer

Bee Hollyer
Dartmouth College, Class of 2021
B.A. Candidate in Government
I cannot imagine North Vancouver without the Windridge forest. It has played a role at every stage of my life. When I was young and attending swimming lessons at Ron Andrews, I would frequently walk through the trails afterwards with my father. When I was in high school, the trails were my go-to destination for exercise, offering cool respite from the heat of open ground. As you probably know, the forest is an important rite of passage for any Windsor student, who must complete the 3km duke run through the forest! After suffering a spinal injury to my back, the trails provide a place to go walking that is gentle on my back, and close to home. On these trails I frequently bump into community members, and we exchange hellos and a smile. These may seem inconsequential, but they are invaluable to my quality of living.

Forests are not commodities. We cannot destroy forests when viable, economical, and environmental alternatives exist (such as Councillor Muri’s proposal.) As a resident of North Vancouver, I am disheartened to write that my local forest is thinning. Many say that it is a lost cause. While it may be, Windridge forest is not. The trees are lush with greenery, the foliage is thick. When you walk in Windridge, the air is fresh with that smell unique to forests; and it is cool against your cheek. You can also hear the birds in the trees. My mother and I frequently see piliated woodpeckers and eagles.

Mayor Muri and Councillors, please protect the quality of living of your residents, the environment, and the wildlife that depends on Windridge. Please choose Councillor Muri’s suggestion that the Seymour Estates land be swapped with the Ron Andrews DNV land.

Thank you,

Bee Hollyer
Dartmouth College, Class of 2021
B.A. Candidate in Government
Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I stand firmly against the proposed Seymour Estates development.

I strongly support Councillor Muri’s with idea that the Seymour Estates land should be swapped with the Ron Andrews DNV land, in order to promote community health and activities, alongside social housing.

The proposed development is too tall, would negatively impact current residents, is inharmonious with what exists today, and would disrupt future developments.

This proposal would increase the congested conditions of an already busy and high trafficked area. Currently, this part of the Seymour Parkway has many properties and these developments are causing a highly concentrated population, a large density of cars, lots of noise, and increased air pollution. A large development would cause these problems to increase.

The proposed development does not answer the needs of the current residents. These people need more green space, greater access to gyms and pools, and less noise. The proposal runs against residents’ requirements.

The proposed development does not respectfully follow what exists today. Currently the Seymour area is being developed at a high rate and this proposal is unacceptably higher again. The current upper development limit has already been drawn and if changed today, should be to decrease the rate of development.

If the Seymour Estates proposal is realized, its influence on future change in this area would be negative. New changes would be large and unattractive, and the quality of life we know today would decrease dramatically. I support Councillor Muri’s suggestion.

Thank you for your careful and respectful attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Khia Hollyer
Dear Mayor and Councillors,

My name is Khia Hollyer, and today is my 21st birthday. I am taking the time to write you because I strongly believe that going forwards with the Seymour Estates Development is a mistake. Doing so is not only sacrificing nature; it is taking away a forest beloved to Windsor students, and the community alike.

I cannot imagine North Vancouver without the Windridge forest. It has played a role at every stage of my life. When I was young and attending swimming lessons at Ron Andrews, I would frequently walk through the trails afterwards with my father. When I was in high school, the trails were my go-to destination for exercise, offering cool respite from the heat of open ground. As you probably know, the forest is an important rite of passage for any Windsor student, who must complete the 3km duke run through the forest! After suffering a spinal injury to my back, the trails provide a place to go walking that is gentle on my back, and close to home. On these trails I frequently bump into community members, and we exchange hellos and a smile. These may seem inconsequential, but they are invaluable to my quality of living.

Forests are not commodities. We cannot destroy forests when viable, economical, and environmental alternatives exist (such as Councillor Muri’s proposal.) As a resident of North Vancouver, I am disheartened to write that my local forest is thinning. Many say that it is a lost cause. While it may be, Windridge forest is not. The trees are lush with greenery, the foliage is thick. When you walk in Windridge, the air is fresh with that smell unique to forests; and it is cool against your cheek. You can also hear the birds in the trees. My mother and I frequently see piliated woodpeckers and eagles.

Mayor Muri and Councillors, please protect the quality of living of your residents, the environment, and the wildlife that depends on Windridge. Please choose Councillor Muri’s suggestion that the Seymour Estates land be swapped with the Ron Andrews DNV land.

Thank you,
Khia Hollyer

Bee Hollyer
Dartmouth College, Class of 2021
*B.A. Candidate in Government*
the trails afterwards with my father. When I was in high school, the trails were my go-to destination for exercise, offering cool respite from the heat of open ground. As you probably know, the forest is an important rite of passage for any Windsor student, who must complete the 3km duke run through the forest! After suffering a spinal injury to my back, the trails provide a place to go walking that is gentle on my back, and close to home. On these trails I frequently bump into community members, and we exchange hellos and a smile. These may seem inconsequential, but they are invaluable to my quality of living.

Forests are not commodities. We cannot destroy forests when viable, economical, and environmental alternatives exist (such as Councillor Muri’s proposal.) As a resident of North Vancouver, I am disheartened to write that my local forest is thinning. Many say that it is a lost cause. While it may be, Windridge forest is not. The trees are lush with greenery, the foliage is thick. When you walk in Windridge, the air is fresh with that smell unique to forests; and it is cool against your cheek. You can also hear the birds in the trees. My mother and I frequently see piliated woodpeckers and eagles.

Mayor Muri and Councillors, please protect the quality of living of your residents, the environment, and the wildlife that depends on Windridge. Please choose Councillor Muri’s suggestion that the Seymour Estates land be swapped with the Ron Andrews DNV land.

Thank you,

Bee Hollyer
Dartmouth College, Class of 2021
*B.A. Candidate in Government*
Good evening, Mayor Little and members of Council,

My name is Eric Andersen and I live at [redacted], and tonight I am not speaking on behalf of any organizations that I may belong to.

Unlike many people, who have expressed support for the proposal, I live in Blueridge, which is close to the actual site.

I have previously expressed some concerns about the proposed redevelopment of the Seymour Estates - both to the developer, to staff and to Council.

Although some changes have been made over the last year, I still have concerns about a number of issues:

**Density and traffic** - I feel that the density is too high. The number of units will triple from 114 units to 341 units, which will also mean that there will be substantially more vehicles on the roads. According to the BUNT traffic assessment prepared for Anthem, this will mean up to 267 vehicles per AM peak hour. This is a whopping 790% increase, from the 30 vehicle trips per hour, it used to be, to 267! It will be going from an average of 1 vehicle every two minutes to 6 to 8 vehicles every two minutes in each peak hour. These are not my assumptions, but are clearly stated on page 99 of the BUNT report.

Traffic is definitely still an issue in Seymour, and once COVID-19 hopefully will be behind us some time next year, it remains to be seen how many people will go back to using public transportation instead of their own vehicles. The changes for Highway #1 have not been completed yet, and these may or may not ease the well-known traffic problems in Seymour. Nobody at this point can guarantee that the proposed changes on the highway system will benefit the Seymour residents. The proof is in the pudding. Even before COVID-19 hit us, there were no indications of planned improvements for the bus service in the Seymour area. This is not likely to happen anytime soon, if ever.

**Parking** – 484 resident parking stalls is very high and will assume (and almost encourage) that every unit will have more than one vehicle. I feel that the number of parking units should be reduced in order to attract more people with fewer cars. Isn’t the purpose of this development to make it fossil-free? Adding that many new vehicles to the road would hardly qualify as being fossil-free. Will all the residents really be driving fully electric vehicles?
The issue of childcare – or lack of childcare – has been pointed out to me. As confirmed by the DNV’s Council Liaison/Support Officer in her response to Council of December 2, there are no community plan provisions that would encourage a childcare facility as part of this development, and it is not part of the rezoning application.

Since this development is supposed to be attractive for young families – meaning that many young kids will be living at the Seymour Estates – we all know that this will mean that many parents will be driving in and out of the Seymour Estates to bring their kids to both school and childcare facilities.

This should not be ignored as this could mean a lot of added vehicle trips during weekdays.

**Rental units** - although it is a step in the right direction that there will be 56 market rental units, 25 Rent To Own units and 33 below market rental units, I feel that for such an increase in density, Council should really insist on more of these types of units. This is only one third of the total, the rest being market housing. The percentage should be much higher than that in order to provide much-needed lower-cost housing in the DNV.

Don’t forget, Council, that YOU are in the driver’s seat!

**Phasing** - although it is good to hear that the whole project will not be built simultaneously, a slower redevelopment would have been appreciated.

**Too compact and number of buildings** - I feel that 15 buildings on this site will make it far too compact. Fewer buildings would enable the site to appear less busy and it would generate less traffic both internally and on the public roads.

**Height** - I find that six storeys is too much for Mount Seymour Parkway which (with one unfortunate exception) only has buildings of four floors in height (which was also recommended and stated in the Seymour Local Plan). I am totally aware that the Seymour Estates was removed from the Seymour Local Plan 20 years ago. This was because already then some of the residents of the Seymour Estates, which was barely 30 years old at the time, wanted to redevelop and cash in on the site, and the head of the DNV planning department in those days felt that it would be easier to have this done if the Seymour Estates was part of the pro-development Maplewood Plan instead of the more slow-growth oriented Seymour Local Plan.

On the positive side, I have to stress the last-minute change to a completely **fossil-free development**. This is most definitely a step in the right direction and I hope that this will live up to its reputation if it proceeds in this fashion.

Hopefully other developers will take note of this shift. However, it does not take care of the fossil developed by the vehicles that will be used by the new residents. Not all of them will be driving EVs.

I would like to point out that I had a good and productive dialogue with Anthem, who did pay attention to the request, that I made, to include a **coffee shop** in this development. I did have a number of meetings with Anthem about this, and I am happy that they did listen to the community’s wish for this addition.
Not just do I think that this will be a good way for new residents to get to know each other and bond, but I do not think that two coffee shops so close to each other as the one at the Seymour Estates and the new United Strangers Coffee across the street will be detrimental to each other. In fact, when you consider how many other coffee shops are close to each other and still do well, I think a little bit of variety in the area may actually bring in even more customers for both cafes.

Nobody has been talking about the elephant in the room. Some of you may even ask what it is. I am referring here to the almost done deal that the federal government will be giving large tracts of land to the local First Nations in Seymour as land settlement.

I am not arguing the settlement, per se, but what everyone should realize that this will mean, is that the control of this land, be it in Maplewood and/or on the current CMHC lands north of Mount Seymour Parkway, will no longer be under the jurisdiction of the DNV.

First Nations are not required to do any public consultation prior to developments on their own lands. What public consultation has there e.g. been about the Raven Woods development in Seymour? Why should we expect this to be different when (not if) this land comes under the jurisdiction of our local First Nations?

This has the potential of adding thousands of new residential units to Seymour – units that would, under current circumstances, have gone through a diligent public consultation first.

**Location** - we know that this is not Anthem’s fault, but the location is not in a town centre, which is where the OCP, otherwise, suggested that new multi-family developments should be located and concentrated.

This brings me to the last point of my presentation, and this is likely to surprise you, Council! I would be prepared to give Anthem a higher density than what they are asking for now!

No, I am definitely not suggesting a higher density than the proposed 341 units on Lytton Street, which I, as already mentioned, feel is too high.

Councillor Muri has previously suggested that the Seymour Estates land should be swapped with DNV land in or closer to town centres. This would probably end up giving Anthem more density (which is always what developers want!), but it would give the DNV the Seymour Estates land next to Ron Andrews. Since this rec centre has to be rebuilt entirely in the near future, this could be done on the current Seymour Estates land – and remain near Canlan, so all the sporting activities would remain close to each other.

After the building of the new rec center on Seymour Estates land, the current Ron Andrews land (which is, of course, owned by the DNV) could then be used for social housing based entirely on the DNV’s criteria and wishes (and not what a developer wants to achieve). I think it is a great idea, which has merit and makes a lot of sense, and definitely ought to be considered by Council. This is called ‘thinking outside the box’.

**THAT** would be a win-win for all – Anthem could achieve higher density, there could be an increase in rental and Rent To Own units, unwanted traffic would not be added
the Mount Seymour Parkway, and Council could eventually use the Ron Andrews land for much needed social housing.

Thanks for listening,

Eric
Mayor and Council,

1. In response to staff’s response on storm water management...Storm water 'management' is not the same as storm water 'mitigation'. Mitigation would require more accommodation for on site absorption and dispersion of rain to the natural ecosystem, rather than displacement towards storm sewers. Gallant Avenue is an unfortunate example of lack of that type of accommodation. I remember Derek Andrews warning us of this potential several decades ago.

2. Regarding Eric Anderson's landswap suggestion related to re-development of Ron Andrews...this sounds like an incredibly good idea! Remembering the pressure that redevelopment of William Griffin put on other North Shore rec centres and considering the increase in population since then, please give this option real consideration. Also, that option would provide a valuable opportunity to control the nature of housing development on the eventually vacated land later when we know the outcome of the current rush of residential development in the District.

Regards,
Katherine Fagerlund
For inclusion in the binder for Seymour Estates – 904 Lytton
SEYMOUR ESTATES

Public Hearing Input – November 18th 2020
Continuation December 15th 2020
Peter Teevan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Max Allowed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>25,339.80</td>
<td>Sq Metres</td>
<td>RM3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>205,052.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>355,715.53</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site 1        | Purchase    | 90,667.0 | 94  |
| Site 1        | Rent to Own | 16,000.0 | 25  |
| Site 2        | Purchase    | 127,639.0 | 102 |
| Site 3        | Purchase    | 47,262.0 | 31  |
| Site 4        | Market Rent | 44,643.0 | 56  |
| Site 4        | Sub Market Rent | 29,505.0 | 33  |

| Purchase Total | 265,568.0 | 227 | 99.1% |
| Increase (decrease) over former | 60,516.0 | 113 | 30% |
| Other Total | 90,147.5 | 227 |

**MY ANALYSIS AFTER SPEAKING WITH MR. VERES**
### Seymour Estates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Max Allowed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>25,339.80</td>
<td>Sq Metres</td>
<td>RM3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205,052.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>355,715.53</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,667.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Rent to Own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127,639.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,262.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,643.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Sub Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,505.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>265,568.0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase (decrease) over former</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,516.0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,147.5</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avg Unit 1800 sq ft**

**PLAN B: IF WE SAY “NO” – REPLACE WHAT WAS THERE**
### Seymour Estates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Max Allowed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>25,339.80</td>
<td>Sq Metres</td>
<td>RM3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205,052.0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>205,052.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>355,715.53</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,667.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Rent to Own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127,639.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,262.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,643.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Sub Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,505.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>265,568.0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,516.0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,147.5</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW MUCH MORE ARE THEY ASKING FOR?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Max Allowed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>25,339.80 Sq Metres</td>
<td>RM3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205,052.00</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273,425.00 Sq Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>273,425.00 Sq Feet</th>
<th></th>
<th>1.30</th>
<th>1.75</th>
<th>355,715.53</th>
<th>341</th>
<th>73.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,667.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Rent to Own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127,639.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,262.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,643.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Sub Market Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,505.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Purchase Total | | | | 265,568.0 | 227 | 99.1% |
| Increase (decrease) over former | | | | 60,516.0 | 113 | 30% |
| Other Total | | | | 90,147.5 | 227 | |
### Seymour Estates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>ESR</th>
<th>Max Allowed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205,052.00</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>273,425.00</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>355,715.53</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,667.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Rent to Own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127,639.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,262.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Market Rent</td>
<td>29,505.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,643.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,505.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>265,568.0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) over former</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,516.0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,147.5</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THERE IS THE “DEAL”**

- Anthem are already allowed to build this: 205,052.00
- If we allow them to add this: 265,568.0
- Then we get this in return: 90,147.5
Why do we need to allow this?

- Simple answer: because rentals are 70% less profitable than market purchase to build.

- In a scenario where builders markup is 15%:
  - Markup represents 13% of market value.
  - GST self assessment is 5% on market value
  - Provincial Property Transfer Tax is 4.3% on market value
  - $9.3 \div 13\% = 71.5\% = \text{lost profit.}$
Reactions of the Seymour Community Association:

- We like the styling.
- We don’t think the Maplewood LAP should apply here on the border between Blueridge and Seymour.
- We wish it could be less dense.
- We think the future residents would like centre-oriented layout.
- Could someone please do something about the Ironworkers Bridge?
If we deny, and Anthem chooses to replace, what happens with the sidewalk?

AMENITIES: SAFE ROUTE TO WINDSOR SCHOOL
Why do I care about this? (Community Shuttle)

- In my view, the future of Transit across the North Shore looks like this:

**Amenities: On Demand Community Shuttle**
PLAN “A” VS PLAN “B”

Plan A – Approve the proposal.

Plan B – Anthem Replaces what was there.

If there is a Plan C, D or E – please tell us?

This Public Hearing only has Plan A or B as options...

Shouldn’t Public Input be on all possibilities?

Making this about Plan A vs Plan B is kind of like a “zoning game of chicken”.
Mayor and Council,

Please note that the proponent's responses to comments were inaccurate on a couple of points:

- The Maplewood Local Plan states an allowable density of 1.2, not 1.75. The 1.75 is a general statement in the DNV OCP.
- The green space area the proponent noted must have been measured between outer walls of the buildings; it does not represent usable green space for the residents.

Regards and happy holidays!
Katherine Fagerlund.

Mayor and Council,

1. In response to staff's response on storm water management...Storm water 'management' is not the same as storm water 'mitigation'. Mitigation would require more accommodation for on site absorption and dispersion of rain to the natural ecosystem, rather than displacement towards storm sewers. Gallant Avenue is an unfortunate example of lack of that type of accommodation. I remember Derek Andrews warning us of this potential several decades ago.

2. Regarding Eric Anderson's landswap suggestion related to re-development of Ron Andrews...this sounds like an incredibly good idea! Remembering the pressure that redevelopment of William Griffin put on other North Shore rec centres and considering the increase in population since then, please give this option real consideration. Also, that option would provide a valuable opportunity to control the nature of housing development on the eventually vacated land later when we know the outcome of the current rush of residential development in the District.

Regards,
Katherine Fagerlund
The attached was received before the closing of the public hearing and is forwarded for your information.

Louise Simkin
Administrative, Information & Privacy Coordinator
District of North Vancouver
604-990-2413

From: Genevieve Lanz <LanzG@dnv.org>
Sent: December 17, 2020 8:12 AM
To: Louise Simkin <louise_simkin@dnv.org>
Cc: James Gordon <gordonja@dnv.org>
Subject: FW: December 15 - Continuation of Public Hearing – 904-944 Lytton St - Anthem Properties

Hi Louise,

Please see the attached received before the conclusion of the PH.

Genevieve

From: Richard Cook
Sent: December 15, 2020 7:34 PM
To: Genevieve Lanz <LanzG@dnv.org>
Cc: James Gordon <gordonja@dnv.org>
Subject: Re: December 15 - Continuation of Public Hearing – 904-944 Lytton St - Anthem Properties

Dear Clerk.

Pleas find my written submission, which is a record of my oral remarks at the hearing tonight.

Richard Cook

On Dec 8, 2020, at 13:51, James Gordon <gordonja@dnv.org> wrote:

Hi Mr. Cook.

I’ve copied Genevieve Lanz who will be able to do a quick practice session with you.
Hi. Thanks very much. I plan to speak, and was told I could share my screen during my presentation time to speak to a couple of slides I have. Let me know please if there are different arrangements for the continuation, especially on sharing the slides.

Richard Cook
You may view the draft minutes and video of the first night of the hearing (November 17, 2020) at DNV.org/agenda

Please contact me if you have any questions.

James A. Gordon
Manager of Administrative Services | Municipal Clerk
District of North Vancouver
355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
604.990.2207 Direct
District of North Vancouver Public Hearing
904-944 Lytton Street

Thank you Mayor Little and Council,

My name is Richard Cook, and I live with five other family members at [redacted], a few blocks from the proposed development at 904-944 Lytton Street, the subject of this public hearing. I am the big orange dinosaur with the scary smile in this photo of us getting ready for Halloween this year.
I am here tonight to speak in favour of the Bylaw 8423 rezoning.

We have lived in the neighbourhood for three years and enjoy it immensely, including the community spirit which remains very much in evidence even in 2020, with Halloween for our family being a great example.

As well as a neighbour, I am member of the executive of LAI, an honorary society focused on land economics. There are 25 chapters and 2,000 members worldwide. A few weeks ago it was my honour to moderate a webinar with participants from 20 cities in North America and Europe. Participants came from government, lenders, consultants and developers. We polled participants on two questions – results are on this slide.

In the first question people said that only 25% of people who were typically at the office, were there on October 30. Looking forward to next April, people thought there would be more people at the office, but still only 38% of normal. So any recovery of offices or downtowns is expected to be quite slow, according to this survey of real estate industry leaders in 20 cities around the globe.

We are in an unprecedented time of challenge for all businesses, retail or real estate. What this chart says to me is that after good due diligence, we should in general welcome proposals for investment in our communities in 2021, both here and further afield. Those willing to invest in the future of our communities deserve our full attention, especially now.

I have looked at some, but by no means all, of the 1,045 pages of materials submitted resulting in staff’s recommendation to support first reading and refer this proposal to public hearing.
In my view, after the multiple reviews and changes spanning several years, the project is at a point where it has my full support. It is in a location which is benign in terms of accommodating the proposed building heights. It will not interfere significantly with neighbours views. That there is more density than what was on site before, is part of what ensures that there can be more rather than less affordability for the next 50 years. It will also provide an important underpinning to better transit and community services. It will provide an option for people like my wife and I, should we want to move from our upstairs/downstairs arrangement and leave more room for a growing family, and yet still be able to stay in our neighbourhood near all of our grandchildren.

At the last municipal election, a majority voted for the District to borrow up to $150 million to contribute to affordable housing. I don’t know how much has been done with that very clear mandate from the taxpayers, but what I do see with this project is an applicant providing innovative commitments to affordable housing as a part of the overall proposal. At zero cost to the taxpayers. And contributing cash to the community on top of that.

I am impressed that Council was able to negotiate a commitment to sustainable energy in advance of first reading.

I have given a thorough read of the Transportation Impact Assessment. I have commissioned and reviewed dozens of these types of studies. This one has gone through at least four major drafts over the course of 3 and a half years. The imprint of District staff on the scope of the review, including various sensitivity analyses, is abundantly clear. With the offsite works proposed, the project will meet the District’s criteria for transportation impacts. And there will be innovative approaches to transportation demand management. If we look at my graphic on how slowly we anticipate a return to previous era for travel in our cities, I am even more convinced that the traffic impacts have been mitigated.
In sum, considering the length and breadth of reviews of this project over many years now, I support Council rezoning the site to allow this project as proposed.