AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

Monday, February 22, 2021
7:00 p.m.
To be held virtually but streamed at dnv.org/council-live

Council Members:
Mayor Mike Little
Councillor Jordan Back
Councillor Mathew Bond
Councillor Megan Curren
Councillor Betty Forbes
Councillor Jim Hanson
Councillor Lisa Muri
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REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

7:00 p.m.
Monday, February 22, 2021
To be held virtually but streamed at dnv.org/council-live

AGENDA

BROADCAST OF MEETING

- Online at dnv.org/council-live

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS NOT AVAILABLE FOR DISCUSSION

- Bylaw 8262 – OCP Amendment 1923 Purcell Way
- Bylaw 8423 – Rezoning 904-944 Lytton Street
- Bylaw 8455 – OCP Amendment 220 Mountain Hwy & 1515-1555 Oxford Street
- Bylaw 8456 – Rezoning 220 Mountain Hwy & 1515-1555 Oxford Street
- Bylaw 8472 – Rezoning Single-Family Standards & Regulations
- Bylaw 8476 – Rezoning Single-Family Standards & Regulations

RESOLUTION TO HOLD PUBLIC MEETING WITHOUT THE PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE

Recommendation:
WHEREAS:

- the Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General has issued Order M192; and,

Order M192 requires British Columbia municipalities to use best efforts to allow members of the public to attend open meetings of council in a manner that is consistent with the applicable requirements or recommendations of the Public Health Act and Public Health Officer orders; and,

- the District has assessed its ability to allow members of the public to attend open meetings of council in a manner that is consistent with the applicable requirements or recommendations of the Public Health Act and Public Health Officer orders; and,

- the District has taken into consideration its Covid-19 Safety Plan as required by Worksafe BC; and,

- the District has determined that, at this time, it cannot safely allow members of the public to physically attend open meetings of council in a manner that is consistent with the applicable requirements or recommendations of the Public Health Act or its Covid-19 Safety Plan;
THEREFORE, this meeting of the Council for the District of North Vancouver is to be held virtually and without members of the public, or Council, being physically present;

AND THAT the principles of openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability are being ensured through:

- Providing an online subscription service for residents to sign up and be apprised of upcoming meetings and the post-meeting availability of meeting minutes and meeting videos;
- Providing advance notice of this meeting in accordance with the Community Charter and advising the public on how they may participate in the meeting by providing public input;
- Providing the availability of the agenda for this meeting on the District’s webpage six days in advance of the meeting;
- The live streaming of this meeting via a link readily available on the District’s webpage;
- Maintaining the thirty minute public input opportunity at each regular meeting and the discretionary public input opportunity at each workshop;
- The ability of the public to provide input on agenda items by full two-way audio and video means;
- Adhering the rules of procedural fairness and acting with respect and courtesy at all times when hearing the public;
- Conducting meetings in a manner that resembles in-person meeting as much as possible;

And reminding the public that they may contact Mayor and Council at any time on any topic via its council@dnv.org email address.

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. February 22, 2021 Regular Meeting Agenda

Recommendation:
THAT the agenda for the February 22, 2021 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adopted as circulated, including the addition of any items listed in the agenda addendum.

2. PUBLIC INPUT

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

3. RECOGNITIONS

4. DELEGATIONS
5. ADOPTION OF MINUTES


Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the January 25, 2021 Regular Council meeting are adopted.

5.2. February 8, 2021 Regular Council Meeting p. 21-27

Recommendation:
THAT the minutes of the February 8, 2021 Regular Council meeting are adopted.

6. RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING DECISIONS

6.1. February 1, 2021 Advisory Oversight Committee Meeting

6.1.1. Appointment to the North Vancouver Public Art Advisory Committee
File No. 01.0360.01/000.000

THAT Nicky Morgan is appointed to the North Vancouver Public Art Advisory Committee for a two-year term ending December 31, 2022;

AND THAT Parvin Peivandi is appointed to the North Vancouver Public Art Advisory Committee for a two-year term ending December 31, 2022;

AND THAT Emily Neufeld is re-appointed for a second term to the North Vancouver Public Art Advisory Committee for a two-year term ending December 31, 2022;

AND THAT this resolution be released to the public.

7. COUNCIL WORKSHOP REPORT

8. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

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

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

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

8.1. 2021-2025 Draft Financial Plan Public Input p. 31
File No.

Public Input Opportunity
8.2. **Community Risk Assessment: Standards of Cover 2020-2025** p. 33-72

File No. 14.7010.02/000.000

Joint Report: Assistant Fire Chief Public Safety and Fire Chief, February 9, 2021
Attachment 1: Fire and Rescue Community Risk Assessment: Standards of Cover 2020-2025

**Recommendation:**
THAT Council approve the document entitled “Community Risk Assessment/ Standards of Cover 2020-2025 – Executive Version”.

8.3. **UBCM Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program – North Shore Application** p. 73-79

File No. 10.5080.00/000.003

Report: Community Planner, February 8, 2021

**Recommendation:**
THAT Staff be directed to work with the City of North Vancouver and District of West Vancouver to submit a joint regional application for the North Shore under Stream 1 of the UBCM Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program for 2021;

AND THAT Council supports the District of West Vancouver as the primary applicant for the North Shore application to apply for, receive, and manage the 2021 UBCM Poverty Reduction and Action Program grant funding on the District of North Vancouver’s behalf.

8.4. **Bylaws 8489, 8490 and 8491: Street and Traffic Bylaw, Fees and Charges Bylaw and Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw Amendments – E-bike Share** p. 81-127

File No. 09.3900.20/000.000

Report: Deputy Municipal Clerk, February 9, 2021
Attachment 1: Bylaw 8489
Attachment 2: Bylaw 8490
Attachment 3: Bylaw 8491
Attachment 4: Staff report dated January 13, 2021

**Recommendation:**
THAT “District of North Vancouver Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8489, 2021 (Amendment 22)” is ADOPTED;

AND THAT “Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8490, 2021 (Amendment 71)” is ADOPTED;

AND THAT “Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7 458, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8491, 2021 (Amendment 59)” is ADOPTED.
8.5. Update to Public Notification Signage Requirements  p. 129-152
File No. 0 8.3060.00/003

Report: Development Planning Assistant, February 4, 2021
Attachment 1: Bylaw 8480
Attachment 2: Bylaw 8144 red-lined version
Attachment 3: Bylaw 8495
Attachment 4: Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications Corporate Policy
Attachment 5: Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications Corporate Policy red-lined version

Recommendation:
THAT “District of North Vancouver Development Procedures Bylaw 8144, 2017 Amendment Bylaw 8480, 2021 (Amendment 1)” is given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT “Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8495, 2021 (Amendment 1)” is given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT the Corporate Policy titled “Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications” is APPROVED as amended.

File No. 16.8310.00/000.000

Report: Section Manager – Transportation, February 9, 2021
Attachment 1: Bylaw 8498
Attachment 2: Bylaw 8499
Attachment 3: Bylaw 8500

Recommendation:
THAT “District of North Vancouver Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8498, 2021 (Amendment 23)” is given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT “Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8499, 2021 (Amendment 73)” is given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT “Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8500, 2021 (Amendment 60)” is given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings.

8.7. Bylaws 8472 and 8476: Standards and Regulations  p. 163-235
in Single Family Zones
File No. 09.3900.20/000.000

Report: Deputy Municipal Clerk, January 28, 2021
Attachment 1: Bylaw 8472
Attachment 2: Bylaw 8476
Attachment 3: Public Hearing report – January 26, 2021
Attachment 4: Staff report dated September 29, 2020
Recommendation:
THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1404 (Bylaw 8472)” is given SECOND and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1405 (Bylaw 8476)” is given SECOND and THIRD Readings.

File No.

Report: Councillor Hanson, February 9, 2021

Recommendation:
THAT staff report back to Council on options for introducing the protocol of conducting Indigenous land acknowledgements during Council proceedings;

AND THAT in developing an acknowledgement for Council consideration, staff are directed to consult with the appropriate First Nations whose territories would be included in such an acknowledgement.

8.9. DNV Support for Provincial Advocacy for Climate Targets  p. 241-263
File No.

Report: Councillor Curren, February 10, 2021

Recommendation:
THAT Council support the Help Cities Lead initiative by writing letters to Ministers Heyman (Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy), Osborne (Minister of Municipal Affairs), Ralston (Ministry of Energy, Mines, and Low Carbon Innovation), Eby (Attorney General and Minister Responsible for Housing), and Robinson (Minister of Finance) requesting five policy actions which would empower the District of North Vancouver to help align building policy with Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) science to achieve our climate targets;

AND THAT Council send a letter to Metro Vancouver Regional District asking Metro Vancouver to also support the initiative;

AND THAT Council send a letter to all BC Local Governments asking them to support the initiative.

9. REPORTS

9.1. Mayor

9.2. Chief Administrative Officer

9.3. Councillors

9.4. Metro Vancouver Committee Appointees
9.4.1. Housing Committee – Councillor Bond
9.4.2. Indigenous Relations Committee – Councillor Hanson
9.4.3. Board – Councillor Muri
9.4.4. Regional Culture Committee – Councillor Muri
9.4.5. Regional Parks Committee – Councillor Muri
9.4.6. Regional Planning Committee – Councillor Muri
9.4.7. Liquid Waste Committee – Mayor Little
9.4.8. COVID-19 Response & Recovery Task Force – Mayor Little
9.4.9. Mayors Committee – Mayor Little
9.4.10. Mayors Council – Translink – Mayor Little
9.4.11. Zero Waste Committee – Mayor Little

10. ADJOURNMENT

Recommendation:
THAT the February 22, 2021 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adjourned.
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Minutes of the Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver held at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, January 25, 2021. The meeting was held virtually with participants appearing via video and telephone conference.

Present:

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

Staff:

Mr. D. Stuart, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. G. Joyce, General Manager – Engineering, Parks & Facilities
Mr. D. Milburn, General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits
Ms. T. Atva, Manager – Community Planning
Mr. J. Gordon, Manager – Administrative Services
Mr. S. Carney, Section Manager - Transportation
Mr. M. Hartford, Section Manager – Development Planning
Ms. G. Lanz, Deputy Municipal Clerk
Ms. J. Simpson, Confidential Council Clerk
Ms. C. Archer, Clerk Typist 3
Ms. S. Clarke, Clerk Typist 3
Ms. S. Ferguson, Customer Service Clerk

Also in Attendance:

MLA Karin Kirkpatrick, West Vancouver – Capilano
Julia Staub-French, Family Services of the North Shore
Valerie Dolgin, Family Services of the North Shore

RESOLUTION TO HOLD PUBLIC MEETING WITHOUT THE PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE

MOVED by Councillor BACK
SECONDED by Councillor CURREN

WHEREAS:

- the Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General has issued Order M192; and,

- Order M192 requires British Columbia municipalities to use best efforts to allow members of the public to attend open meetings of council in a manner that is consistent with the applicable requirements or recommendations of the Public Health Act and Public Health Officer orders; and,

- the District has assessed its ability to allow members of the public to attend open meetings of council in a manner that is consistent with the applicable requirements or recommendations of the Public Health Act and Public Health Officer orders; and,
• the District has taken into consideration its Covid-19 Safety Plan as required by Worksafe BC; and,

• the District has determined that, at this time, it cannot safely allow members of the public to physically attend open meetings of council in a manner that is consistent with the applicable requirements or recommendations of the Public Health Act or its Covid-19 Safety Plan;

THEREFORE, this meeting of the Council for the District of North Vancouver is to be held virtually and without members of the public, or Council, being physically present;

AND THAT the principles of openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability are being ensured through:

• Providing an online subscription service for residents to sign up and be apprised of upcoming meetings and the post-meeting availability of meeting minutes and meeting videos;

• Providing advance notice of this meeting in accordance with the Community Charter and advising the public on how they may participate in the meeting by providing public input;

• Providing the availability of the agenda for this meeting on the District’s webpage six days in advance of the meeting;

• The live streaming of this meeting via a link readily available on the District’s webpage;

• Maintaining the thirty minute public input opportunity at each regular meeting and the discretionary public input opportunity at each workshop;

• The ability of the public to provide input on agenda items by full two-way audio and video means;

• Adhering the rules of procedural fairness and acting with respect and courtesy at all times when hearing the public;

• Conducting meetings in a manner that resembles in-person meeting as much as possible;

• And reminding the public that they may contact Mayor and Council at any time on any topic via its council@dnv.org email address.

CARRIED
1. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

1.1. **January 25, 2021 Regular Meeting Agenda**

   **MOVED by Councillor BACK**
   **SECONDED by Councillor CURREN**

   THAT the agenda for the January 25, 2021 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adopted as circulated.

   **CARRIED**

2. **PUBLIC INPUT**

2.1. **Ms. Laurie Parkinson, resident of Moodyville:**
   - Spoke in support of item 8.7 regarding the proposed Canfield Crescent project;
   - Noted the environmental aspects of the project;
   - Suggested installing or providing conduits for solar panels;
   - Suggested using low carbon building materials; and,
   - Suggested Council make decisions through a climate lens.

2.2. **Ms. Christy Gold, Scott Road:**
   - Spoke in support of item 8.7 regarding the proposed Canfield Crescent project;
   - Suggested the project provides appropriate transition between commercial and single-family dwellings;
   - Suggested the project fulfills current housing needs; and,
   - Noted the transportation measures the developer committed to providing.

2.3. **Mr. Mark Lutz, Scott Road:**
   - Spoke in support of item 8.7 regarding the proposed Canfield Crescent project;
   - Noted the project provides a needed housing alternative; and,
   - Spoke to the lack of affordability for families looking to upsize.

2.4. **Ms. Adriana Martin, resident of North Vancouver:**
   - Spoke in support of item 8.7 regarding the proposed Canfield Crescent project; and,
   - Noted the short supply of affordable housing for families.

2.5. **Mr. Adam Ketcheson, Capilano Road:**
   - Spoke in support of item 8.7 regarding the proposed Canfield Crescent project;
   - Commented on the lack of affordability in North Vancouver;
   - Spoke to the instability of renting; and,
   - Suggested the project will provide families with the opportunity to live in the community.

2.6. **Mr. Michael Oord, Riverside Drive:**
   - Spoke in support of item 8.7 regarding the proposed Canfield Crescent project;
   - Noted the proximity to services and amenities; and,
   - Suggested the project complements the community.
3. **RECOGNITIONS**

Nil

4. **DELEGATIONS**

4.1. **MLA Karin Kirkpatrick**  
Re: Introduction and Term Priorities

MLA Karin Kirkpatrick introduced herself and touched on her diverse background before being elected as the representative for the West Vancouver – Capilano riding in the 2020 provincial election. MLA Kirkpatrick provided an overview of term priorities, highlighting affordability, sustainability, environment, community planning, transportation, increasing senior care and child care and the COVID-19 pandemic Restart Plan.

MOVED by Councillor MURI  
SECONDED by Councillor FORBES  
THAT the delegation from MLA Karin Kirkpatrick is received for information.  

CARRIED

4.2. **Julia Staub-French and Valerie Dolgin, Family Services of the North Shore**  
Re: An Update – Changing Lives Together

Ms. Julia Staub-French provided an introduction of the Family Services of the North Shore and spoke to their work within the community. Ms. Staub-French noted the increase in volunteers at the Delbrook Community Recreation Centre and spoke to the following services provided: Thrive Family Services, meals to seniors, groceries to families, caring phone calls and the Christmas Bureau.

Mayor LITTLE left the meeting at 7:43 p.m. and Councillor MURI assumed the Chair.

Mayor LITTLE returned to the meeting at 7:46 p.m. and assumed the Chair.

MOVED by Councillor MURI  
SECONDED by Councillor BACK  
THAT the delegation from Family Services of the North Shore is received for information.  

CARRIED

5. **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

5.1. **January 11, 2021 Regular Council Meeting**

MOVED by Councillor BACK  
SECONDED by Councillor CURREN  
THAT the minutes of the January 11, 2021 Regular Council meeting are adopted.  

CARRIED
6. RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING DECISIONS
Nil

7. COUNCIL WORKSHOP REPORT
Nil

8. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

8.1. Bylaws 8451, 8452 and 8453: OCP Amendment, Rezoning and Development Cost Charge Waiver Bylaws for 267 Orwell Street
File No. 08.3060.20/016.20

MOVED by Councillor CURREN
SECONDED by Councillor BACK
THAT "District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan Bylaw 7900, 2011, Amendment Bylaw 8451, 2020 (Amendment 40)" is ADOPTED;
AND THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1401 (Bylaw 8452)" is ADOPTED;
AND THAT "Orwell Street Development Cost Charges Waiver Bylaw 8453, 2020" is ADOPTED.

CARRIED

8.2. Bylaw 8449: Rezoning Bylaw for 840 St. Denis Avenue
File No. 08.3060.20/012.19

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor CURREN
THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1400 (Bylaw 8449)" is ADOPTED.

CARRIED

8.3. Development Permit 12.19 - 840 St. Denis Avenue
File No. 08.3060.20/012.19

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor BACK
THAT Development Permit 12.19 for a three-unit ground-oriented residential development at 840 St. Denis Avenue is ISSUED.

CARRIED
8.4. **Bylaws 8436 and 8437: Solid Waste Management Bylaw 8436 and Bylaw Notice Enforcement 8437**
File No. 11.5360.90/007.00

MOVED by Councillor BOND
SECONDED by Councillor MURI
THAT “Solid Waste Management Bylaw 8436, 2021” is given FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD Readings;


CARRIED

8.5. **2021 Social Service Grants - Core Funded Agencies**
File No. 05-1930-Grants/Sponsorship 2021

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT a budget of $1,156,414 is approved for social service core funding grants in 2021 and disbursed to agencies, as attached to the January 5, 2021 report of the Community Planner entitled 2021 Social Service Grants – Core Funded Agencies.

CARRIED

8.6. **Lynn Canyon Pay Parking Pilot Project - Council Endorsement**
File No. 11.5210.00/000.000

MOVED by Councillor BACK
SECONDED by Councillor MURI
THAT the plan for the Lynn Canyon Park Pay Parking Pilot is approved by Council for implementation.

CARRIED
Opposed: Councillors BOND and CURREN

8.7. **3155 and 3175 Canfield Crescent - Detailed OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application**
File No.

Public input:

Judith Brook, Lauralynn Drive:
• Spoke in support of the item;
• Suggested the project provides needed accommodation for families;
• Noted the need for housing diversity; and,
• Spoke to the environmental aspects of the project.
MOVED by Councillor BACK
SECONDED by Councillor BOND
THAT staff be directed to prepare bylaws for Council’s consideration, based on the applicant’s OCP amendment and rezoning application for an eight unit townhouse development, prior to the completion of the targeted review of the OCP.

CARRIED

9. REPORTS

9.1. Mayor

9.1.1 Mayor Little gave his condolences for a death in the community. He further reported on his attendance at a Blueridge Community Association meeting regarding traffic and parking concerns.

9.2. Chief Administrative Officer

Nil

9.3. Councillors

9.3.1 Councillor Muri reported on her attendance at the North Vancouver Recreation & Culture Commission inaugural meeting and commented on the Harry Jerome Community Recreation Centre redevelopment project.

9.4. Metro Vancouver Committee Appointees

9.4.1. Housing Committee – Councillor Bond

Councillor Bond reported on his attendance at the Housing Committee meeting on January 13, 2021.

9.4.2. Indigenous Relations Committee – Councillor Hanson

Nil

9.4.3. Board – Councillor Muri

Nil

9.4.4. Regional Culture Committee – Councillor Muri

Nil

9.4.5. Regional Parks Committee – Councillor Muri

Councillor Muri reported on her attendance at the Regional Parks Committee meeting on January 20, 2021.
9.4.6. **Regional Planning Committee – Councillor Muri**

Councillor Muri reported on her attendance at the Regional Planning Committee meeting on January 14, 2021.

9.4.7. **COVID-19 Response & Recovery Task Force – Mayor Little**

Nil

9.4.8. **Liquid Waste Committee – Mayor Little**

Mayor Little reported on his attendance at the Liquid Waste Committee meeting on January 21, 2021.

9.4.9. **Mayors Committee – Mayor Little**

Nil

9.4.10. **Mayors Council – Translink – Mayor Little**

Nil

9.4.11. **Zero Waste Committee – Mayor Little**

Mayor Little reported on his attendance at the Zero Waste Committee meeting on January 22, 2021.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOVED by Councillor MURI**

**SECONDED by Mayor LITTLE**

THAT the January 25, 2021 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adjourned.

**CARRIED**

(9:11 p.m.)
DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER  
REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver held at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 8, 2021. The meeting was held virtually with participants appearing via video and telephone conference.

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

Staff:  
Mr. D. Stuart, Chief Administrative Officer  
Mr. G. Joyce, General Manager – Engineering, Parks & Facilities  
Mr. D. Milburn, General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits  
Mr. A. Wardell, General Manager – Finance/CFO  
Ms. J. Paton, Assistant General Manager – Development Planning & Engineering  
Mr. R. Danyluk, Manager – Manager – Business Planning and Decision Support  
Mr. J. Gordon, Manager – Administrative Services  
Ms. C. Grafton, Manager – Strategic Communications & Community Relations  
Mr. M. Hartford, Section Manager – Development Planning  
Ms. G. Lanz, Deputy Municipal Clerk  
Mr. Z. Mathurin, North Shore TDM/Bike Share Joint Coordinator  
Ms. C. Peters, Senior Planner  
Ms. I. Weisenbach, Transportation Planner  
Ms. S. Young, Accounting Officer 2  
Ms. S. Dale, Confidential Council Clerk  
Ms. S. Clarke, Committee Clerk  
Ms. S. Ferguson, Committee Clerk

Also in Attendance:  
Ms. Catharine Hume, RainCity Housing  
Ms. Amelia Ridgway, RainCity Housing  
Ms. Naomi Brunemeyer, BC Housing

RESOLUTION TO HOLD PUBLIC MEETING WITHOUT THE PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE

MOVED by Councillor MURI  
SECONDED by Councillor BACK  
WHEREAS:

• the Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General has issued Order M192; and,

• Order M192 requires British Columbia municipalities to use best efforts to allow members of the public to attend open meetings of council in a manner that is consistent with the applicable requirements or recommendations of the Public Health Act and Public Health Officer orders; and,
the District has assessed its ability to allow members of the public to attend open meetings of council in a manner that is consistent with the applicable requirements or recommendations of the Public Health Act and Public Health Officer orders; and,

the District has taken into consideration its Covid-19 Safety Plan as required by Worksafe BC; and,

the District has determined that, at this time, it cannot safely allow members of the public to physically attend open meetings of council in a manner that is consistent with the applicable requirements or recommendations of the Public Health Act or its Covid-19 Safety Plan;

THEREFORE, this meeting of the Council for the District of North Vancouver is to be held virtually and without members of the public, or Council, being physically present;

AND THAT the principles of openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability are being ensured through:

- Providing an online subscription service for residents to sign up and be apprised of upcoming meetings and the post-meeting availability of meeting minutes and meeting videos;
- Providing advance notice of this meeting in accordance with the Community Charter and advising the public on how they may participate in the meeting by providing public input;
- Providing the availability of the agenda for this meeting on the District’s webpage six days in advance of the meeting;
- The live streaming of this meeting via a link readily available on the District’s webpage;
- Maintaining the thirty minute public input opportunity at each regular meeting and the discretionary public input opportunity at each workshop;
- The ability of the public to provide input on agenda items by full two-way audio and video means;
- Adhering the rules of procedural fairness and acting with respect and courtesy at all times when hearing the public;
- Conducting meetings in a manner that resembles in-person meeting as much as possible;

And reminding the public that they may contact Mayor and Council at any time on any topic via its council@dnv.org email address.

CARRIED
1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. February 8, 2021 Regular Meeting Agenda

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT the agenda for the February 8, 2021 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. PUBLIC INPUT

2.1. Mr. Hazen Colbert, 1100 Block East 27th Street:
- Commented on the budget deliberations and opined that property taxes should be reduced by 20%;
- Spoke to item 8.3 regarding the proposed bylaws for a supportive housing development at West 16th Street; and,
- Spoke in support of this item proceeding to a Public Hearing.

2.2. Mr. Peter Teevan, 1900 Block Indian River Crescent:
- Spoke to item 8.1. regarding the Solid Waste Management Bylaw;
- Expressed concerns that the wording of the bylaw suggests that residents may be fined for placing their solid waste containers for collection outside the permitted times;
- Spoke to item 8.4 regarding 2021 Budget Introduction and Draft Financial Plan Workbook; and,
- Expressed concerns that the Budget Introduction and Draft Financial Plan Workbook was not made available to the public prior to the meeting.

2.3. Ms. Mari Kitawaki, 1100 Block Handsworth Road:
- Spoke as a member of the North Shore Safety Council (NSSC) and Safety Coordinator at Canyon Heights Elementary;
- Expressed support and gratitude for all the initiative by the District to foster safe active transportation, including hiring a full time Transportation Demand Management Coordinator; and,
- Thanked staff for attending NSSC meetings.

2.4. Mr. Ehsan Pourorab, 2700 Block Library Lane:
- Expressed concerns with the constant noise generated from the loading bay operated by Save-On-Foods in Lynn Valley;
- Noted that the noise starts at 6:30 a.m. and often continues past 10:00 p.m.; and,
- Commented that he works from home and is not able to open his windows.

3. RECOGNITIONS

Nil
4. DELEGATIONS
Nil

5. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

5.1. January 26, 2021 Public Hearing

MOVED by Councillor BACK
SECONDED by Councillor MURI
THAT the minutes of the January 26, 2021 Public Hearing are received.

CARRIED

6. RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING DECISIONS
Nil

7. COUNCIL WORKSHOP REPORT
Nil

8. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

8.1. Bylaws 8436 and 8437: Solid Waste Management Bylaw 8436 and Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 8437
File No. 09.3900.20/000.000

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor BACK
THAT “Solid Waste Management Bylaw 8436, 2021” is ADOPTED;
AND THAT “Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8437, 2021 (Amendment 52)” is ADOPTED.

CARRIED
Opposed: Councillor FORBES

8.2. Bylaws 8489, 8490, and 8491: Proposed Bylaw Amendments to Enable E-Bike Share
File No. 16.8620.01/025.000

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor BACK
THAT “Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004, Amendment Bylaw 8489, 2021 (Amendment 22)” is given FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD Readings;
AND THAT “Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992, Amendment Bylaw 8490, 2021 (Amendment 71)” is given FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD Readings;
AND THAT “Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004, Amendment Bylaw 8491, 2021 (Amendment 59)” is given FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT the E-Bike Share Permit be implemented on a pilot basis for two years from the time of permit issuance;
AND THAT staff is directed to limit the number of permits the District jointly issues with participating North Shore municipalities to one E-Bike Share operator during the pilot.

CARRIED

8.3. Bylaws 8486, 8487, and 8488: OCP Amendment, Rezoning, and Development Cost Charge (DCC) Waiver Bylaws for a Supportive Housing Development at W. 16th Street
File No. 10.5040.20/029.000

MOVED by Mayor LITTLE
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT “District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan Bylaw 7900, 2011, Amendment Bylaw 8486, 2021 (Amendment 43)” is given FIRST Reading;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1407 (Bylaw 8487)” is given FIRST Reading;

AND THAT “West 16th Street Development Cost Charges Waiver Bylaw 8488, 2021” is given FIRST Reading;

AND THAT pursuant to Section 475 and Section 476 of the Local Government Act, additional consultation is not required beyond that already undertaken with respect to Bylaw 8486;

AND THAT in accordance with Section 477 of the Local Government Act, Council has considered Bylaw 8486 in conjunction with its Financial Plan and applicable Waste Management Plans;

AND THAT Bylaw 8486 and Bylaw 8487 is referred to a Public Hearing;

AND THAT staff is directed to proceed with waiving any additional District of North Vancouver fees, subject to securing the supportive housing units in a lease agreement.

CARRIED

8.4. 2021 Budget Introduction and Draft Financial Plan Workbook
File No. 05.1700

Councillor CURREN left the meeting at 8:41 p.m. and returned at 8:42 p.m.
MOVED by Councillor FORBES
SECONDED by Councillor BOND
THAT the Draft 2021-2025 Financial Plan is received for information.

CARRIED

Councillor MURI left the meeting at 8:56 p.m.

9. REPORTS

9.1. Mayor

Mayor Little reported his attendance at the Finance & Audit Committee meeting on February 3, 2021.

9.2. Chief Administrative Officer

Nil

9.3. Councillors

9.3.1 Councillor Back reported on his attendance at the North Shore Museum and Archives Commission meeting on February 4, 2021.

9.3.3 Councillor Curren reported on her attendance at the North Vancouver District Public Library Board meeting on January 28, 2021.

9.4. Metro Vancouver Committee Appointees

9.4.1. Housing Committee – Councillor Bond

Nil

9.4.2. Indigenous Relations Committee – Councillor Hanson

Councillor Hanson reported on his attendance at the Metro Vancouver Indigenous Relations Committee on February 4, 2021.

9.4.3. Board – Councillor Muri

Nil

9.4.4. Regional Culture Committee – Councillor Muri

Nil

9.4.5. Regional Parks Committee – Councillor Muri

Nil
9.4.6. Regional Planning Committee – Councillor Muri
Nil

9.4.7. COVID-19 Response & Recovery Task Force – Mayor Little

9.4.8. Liquid Waste Committee – Mayor Little
Nil

9.4.9. Mayors Committee – Mayor Little
Nil

9.4.10. Mayors Council - TransLink – Mayor Little
Nil

9.4.11. Zero Waste Committee – Mayor Little
Nil

10. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor BACK
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON
THAT the February 8, 2021 Regular Meeting of Council for the District of North Vancouver is adjourned.

CARRIED
Absent for Vote: Councillor MURI
(9:06 p.m.)

Mayor

Municipal Clerk
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2021 – 2025 Draft Financial Plan Public Input

Public Input Opportunity
The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COUNCIL

February 9, 2021
File: 14.7010.02/000.000

AUTHOR: Haida Fortier - Assistant Fire Chief Public Safety
Brian Hutchinson - Fire Chief

SUBJECT: Community Risk Assessment: Standards of Cover 2020-2025

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council approve the document entitled “Community Risk Assessment/Standards of Cover 2020-2025 - Executive Version”.

REASONS FOR REPORT:

To update Council on the completion of the District of North Vancouver Fire & Rescues Services (DNVFRS) document entitled “Community Risk Assessment: Standards of Cover 2020-2025” (CRA/SOC) and the “Executive Version”.

SUMMARY:

DNVFRS is committed to building on proactive processes already in place and to ensure a foundation of sustainable department-wide continuous improvement. Developing the CRA/SOC establishes a credible reality-based process whereby a model and methodology is established to measure outputs and outcomes, and compare services against industry best practices. This is achieved through process review and data analytics.

BACKGROUND:

The CRA/SOC includes an overview of the municipality of the District of North Vancouver (DNV) and its fire service. A risk assessment is discussed for all areas of service that are provided by DNVFRS by geographic response area. Fire and non-fire hazards and risks are included as well as pertinent facts that increase or decrease risks. The assessment includes critical tasking based on determined service level objectives, and reflects distribution (first arriving apparatus) and concentration (effective response force) measures. Calls for service focus on a municipal perspective, but also include the impact on the DNV and the DNVFRS of regional service provision with its shared service partners: the City of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver. Performance analytics are displayed as baseline (current
performance) and benchmarks (target performance) to industry standards of 90th percentile response times. An "Executive Version" of the CRA/SOC has been prepared as a summary of the full detailed version and is included with this Report to Council.

ANALYSIS:

Timing/Approval Process:
The "Executive Version" of the CRA/SOC, the detailed CRA/SOC, and accompanying video story will be made available online following approval of the CRA/SOC by Council.

Concurrence:
The following DNV departments and external stakeholders have reviewed the document: Finance, Corporate Services, Planning, Engineering, RCMP, North Vancouver Recreation, Libraries, Museum and Archives, and NSEM.

Public Input:
DNVFRS currently engages with internal and external stakeholders in many informal ways. Stakeholder engagement is an important component of a community risk assessment. DNVFRS is collaborating with the Communications Division to develop a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan to ensure that service provision reflects the needs of the community now and into the future. DNVFRS would like to provide a clear path for stakeholders to receive information about the fire service, as well, the opportunity to provide feedback on service provision.

Conclusion:
DNVFRS is creating a foundation for data analytics to support decision-making, and evidence based metrics that will support steady growth in service provision into the future. The internal development of this CRA/SOC is an example of the DNVFRS commitment to research, review, validation and verification towards establishing a culture of self-improvement and providing the community of the DNV with an innovative, progressive fire department that meets and even exceeds expectations.

Respectfully submitted,

Haida Fortier, BPSA, CFPS
Assistant Fire Chief Public Safety

Brian Hutchinson, MA, CEM®, ECFO
Fire Chief

Attachments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th>External Agencies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Development Planning</td>
<td>☐ NS Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Development Engineering</td>
<td>☐ RCMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Utilities</td>
<td>☐ NVRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Engineering Operations</td>
<td>☐ Museum &amp; Arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Parks</td>
<td>☐ NSEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Environment</td>
<td>☐ Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Facilities</td>
<td>☐ ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Review and Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Clerk's Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Fire Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ GIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Bylaw Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FIRE SERVICE ACCREDITATION - INTRODUCTION

In 2018 the District of North Vancouver Fire & Rescue Services (DNVFRS) began a process to become an accredited fire service through the Center for Public Safety Excellence (CPSE). The CPSE is a not-for-profit international technical organization that oversees three (3) quality improvement programs: accreditation, credentialing, and education for fire and emergency services. The Commission on Fire Service Accreditation International (CFAI) oversees the accreditation program for CPSE.

The drive supporting the DNVFRS goal for accreditation; to build on proactive processes already in place and to ensure a foundation of sustainable department-wide continuous improvement. The DNVFRS timeline for first accreditation is the CFAI public hearing in the spring 2022 and aligns with the transition of the CPSE to the 10th Edition manual entitled “Quality Improvement for the Fire and Emergency Services”.

Accreditation is a credible reality-based process whereby a model and methodology is established to measure outputs and outcomes, and compare services against best practices. This is achieved through process review and analytics. Supporting this initial body of work towards accreditation also includes developing a system of annual compliance review and reporting, which aligns with the DNVFRS annual reporting process in place since 2018. Goals and performance are articulated in three companion documents that outline the commitment to a process of continuous review and improvement:

- Community Risk Assessment: Standards of Cover 2020-2025 (CRA/SOC)
- Fire & Emergency Service Self-Assessment Manual 2021-2026 (FESSAM)
- Strategic Plan 2020-2025

This document is an “Executive Version” of the CRA/SOC. It includes components of the CRA/SOC such as an overview of the municipality of the District of North Vancouver (DNV) and its fire service. A summary of the risk assessment is discussed for all areas of service that are provided by DNVFRS. The analysis in the CRA/SOC includes critical tasking based on determined service level objectives, and reflects distribution (first arriving apparatus) and concentration (effective response force) measures. Calls for service focus on a municipal perspective, but also include the impact on the DNV and the DNVFRS of regional service provision with its Cooperative Fire/Rescue Service partners: the City of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver. Performance analytics are displayed as baseline (current performance) and benchmarks (target performance) to industry standard of 90th percentile response times.

The DNVFRS is committed to attaining and maintaining CFAI accreditation. The path to achieving this goal provides the opportunities to:

- Emphasize DNVFRS dedication to excellence
- Establish a culture of continuous improvement
- Receive independent validation of all service areas
- Provide tangible data for elected officials and stakeholders

The collaboration and transformation being facilitated as a result of accreditation will influence the DNVFRS, its internal and external stakeholders, and the community of the DNV into the foreseeable future. Through accreditation, DNVFRS will create a foundation for data analytics and metrics to support decision-making, and
promote steady growth in service provision into the future. The journey to accreditation demonstrates the DNVFRS commitment to research, review, validation, verification and evidence-based decision-making. This also highlights the momentum towards establishing a culture of self-improvement, providing the community with an innovative, progressive fire department that meets and even exceeds expectations.
MESSAGE FROM THE FIRE CHIEF

On behalf of the women and men of the District of North Vancouver Fire & Rescue Services (DNVFRS), it is my honour to present the “Executive Version” of the Community Risk Assessment: Standards of Cover 2020-2025 (CRA/SOC).

The DNVFRS is an “all-hazards” Fire Service providing emergency medical response, fire suppression, technical rescue, fire inspections, public education, investigation, and community training and education. We strive to provide the highest quality services to protect the lives, property, and environment of our North Vancouver community. Currently the DNVFRS is working towards accreditation through the Commission on Fire Accreditation International/Center for Public Safety Excellence within which the CRA/SOC is a key step.

Conducting a CRA/SOC is a planning process of gathering data, analyzing it, prioritizing risks, and balancing our emergency response with our prevention/mitigation efforts. Developing strategies to deal with the risks means different things depending on whether you are focusing on emergency response or on prevention. That means being prepared to deal with any real or potential risk identified for the community. But focusing prevention efforts often means prioritizing the risks and problems that will receive special attention. This is where the Community Risk Assessment transitions into Community Risk Reduction (CRR). A true CRR effort involves an integrated approach where we more thoughtfully combine our emergency response and prevention efforts. The purpose for completing this document is to assist the DNVFRS in ensuring a safe and effective response force for emergency medical services, fire suppression, and specialty response situations, while viewing our efforts through a wider lens that involves prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery. Our ability to support community resiliency will be enhanced through this process.

In closing I want to thank all those who have contributed to this process. This involved significant collaboration internally and with external stakeholders and required that a number of key areas be researched, studied, and evaluated. These efforts set the stage as we look to the future and strive towards continuous improvement in the services we deliver today and into tomorrow.

Brian Hutchinson, MA, CEM®, ECFO
Fire Chief
DNVFRS MISSION, VISION AND VALUES

In 2018, the DNVFRS engaged with personnel over a ten (10) month period aimed at developing a shared mission, vision and values. These initial steps then resulted in a further eleven (11) month process commencing in 2019 to build a five-year strategic plan. This inclusive strategic planning process entailed focus groups, feedback forums and workshops, and notably included a dedicated strategic planning working group of nine (9) personnel from across the organization that championed the initiative.

Highlights of the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025:

The District of North Vancouver Fire & Rescue Services (DNVFRS) is committed and focused on what it does—it’s Mission. DNVFRS has defined and declared a Vision of who it is and where it is going. DNVFRS Values are reflected in its culture and are integral to performance and public service duties.

What We Believe

Our Mission

We proudly serve our community by providing exceptional fire suppression, medical aid, technical rescue, fire prevention and public education services.

Our Vision

To be an inclusive and progressive leader that consistently provides our community with excellent service.

Our Values

- Community – Treat people with kindness and respect
- Integrity – Do the right thing
- Wellbeing – Foster physical, mental, and emotional wellbeing
- Innovation – Drive change for the good

Four broad strategic priorities were identified: deliver exceptional emergency services, promote a shared culture of inclusion and engagement, foster resilient communities, and promote external and internal partnerships. DNVFRS has created strategic objectives for each of these priorities and assigned target dates for supporting actions. The Strategic Plan 2020-2025 was reviewed by DNV staff, was accepted by Council, and can be found on DNV.org/FireStrategicPlan.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**FIRE SERVICE ACCREDITATION - INTRODUCTION** ........................................................... i

**MESSAGE FROM THE FIRE CHIEF** .............................................................................. iii

**DNVFRS MISSION, VISION AND VALUES** ................................................................. iv

**TABLE OF CONTENTS** ................................................................................................... 1

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** .............................................................................................. 3

  Three Companion Documents of Fire Service Accreditation ........................................... 3

  Direction for the Future ................................................................................................... 4

**SECTION 1 COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT** ........................................................... 5

  The District of North Vancouver .................................................................................. 5

  Fire & Rescue Services Overview - DNVFRS .............................................................. 6

  Interoperability ........................................................................................................... 7

  North Shore Emergency Management (NSEM) ............................................................ 8

  Risk Methodology ........................................................................................................ 9

**SECTION 2 STANDARDS OF COVER** ......................................................................... 11

  Current Delivery System ............................................................................................. 11

  Staffing Levels and Patterns ......................................................................................... 12

**PERFORMANCE MONITORING** ................................................................................... 12

  Incident Volume Breakdown .......................................................................................... 12

  Benchmarks/Response Targets ...................................................................................... 14

**RESPONSE DATA ANALYTICS (2017-2019)** ............................................................. 15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Suppression</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services (MESA)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue Motor Vehicle Accident (MVA) (Moderate Risk)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Rescue (High Risk)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA ANALYTICS SUMMARY</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why does time matter?</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Fire/Rescue Service – DNV Response</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to City of North Vancouver (CNV)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to District of West Vancouver (DWV)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT GOALS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Why become an accredited agency? Creating a process of accreditation affords an organization the opportunity to take a deep dive into who they provide services to, what services they provide, where they are being provided, when they are being provided, and why they are being provided. It affords the opportunity to evaluate, monitor and plan for continuous improvement. It is an opportunity to verify and validate efficiency and effectiveness to industry best practices. Through this process DNVFRS will create a foundation for data analytics and evidence-based metrics to support decision-making affecting service provision into the future.

Three Companion Documents of Fire Service Accreditation
DNVFRS goals and performance are articulated in three companion documents of accreditation:

- Community Risk Assessment: Standards of Cover 2020-2025 (CRA/SOC)
- Fire & Emergency Service Self-Assessment Manual 2021-2026 (FESSAM)
- Strategic Plan 2020-2025

The Community Risk Assessment represented in Section I of the CRA/SOC reflects the makeup of the community—its demographics and design. It is an assessment of the risks that have been identified for the community both from natural and human-caused disasters. The assessment of community specific risk includes physical factors such as boundaries, development, population growth, critical infrastructure, topography, and transportation networks. This is identified by geographic planning zones (Fire Station Response Areas), and is the component of the accreditation model that reflects risk specific to the community.

The Standards of Cover represented in Section II of the CRA/SOC reflects the policies and procedures that have been put in place to establish response within the jurisdiction. This is a mandatory component of accreditation. It is an analysis of how the agency matches its resources to the community need; to its risks and the expectation that the community has for service. This may be accomplished by varying levels of service, but must be accomplished through and with the support of District Council. The Standards of Cover includes a report of response times for the top three moderate risk responses within the municipality of the District of North Vancouver (DNV). Response is detailed by first due apparatus (distribution), and the effective response force (ERF) of the complete first alarm, identified as concentration. As an agency going through accreditation for the first time, DNVFRS will be reporting on a total of four identified response types as represented in the performance tables: fire suppression (moderate), emergency medical services (MESA), and two categories of rescues. The rescue responses are broken down into moderate risk, and high risk (technical rescue). This reporting will delineate the critical tasking to effectively mitigate these response types and 90th percentile baselines (actual performance) and benchmarks (target performance).

The Fire & Emergency Service Self-Assessment Manual is a standardized template of performance indicators used by organizations going through the CFAI process to complete a self-assessment of services that it provides to the community. These are divided into the following 11 categories:

- Category I – Governance and Administration
- Category II – Assessment and Planning
- Category III – Goals and Objectives
- Category IV – Financial Resources
• Category V – Community Risk Reduction Programs
• Category VI – Physical Resources
• Category VII – Human Resources
• Category VIII – Training and Competency
• Category IX – Essential Resources
• Category X – External Systems Relationships
• Category XI – Health and Safety

These 11 categories contain 251 performance indicators in total, which represent specific services provided to the community. Each performance indicator includes a description of the level of service that the fire service provides, if the performance is meeting the identified needs, and what plans are in place to measure change or progress towards goals. References of industry best practices for each performance indicator are also included.

The Strategic Plan 2020-2025 was completed in July 2020. It was created in collaboration with a broad section of DNVFRS personnel. The outcome of this inclusive process is a community-focused plan that is measurable and results-oriented. As stated by Fire Chief Brian Hutchinson “this plan is our roadmap to guide us in our journey to implementing proactive change with a focus on the most important challenges and opportunities before us. The resulting outcomes will directly benefit our community and sustain our tradition of excellence.” Specific objectives have resulted from the strategic priorities and will be measured and reported on annually as part of the strategic implementation plan.

Direction for the Future
Supporting this initial accreditation work includes an annual expectation for compliance review and reporting of each category program area. A full accreditation resubmission is required every five years. The data analysis performed through the creation of this CRA/SOC and its companion documents reflects a fire service that is advancing toward its goals. The roadmap that has been laid out in the Strategic Plan 2020-2025 is well supported by the process that is being established through accreditation and the performance measures of systems that are already in place. Goals, objectives and actions that have resulted from this CRA/SOC, together with the Strategic Plan priorities, and the recommendations that will result from the CFAI Accreditation process, form the direction for the future. The measures that are being put in place today, solidify the establishment of a culture of continuous improvement and align DNVFRS output and outcomes with the community needs.
SECTION 1 COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

The District of North Vancouver

Located on the North Shore within Metro Vancouver, the District of North Vancouver (DNV) was incorporated in 1891 and is a separate municipality from the City of North Vancouver, of which the DNV borders on three sides. It is also separate from the District of West Vancouver which lies to the west adjacent to the Capilano River. The three municipalities are often referred to collectively as the North Shore.

The DNV is located in Canada’s Pacific South West and is part of the Metro Vancouver region. It is an urban municipality with occupancy uses located in town centres, in adjacent neighbourhoods, along greenways and forests, and up the Burrard Inlet to Indian Arm. Most development is contained within the regionally defined Metro Vancouver “urban containment boundary”. However, there are a number of clusters of development located along the Indian Arm waterway, including boat access only seasonal and full-time dwellings.

The District of North Vancouver is bordered on the North by forest, provincial parks, and two recreational ski mountains—Grouse Mountain and Mount Seymour—further to the north by the Coast Mountains, the east by Indian Arm, south by the City of North Vancouver and the Burrard Inlet, and west by the Capilano River and adjacent West Vancouver. It spans from sea level to 1,449 metres above sea level (4,754 feet). Industrial lands are located along the shores of Burrard Inlet, with road, water and rail access. The Trans-Canada Highway intersects North Vancouver, and is a major travel route across the North Shore for freight transportation, tourism, and commuters.

As reported in the Canadian Census 2016, DNV spans an area of 160.76 km² (62.07 square miles). As reflected in the above map, there are federal lands, provincial lands, Indigenous peoples lands (First Nations), Metro Vancouver Regional District (Greater Vancouver Regional District), the City of North Vancouver, The District of
West Vancouver, and Vancouver Port Authority Lands encompassed within or adjacent to the jurisdiction. With such a large number of adjacent agencies, and a relatively cut-off geographic location from Metro Vancouver, inter-agency and stakeholder relationships are a priority for the DNV.

**Fire & Rescue Services Overview - DNVFRS**

DNVFRS is an all-hazards fire and rescue service providing fire suppression, emergency medical services (commonly referred to by DNVFRS as MESA), technical rescue, fire prevention and public education services to the community and visitors of the DNV. DNVFRS also participates in an automatic aid Cooperative Fire/Rescue Service Agreement on the North Shore through a tri-municipal regional service partnership, and further provides mutual aid to member municipalities of the Metro Vancouver area.

DNVFRS is a career fire service, consisting of 129 International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) Local 1183 members, two and half (2-1/2) Canadian Union of Public Employee (CUPE) Local 389 members, one (1) exempt Administrative Staff, and seven (7) exempt Command Staff. There is a minimum staffing requirement of twenty-three (23) Fire Suppression members on duty at any time, ready to respond from five primary Fire Station locations. Response to incidents takes place in a combination of engines, quints, ladder, rescue, and squad apparatus depending on the incident type and critical tasking determinations.

DNVFRS believes that a collaborative relationship with the International Association of Fire Fighters Local 1183 serves the long-term interests of all. Collaboration enables both parties to work together for common goals including the delivery of quality services, customer satisfaction, and valuing personnel. Business is conducted with commitment and accountability in accordance with the following seven (7) principles as listed in the signed Working Relationship Agreement:

- Recognizing and respecting each other’s roles, interests and accountabilities.
- Communicating with each other in ways that promote common understanding, affective problem solving, and enhanced relationships.
- Working to earn and sustain trust.
- Using a collaborative approach to problem solving, decision-making, and negotiation.
- Attacking issues, not people.
- Honouring the agreements we reach.
- Giving each other the benefit of the doubt.

The three North Shore Fire and Rescue Services participate in a “Cooperative Fire/Rescue Service”. This functional service is executed by memorandum of understanding dated April 6, 2017 between the respective Chief Administrative Officers and Fire Chiefs of the three municipalities. As stated the goal is increasing cooperation and shared services between the three in order to:

- Improve fire/rescue service levels to residents, businesses, and industry.
- Improve the safety of responders at mutual aid incidents.
- Improve resource coordination between the three departments.
- Stabilize or even reduce operating and/or capital costs of fire/rescue services.
- Reduce risks associated with providing fire/rescue services.
The DNV has entered into a “Mutual Aid Agreement for Emergencies, October 13, 1995”. The agreement is in place for requesting and rendering aid between 20 signatory members of the Greater Vancouver/Metro Vancouver Mutual Aid consortium. Ongoing consultation, provision of emergency resources, cost recovery, termination of agreement, legal action, and negligence are all addressed within the agreement. Mutual aid response is activated by a Chief Officer when there is a need for additional resources, or resources with a capacity that does not exist in that municipality.

**Interoperability**

DNVFRS values its relationships with internal and external stakeholders. Interoperability is developed internally with DNV departments through weekly management meetings. Opportunities that have developed include standing up an Extended Operations Unit (EOU) staffed by DNV non-fire personnel. Beginning in 2018, DNVFRS strengthened its local response by training this 35-member EOU team of DNV personnel with skills and experience from their assigned “day” jobs such as arborists and heavy equipment operators. This trained group of staff would be used to augment the capacity of DNVFRS, resulting in increased community resiliency, and facilitating swifter recovery during disasters. The EOU team is trained in wildfire basic fire suppression, disaster emergency response training, and participates in ongoing exercises with DNVFRS personnel.

Residents and visitors to DNV forested areas and waterways benefit from the outdoor recreation destination. This popular pass time results in specialized training and requirement for technical rescue responses such as for swift water and high angle rescue in the rivers and canyons, as well, injured hikers and mountain bike rescues in the mountains and forested trails. To support this unique need, interagency partnerships have been developed with Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), North Shore Rescue (NSR), Talon Helicopters, Metro Vancouver, Royal Canadian Marine Search and Rescue (RCMSAR), and BC Emergency Health Services (BCEHS).

Exercising has provided further interoperability with partners and emergency response agencies from across the lower mainland, including the Tsleil-Waututh Nation, the Squamish Nation, Canadian Coast Guard, Vancouver Police Department, and Canada Task Force 1.

DNVFRS along with the North Vancouver City Fire Department (NVCFD) and West Vancouver Fire & Rescue (WVFR) have a service agreement with Seaspan Vancouver Shipyards, to respond to land-based marine emergencies. The service agreement includes Vancouver Fire Rescue Services (VFRS) with true marine firefighting capability on the water through VFRS’s two fire boats. Fire personnel are trained in partnership with Justice Institute of BC (JIBC) and Seaspan. This interagency collaboration actively involves RCMSAR, RCMP Marine Unit, VFRS Fireboat, Vancouver Police Department Marine Unit, and the Port of Vancouver.

DNVFRS personnel respond to incidents in the wildland areas of the DNV. Rescue calls may involve a need for specialized search and rescue capacity. Interoperability with NSR and Talon Helicopters facilitates a need for speedier response, access to challenging locations, and urgent medical evacuation needs of patients. Members of NSR are trained in Helicopter Human External Transport Systems (HETS), also known as long-line rescue.
Talon Helicopters is accessible through NSR for rescue incidents. In December 2020, NSR was given provincial authority for a pilot project that allows night rescue using a night-vision imaging system.

Aerial fire-fighting service is typically accessed through BC Wildfire and may include any number of air support services that are provincially available at the time. Together with BC Wildfire and Metro Vancouver Watershed Wildfire response team, helicopter companies provide integral access and resource deployment into the wildland area. During 2019 technological advancements enhanced the capacity of aerial fire-fighting and rescue response service. Talon Helicopters is the first Transportation Canada approved NVG Night Fire Attack medium helicopter. The Dauphin Airbus AS365 N2 is certified for night hover exit, medevac, SAR, passenger transport, and day and night fire attack. The Dauphin has a capacity of 901L of water and 83L of foam via belly tank.

North Shore Emergency Management (NSEM)

North Shore Emergency Management (NSEM) is a tri-municipal agency located in the Gerry Brewer Building in the City of North Vancouver. It has provided emergency management services to the three North Shore municipalities since 1978. The NSEM facility is an Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) which can operate in support of one or more of the municipalities on the North Shore in the event of an emergency and coordinates the regional emergency program for the three (3) municipalities. In major emergencies the facility becomes the Integrated North Shore Emergency Operations Center (INSEOC). This proactive integration of service enhances response capacity and capability for each individual community, and for the greater region of the North Shore.

NSEM has completed a Hazard, Risk, and Vulnerability Analysis (HRVA) to “identify hazards or emergency situations which are a priority for North and West Vancouver.” In British Columbia (BC) the development of a HRVA is mandated in the Emergency Program Act (1996). Specifically local governments are mandated to assess the “relative risk of occurrence and potential impact on people and property of emergencies or disasters.” The January 2010 HRVA was prepared using the HRVA Community Self-Assessment Tool that is provided by the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General, Provincial Emergency Program.

A process is currently in place to update the 2010 HRVA for the North Shore. Ebbwater Consulting Inc. has been hired to develop a preliminary HRVA for the North Shore including a baseline assessment of priority hazards, vulnerabilities and risks in the region, utilizing a template to build-out a complete HRVA. On September 17, 2019, fifty-eight (58) stakeholders with subject matter expertise from across the North Shore attended a collaborative HRVA workshop. The working group considered eight (8) priority hazards, focusing on hazard likelihood, historical events, hazard trends, vulnerability/resiliency, strategic risk treatments, and consequences. The following is the resulting risk priority list:

1. Windstorm
2. Landslide/debris flow
3. Extreme heat
4. Wildfire (tied with extreme heat)
5. Coastal flood
6. Earthquake
7. Hazardous material spill
8. Clearwater flooding
9. Forest Fire and Wildland Urban Interface Fire Risks

Risk Methodology
For the purposes of Fire Department response, the DNV is divided into five (5) fire station response planning areas:

- Fire Station #1 – Lynn Valley
- Fire Station #2 – Lynnmour
- Fire Station #3 – Montroyal
- Fire Station #4 – Seymour/Deep Cove
- Fire Station #5 – Norgate

Further dividing these five (5) fire response planning areas into fire response zones allows for greater determination of closest apparatus for fulfilling concentration (effective response force ERF), as well, for recognizing unique areas in the DNV, such as wildland zones Z1 – Z4, and highway zones H1 – H5. The zones are used by computer aided dispatch (CAD) for managing resources through computer-aided move-ups using a “live move-up module” termed LiveMUM by Deccan International.
DNVFRS risk methodology takes into consideration a 2-axis risk categorization based on probability and consequence. This methodology relies on the commitment of resources for the service being provided, as well as the frequency of incidents by type and the severity of the outcome on the community. Outcome on community takes into consideration the types of use in the built-up area and the wildland.

The allocation of resources has been determined to meet the level of risk. Resource commitment for the service being provided also incorporates consequences as a factor, rated from low to very high. The benefit to recognizing moderate risk as including minor risk, normal risk, temperate risk, and very high risk, aligns with the resources deployed for high probability events that occur frequently, for example structure fires (see following commitment of resources chart).

This methodology also recognizes maximum risk as including maximum risk, extreme risk, and severe risk, which aligns with the high probability of a wildfire to the community, and the high consequence it could have on the wildland area and urban interface.

Risk methodology for the DNV considers occupancy type/use information which aligns with fire department response. The services provided include consideration for natural and human-made hazards and risk identification and correlate with the existing HRVA. The anticipated future needs related to wildfire are also included in the HRVA update that is currently underway.
Risk is further determined by fire station response area, providing a more detailed Community Risk Assessment (CRA). In the future, additional data sets would form a component part of a comprehensive CRA, including census demographics by neighbourhood. This would include socio-economic factors, gender, age, and cultural background which could then be applied to a mapping layer that includes incident response. The work may require realigning fire station response areas to align with neighbourhood mapping or vice versa.

SECTION 2 STANDARDS OF COVER

Current Delivery System

District of North Vancouver Fire and Rescue Services (DNVFRS) provides emergency and non-emergency response, and community risk reduction services to the residents and visitors of the District of North Vancouver (DNV). DNVFRS “engages across the organization at the strategic, tactical, and task level” as referenced by Fire Chief Brian Hutchinson “our priorities are summed up as the five ‘rights’: our job is to ensure the right people (our Fire Fighters), are at the right place, at the right time, with the right equipment and training, doing the right things and solving the problems at hand” (Annual Report 2019).

DNVFRS provides service to the DNV urban and wildland environment. Frontline apparatus consisting of five (5) fire engines/quints, one (1) each tower/rescue (cross-staffed), and a command vehicle, operate from five (5) strategically located fire stations, and together with the training centre, support DNVFRS capacity. Additional light apparatus including wildland and rescue squads support response throughout the jurisdiction.

In addition to fighting fires, DNVFRS Fire Fighters routinely respond to calls for medical assistance, rescue of all kinds, hazardous materials concerns, requests for public assistance and more. In 2019 DNVFRS Fire Fighters responded to 4,256 incidents. The top five response types in 2019 were: emergency medical services (MESA) 52%, alarms ringing 18%, vehicle accidents 9%, fires 7%, and rescues 4% (Annual Report, 2019).

Mitigating the impact of fire and reducing the number of fires that start in the first place is a primary goal of DNVFRS. Risk reduction measures are pursued by investigating fires to understand where they started and what caused them, by working with builders and developers to ensure that measures are in place to limit fire risk, and by regularly inspecting commercial, industrial, and multi-family buildings to ensure they comply with fire codes and standards. Risk reduction measures benefit the community and DNVFRS Fire Fighters by providing building and occupancy specific details, hazard alerts, and ensuring that life safety systems are regularly serviced.

The personnel of DNVFRS are its greatest asset. DNVFRS provides comprehensive training to its members. In 2019 the Training Division provided 9,392 hours of specialized training delivered in 343 training sessions to 126 staff (Annual Report, 2019). Specialized training of fire and rescue disciplines is delivered by DNVFRS professionally certified instructors. The instructor led disciplines include: fire ground survival, rapid intervention team, emergency vehicle operations, Critical Incident Stress Management/Resilient Minds, utilities safety, structural collapse, Blue Card Hazard Zone Incident Command, fire behavior, swift-water rescue, high angle rope rescue, vehicle extrication, fire ground operations, wildland firefighting, and Emergency Medical Assistant (EMA) delivered at the First Medical Responder (FMR) and Emergency Medical Responder (EMR) levels. This depth and breadth of training enhances DNVFRS operational capacity and effectiveness when responding to emergencies.
In addition to specialized training, DNVFRS personnel also receive a significant amount of on-the-job training that teaches foundational skills such as: ladder operations, traffic safety, radio communications, hose deployment, gas and electric safety, and building construction. Foundational skill training ensures that DNVFRS Fire Fighters maintain the required competency standards for Fire Fighters in a ‘Full Service’ Fire Department as outlined by the BC Office of the Fire Commissioner in the BC Fire Service Structure Fire Fighters Competency and Training Playbook (Playbook, May 2015).

**Staffing Levels and Patterns**

DNVFRS Fire Suppression personnel follow the two-platoon system as referenced in the Fire Department Act [RSBC 1996] Chapter 143. The DNVFRS has four (4) platoons lettered A, B, C, and D. All personnel within this system work forty-eight (48) hours in an eight (8) day cycle: with two (2) 10-hour days followed by two (2) 14-hour nights, followed by four (4) days off. The two platoon system as defined is the No. 2 System (Fire Department Act, Section 4).

DNVFRS maintains a regular shift strength of the following levels as per Letter of Understanding (LOU) dated March 15, 2016:

- **Station #1 – Lynn Valley**
  - Two (2) Captains plus five (5) Fire Fighters
- **Station #2 – Lynnmour**
  - One (1) Captain plus three (3) Fire Fighters
- **Station #3 – Montroyal**
  - One (1) Captain plus three (3) Fire Fighters
- **Station #4 – Deep Cove**
  - One (1) Captain plus three (3) Fire Fighters
- **Station #5 – Norgate**
  - One (1) Captain plus three (3) Fire Fighters

Minimum staffing of shift strength is equal to 23 Fire Suppression personnel.

Since 1997, the least senior ten (10) Fire Suppression personnel are scheduled on a 56-day cycle in accordance with Operating Guideline 5.01.16.16 “Fire Fighter Relief Pool” and Letter of Understanding (LOU) dated March 15, 2016. The guideline is in place to ensure appropriate shift strength is maintained. Relief pool members are full-time Fire Fighters who are assigned to a platoon for the purposes of determining benefits. However, instead of working the two-platoon system, they work a 56-day cycle consisting of no more than 336 hours through working any combination of platoons.

As of December 2020 DNVFRS maintains eight (8) positions in the Public Safety Division, staffed by Group 2 IAFF personnel. The Training Division is staffed by one (1) Group 2 IAFF member. The hours of work are a 35-hour week. As of January 1, 1977 a principle of hours was set out in the Collective Agreement stating that Group 2 employees who are required to work a four (4) day week shall work a 9-1/4 hour day inclusive of a 30 minute lunch break. Employees who work a five (5) day week shall work eight (8) hours with a one (1) hour lunch break.

**PERFORMANCE MONITORING**

**Incident Volume Breakdown**

DNVFRS provides emergency and non-emergency services to the DNV residents and visitors. Through the regional Cooperative Fire/Rescue Service Letter of Understanding (commonly referred to as the Shared Service...
Agreement), DNVFRS also responds to the City of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver. DNVFRS fire apparatus and personnel could be a first due apparatus in any of the three municipalities, as well as part of the effective response force (ERF) and vice versa.

### Incident Volume Breakdown - All DNV Fire Station Response Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Suppression</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue and MVA</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Emergency</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standbys</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>4956</td>
<td>4332</td>
<td>4256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All Incidents within All DNV Fire Station Response Areas 2017 - 2019

*Five (5) Fire Stations and the Training Centre are noted by the DNVFRS Maltese Cross (logo)*

*Standby locations are noted by the twelve (12) large circles coloured light blue, purple, orange and red*
Benchmarks/Response Targets
As a fire service agency that is seeking first time accreditation, DNVFRS is required to write to all services areas in the Fire & Emergency Services Self-Assessment Manual (FESSAM), to report the response data for the top three (3) moderate response types, and any high risk response type where service was provided more than 10 times annually, or cumulative 50 over five (5) years.

DNVFRS records the total response time to incidents (baseline actuals) and has established goals for response time aligned with industry best practice (benchmark targets). The incident types being reported in the CRA/SOC are: Fire Suppression Moderate Risk, Emergency Medical Services (MESA) Moderate Risk, Rescue Motor Vehicle Accident (MVA) Moderate Risk, and Technical Rescue High Risk.

The benchmark targets that have been established for these four (4) incident types are broken down by alarm handling, turnout time, travel time of first due, total response time of first due, additional travel time for the effective response force (ERF), and the total response time of the ERF. Establishing a benchmark target has allowed the DNVFRS to review and analyze performance to the 90th percentile. The following table represents the benchmark targets for DNVFRS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reportable Categories Based on Moderate Risk and Responses Greater than 10/Year</th>
<th>Alarm Handling</th>
<th>Turnout Time</th>
<th>Travel Time First Due</th>
<th>Total Response Time - First Due</th>
<th>Add'l Travel Time ERF</th>
<th>Total Response Time - ERF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Suppression - Moderate Risk</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>01:00</td>
<td>01:30</td>
<td>04:00</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>04:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services (MESA) - Moderate Risk</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>01:00</td>
<td>01:00</td>
<td>04:00</td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue Motor Vehicle Accident (MVA) - Moderate Risk</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>01:00</td>
<td>01:30</td>
<td>04:00</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>04:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Rescue - High Risk</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>01:00</td>
<td>01:30</td>
<td>04:00</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>04:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018 DNVFRS established a data analytics reporting process for turnout times by incident. Data was analyzed and cleaned utilizing actual information based on Fire Command (automatic vehicle locator tool) and supported by Chief Officers. As an example, an incident dispatched as an alarms call that became a fire suppression incident would be coded to the actual nature of the incident and reported as such. Responses that were over a total response time of 10 minutes were investigated and compared against Fire Command for actuals and the records were adjusted if warranted.

The reporting statistic reflected in both the 2018 and 2019 Annual Reports employed an “average” response time calculation. DNVFRS has transitioned away from reporting as an average to reporting based on the CFAI model of 90th percentile. This means that DNVFRS is now reporting data on what is being done 90% of the time, as opposed to the broader range that averages provides. This process also provides the ability to quantify deployment data and compare to previous years, and established benchmark targets with like-sized organizations. 90th percentile based on baseline actuals and benchmark targets established by DNVFRS provides a consistent and quantifiable approach to data analytics. The total response time of the first due unit allows DNVFRS to test distribution of resources within the DNV, and determine how well the needs of the
community are met. The total response time of the ERF allows DNVFRS to test how well the concentration of
the full first alarm complement performed, as determined based on critical tasking analysis.

Alarm handling time is under the control of Surrey Fire Service (SFS) Dispatch Centre and consistently meets
and exceeds NFPA 1121 (2019) of 60 seconds, 90% of the time. Alarm handling time is not influenced by
DNVFRS personnel. DNVFRS personnel have the capacity to influence turnout time and travel time as
components of total response time.

NFPA 1710 (2020) is an internationally recognized standard for “Organization and Deployment of Fire
Suppression Operations, Emergency Medical Operations, and Special Operations to the Public by Career Fire
Departments.” The economic restrictions for DNVFRS to provide response coverage meeting NFPA 1710 all of
the time (100%) is not possible. Using the industry best practice of the CFAI model supports the positioning of
fire stations and resources to cover 90 percent of the service area in each first-due area, and achieving the
concentration of the effective response force (ERF) to multi-unit responses. Utilizing the 90th percentile and
CFAI aligned data analytics will support decision-making to allow for equity of service to DNV residents and
visitors, and the ability to proactively plan for efficient and effective service levels.

**RESPONSE DATA ANALYTICS (2017-2019)**

To align with best practices and the CFAI accreditation model, DNVFRS is supported by Deccan International’s
purpose-built CAD Analyst application for reporting the three (3) year period 2017-2019 using the
methodology of calculating 90th percentile. This sets a realistic expectation of response performance for the
community.
Fire Suppression

As supported by three (3) years of cumulative data, DNVFRS meets its goal of 00:06:30 minutes for first due total response time to fire suppression calls 64% of the time. The 90th percentile performance for the period for total response time was 00:08:45.

1st Due Target Benchmark - Based on 90th Percentile
Three Year Period 2017-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Suppression - Moderate Risk</th>
<th>Alarm Handling (1 Min)</th>
<th>Turnout Time (1.5 Min)</th>
<th>Travel Time (4 Min)</th>
<th>Total Response Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Fire Stations</td>
<td>89% 00:00:58</td>
<td>34% 00:02:25</td>
<td>62% 00:06:21</td>
<td>64% 00:08:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #1 - Lynn Valley</td>
<td>91% 00:00:58</td>
<td>29% 00:02:36</td>
<td>60% 00:06:52</td>
<td>71% 00:08:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #2 - Lynnmour</td>
<td>89% 00:01:00</td>
<td>38% 00:02:23</td>
<td>49% 00:06:26</td>
<td>55% 00:08:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #3 - Montroyal</td>
<td>91% 00:00:56</td>
<td>28% 00:02:35</td>
<td>47% 00:06:26</td>
<td>60% 00:08:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #4 - Seymour/Deep Cove</td>
<td>94% 00:00:53</td>
<td>25% 00:02:37</td>
<td>42% 00:08:10</td>
<td>43% 00:10:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #5 - Norgate</td>
<td>92% 00:00:54</td>
<td>24% 00:02:40</td>
<td>65% 00:06:14</td>
<td>65% 00:08:43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance would be positively effected by decreasing turnout time and travel time. There is the greatest opportunity for improvement with turnout time, as the benchmarks are consistently not being achieved; targets set by DNVFRS personnel are being achieved 34% of the time. The best response performance is Fire Station #2 — Lynnmour. Alternately, travel times are significantly longer in Fire Station #4 — Seymour/Deep Cove which has the largest area of coverage at 10.81 km2 of urban area, and 56.72 km2 of wildland.

![2017-2019 Fire Suppression- Moderate Risk Total Response Time 90th Percentile Scores](image)
Emergency Medical Services (MESA)
The three (3) years of cumulative data 2017-2019 show the DNVFRS meets its goal of 06:00 minutes for first
due total response time to MESA calls 65% of the time. The 90th percentile performance for the period for total
response time was 00:08:10.

| 1st Due Target Benchmark - Based on 90th Percentile
| Three Year Period 2017-2019 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency Medical Services (MESA) - Moderate</th>
<th>Alarm Handling (1 Min)</th>
<th>Turnout Time (1.5 Min)</th>
<th>Travel Time (4 Min)</th>
<th>Total Response Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Fire Stations</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #1 - Lynn Valley</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #2 - Lynnmour</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #3 - Montroyal</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #4 - Seymour/Deep Cove</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #5 - Norgate</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes that are made to reduce turnout time and travel time for fire suppression should also have a positive
affect on MESA as changes in behaviour, readiness, fire station design, etc. will have overall effects. DNVFRS
personnel do not typically turn out for MESA incidents in structural fire fighting Personal Protective Equipment
(PPE). Appropriate MESA PPE is available in the apparatus and may be donned on route while seat-belted or
upon arrival as the situation dictates, i.e. masks, gowns, face shield. Updates regarding level of MESA PPE
required may be noted in the incident notes, or may be updated on route by dispatch.
Rescue Motor Vehicle Accident (MVA) (Moderate Risk)

DNVFRS responded to an annual average of 540 rescue calls for all risk levels, from 2017-2019. Based on 2-axis risk analysis and critical tasking that aligns with O.G. #2.03.04, rescues have been divided into low risk, moderate risk, and high risk. Over the three (3) year period, DNVFRS responded to an average of 211 moderate risk rescues. Moderate risk rescues are MVA Rescue Required, including MVA Highway. The first due for a moderate risk rescue met the goal of 06:30 for total response time 40% of the time. The 90th percentile time was 00:09:04.

1st Due Target Benchmark - Based on 90th Percentile
Three Year Period 2017-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rescue MVA - Moderate Risk</th>
<th>Alarm Handling Time (1 Min)</th>
<th>Turnout Time (1.5 Min)</th>
<th>Travel Time (4 Min)</th>
<th>Total Response Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Fire Stations</td>
<td>40% 00:01:27</td>
<td>40% 00:02:37</td>
<td>35% 00:06:45</td>
<td>40% 00:09:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #1 - Lynn Valley</td>
<td>88% 00:00:43</td>
<td>25% 00:02:09</td>
<td>75% 00:05:04</td>
<td>62% 00:07:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #2 - Lynnmour</td>
<td>81% 00:01:13</td>
<td>41% 00:02:42</td>
<td>31% 00:07:10</td>
<td>37% 00:10:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #3 - Montroyal</td>
<td>100% 00:00:30</td>
<td>0% 00:02:24</td>
<td>20% 00:04:39</td>
<td>20% 00:07:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #4 - Seymour/Deep Cove</td>
<td>93% 00:00:42</td>
<td>14% 00:02:45</td>
<td>29% 00:10:22</td>
<td>36% 00:13:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #5 - Norgate</td>
<td>91% 00:00:52</td>
<td>36% 00:02:23</td>
<td>26% 00:06:09</td>
<td>41% 00:07:57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Rescue (High Risk)

DNVFRS responded to an annual average of 100 high risk rescues (technical rescues) during the three year period. High risk rescues are technical rescues involving swift water, high angle, trench, confined space, and trail. For high risk technical rescues the 06:30 total response time was achieved 26% of the time. The 90th percentile total response time was 00:16:11.

1st Due Target Benchmark - Based on 90th Percentile
Three Year Period 2017-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Station - High Risk</th>
<th>Alarm Handling Time (1 Min)</th>
<th>Turnout Time (1.5 Min)</th>
<th>Travel Time (4 Min)</th>
<th>Total Response Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Fire Stations</td>
<td>49% 00:04:27</td>
<td>43% 00:02:50</td>
<td>33% 00:11:45</td>
<td>26% 00:16:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #1 - Lynn Valley</td>
<td>60% 00:02:05</td>
<td>34% 00:02:47</td>
<td>37% 00:08:19</td>
<td>37% 00:11:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #2 - Lynnmour</td>
<td>40% 00:03:31</td>
<td>55% 00:02:37</td>
<td>20% 00:14:33</td>
<td>15% 00:17:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #3 - Montroyal</td>
<td>50% 00:01:41</td>
<td>29% 00:02:42</td>
<td>47% 00:08:27</td>
<td>26% 00:10:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #4 - Seymour/Deep Cove</td>
<td>37% 00:05:22</td>
<td>51% 00:03:00</td>
<td>25% 00:15:45</td>
<td>12% 00:19:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #5 - Norgate</td>
<td>44% 00:01:40</td>
<td>56% 00:02:57</td>
<td>62% 00:05:48</td>
<td>50% 00:08:05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes made to reduce turnout time and travel time should have a positive effect on all calls, as changes in behaviour, readiness, station design and layout, will have overall effects. Notably alarm handling time for rescue calls is increased. Additional information is taken by the dispatch call taker, information is often verified, additional questions asked, etc. Turnout time does not appear measurably affected by the added complexity of these call types. Travel time is measurably longer which could be as a result of location in the wildland, additional PPE or information required at a staging point, or may include travel time to the patient/incident.

![2017-2019 Rescue - High Risk Total Response Time 90th Percentile Scores](image)
DATA ANALYTICS SUMMARY

Reflecting on the 90th percentile performance tables of all four reportable categories, there is a historical pattern of response performance that can be improved. Addressing performance may consider changes on multiple levels:

- What changes are controlled by personnel related to behavior and readiness?
- What support do personnel need to make those changes?
- What changes are controlled by management, and what are the barriers to those changes?

Assessing the need, identifying the changes, initiating change, and monitoring and providing feedback on success and challenges are part of a process that began in 2019 related to turnout times. In mid-2020 DNVFRS began reporting average turnout times to department personnel. Data reporting to personnel has now been realigned from average to 90th percentile.

Why does time matter?

There are two (2) time-critical response needs for the first fire apparatus to arrive at an incident. For a fire it is the time-critical need to stop progression towards flashover. For a cardiac arrest patient it is the point of brain death.

Flashover is a threat to life and property. There is little opportunity for the first arriving apparatus to save lives and property once flashover occurs in an occupancy. Public Safety personnel can mitigate this threat through public education, outreach, and inspections on inspectable properties. Occupants can mitigate this threat through good fire safety practices and housekeeping, practicing escape planning, having sprinkler systems, working smoke alarms and fire alarm devices, or potentially through protecting in a safe area and awaiting rescue.

Regardless, fires happen and when they do, they burn quicker and hotter as new building construction materials and the composition of home furnishings are drastically different than 40+ years ago. Today’s home contents contain large quantities of petroleum-based products and synthetics that burn faster and hotter versus traditional, more natural materials such as wood and cotton. Legacy construction as occurred before the mid-80s could typically sustain until flashover for around 30 minutes. However, science is showing that this time frame is now outdated. Due to the modern fire environment—building construction and fuel load—fire is accelerating faster, and times to collapse and flashover may occur as quickly as 3-4 minutes. This gives occupants less time to evacuate, and means that the total response time for a fire suppression response matters!

![IMPACT OF CONSTRUCTION TYPE ON FIRE TIMELINE](image-url)
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When we consider time as it relates to emergency medical services we consider that irreversible brain death can occur within six (6) minutes when oxygen is not circulating to the brain. Bystander CPR, early defibrillation, and community CPR type programs can be mitigating measures. Regardless, the greatest chance for survivability is within the first 10 minutes of the event occurring. This means that total response time for emergency medical service calls matters too!

**Cooperative Fire/Rescue Service – DNV Response**

The Cooperative Fire/Rescue Service Letter of Understanding supports the provision of the best service for all residents and visitors to the North Shore. When resources in any municipality are anticipated to be tied up for greater than 10 minutes, LiveMUM anticipates whether due to the time of day/day of week, there is a historical need for a coverage move-up. This computer-aided move-up anticipates service gaps, and allows all three (3) municipalities the benefit of additional resources for simultaneous calls without having to be concerned with habitual draw-down of resources.

While DNVFRS predominantly responds within the DNV, service is also provided to the City of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver to support their primary service provision. On average during the three year period 2017-2019, 86.6% of DNVFRS calls for service were located in the DNV. DNVFRS personnel responded into the City of North Vancouver 10.2%, and 3.2% in the District of West Vancouver.
Response to City of North Vancouver (CNV)

DNVFRS predominantly responds into the CNV as a component of Fire Suppression ERF as noted in the following table. Calls for service tend to occur more frequently on Tuesdays and less frequently on Sundays.

### Incident Volume Breakdown - CNV Fire Station Response Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Suppression</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue and MVA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Emergency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standbys</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Incident Volume (Avg) by Day of Week - CNV Response Area

![Incident Volume (Avg) by Day of Week - CNV Response Area](image)

### Incident Volume (Avg) by Month of Year - CNV Response Area

![Incident Volume (Avg) by Month of Year - CNV Response Area](image)
Response to District of West Vancouver (DWV)

DNVFRS personnel respond into the DWV as a component of Fire Suppression ERF but also for rescues and motor vehicle accidents (MVAs). MESA support services are less frequent. Rescue calls are most likely to occur on a Friday, Saturday or Sunday.

Incident Volume Breakdown - DWV Fire Station Response Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Suppression</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue and MVA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Emergency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standbys</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incident Volume (Avg) by Day of Week - DWV Response Areas

Incident Volume (Avg) by Month of Year - DWV Response Areas
PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT GOALS

GOAL #1 – Meet total response time 90th percentile benchmark targets by Q4, 2025.

DNVFRS has identified a need to monitor and improve response performance. When fire department response times and effective response force assembly times are low, it is more likely that sufficient resources have been deployed, which is associated with more positive outcomes from risk events.

Performance objectives to meet Goal #1 are related to: total response time targets, location of apparatus, access to remote locations, and traffic congestion. Actions are required to meet objectives, and are expected to align with the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025.

1.1 Total Response Time Targets

Improving response time can be affected in a number of ways. Personnel have the capacity to influence turnout time and travel time, thereby impacting overall response time. Turnout time can be influenced by operational readiness, physical location, and fire station physical layout. Travel time can be influenced by operational readiness and area street location familiarity. Travel time is also impacted by traffic congestion, construction, and fluctuates with time of day, day of week, time of year, and weather conditions. Anticipated actions include:

- Review turnout time and travel time benchmark targets to determine whether they are achievable, realistic and safe.
- Encourage personnel to be ready to respond to incidents with PPE checked and staged in an appropriate location to ensure timeliness in turnout time can be met and improved upon.
- Promote familiarity with streets and routes and/or reliance on digital routing information so as to eliminate time spent at the map.
- Encourage consistency for Fire Officers to select “on route” when the apparatus roles the tires to an incident, and to select “on scene” when the apparatus stops its tires/arrives at the incident.
- Explore efficiencies in fire station layout and design to reduce/remove barriers to timely turnout time.
- Evaluate locations of new fire stations in consideration of data analytics aligned with 90th percentile as opposed to average times.
- Undertake a program of regular reviews of performance aligned with annual reporting of 90th percentile.

1.2 Location of Apparatus

DNVFRS apparatus are strategically located in the community. The location of the closest fire station can influence the travel time(s) of apparatus and affect the outcomes of fire suppression or a patient that is in need of critical intervention. DNVFRS has been working with Deccan International and its predictive analysis model to plan for a regional model of response across the North Shore by “closest fire station”. DNVFRS is working with Fire Dispatch to prepare a test environment where scenarios for response in all three (3) North Shore municipalities can be tested and demonstrated to support the data analytics that have been prepared. Anticipated actions include:
• Collaborate across the North Shore on the “closest fire station” response model.
• Report analytics to reflect 90th percentile as opposed to average times.
• Investigate the impact that staffing a 4th Fire Fighter on the Tower/Rescue would have on apparatus availability, standby’s, and overall response time in DNV.
• Investigate time of day and day of year predictive analytics to determine best locations (including standby locations) for responses that would improve response time targets.
• Investigate options to improve response to the road access areas of the homes in the wildland using predictive analytics, such as pre-deployment to a staging area during times where risk is escalated.
• Collaborate with internal and external stakeholders (Planning Division, Metro Vancouver migration numbers, predictive analytics, etc.) on data research for projected densification and population growth and its impact on future operational capabilities.

1.3 Access to Remote Locations

DNVFRS responds to structures outside of the Metro Vancouver Urban Containment Boundary. There are also a number of residential structures adjacent to the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), some of which are accessed by road and some are by boat/water access only. These response locations could be considered rural, although the DNVFRS does not currently have the capacity to track response to those locations, i.e. “arrive at patient”. To obtain a comprehensive total response time into the wildland interface and intermix areas DNVFRS would need to begin tracking response time to the patient or point of concern. Anticipated actions include:

• Evaluate the number of responses that would be affected and determine the value that would be received from tracking this information.
• Conduct annual analysis of response data to determine best location for resources responding to the wildland urban interface, and wildland intermix areas.
• Assess if predictive analysis could result in location assignments or move-ups of apparatus during various time periods that could reduce travel times to these areas.

1.4 Traffic Congestion

DNVFRS has been collaborating with the DNV Traffic Division regarding building a comprehensive Traffic Pre-emption Program. As of 2020 two (2) traffic signals have been upgraded with GTT Opticom 2.4 GHz pre-emption equipment. An additional five (5) are planned for 2021. Traffic pre-emption signals can alleviate delays with traffic congestion and increase Fire Fighter and civilian safety when responding in an emergency situation. Anticipated actions include:

• Develop a comprehensive plan in partnership with DNV Traffic Division for prioritizing key intersections for implementation of Traffic Pre-emption Program.
• Collaborate with NVCFD and WVFR to align the Traffic Pre-emption Program across the North Shore.
• Proactively work to ensure capital funding and ongoing operational funding for the GTT transmitter equipment for frontline apparatus is in place to support the Traffic Pre-emption Program.
GOAL #2 – Collaborate with internal and external stakeholders to build a comprehensive Community Risk Assessment (CRA) by Q2, 2022.

DNVFRS has performed a Community Risk Assessment (CRA) based on population, Fire Station Response Area, occupancy type/use, and response type. Additional data sets could be combined to provide a more comprehensive CRA. The resulting analytics may then be used to inform all programs in the fire service—both proactive and reactive programs—and potentially public safety programs that are under the jurisdiction of other service providers. In 2020 DNVFRS filled the temporary full time position of Captain – Community Risk Reduction and Pre-Incident Fire Planning. This three-year annually renewable position is planned to work with the Assistant Fire Chief Public Safety on a comprehensive CRA, and build a comprehensive pre-planning program. Data analytics on the productivity and effectiveness of this position will need to be tracked to determine community impacts and value.

Performance objectives to meet Goal #2 are related to: availability of data sets, data analytics, and communications. Actions are required to meet objectives, and are expected to align with the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025. Anticipated actions include:

- Investigate industry best practices for inclusion of a wide range of data to support a comprehensive and evergreen CRA.
- Review and revise programs to ensure messaging and content is appropriate and applicable for intended target audiences, and monitor community impact of these programs.
- Share data analytics with other stakeholders and service providers to gain maximum benefits towards Community Risk Reduction (CRR).
- Dedicate time and resources to develop a comprehensive Pre-Incident Fire Planning Program.
- Utilize evidence-based decision making and data analytics to support the business plan facilitating transition of the Captain – Public Safety (Community Risk Reduction and Pre-Incident Fire Planning) from a temporary full-time position to a full-time position with DNVFRS.
- Build out a diversity and inclusion program (in coordination with Training Division).

GOAL #3 – Investigate current capability and capacity of DNVFRS Training Division to meet organizational needs and expectations. Complete a gap analysis with regards to training delivery and staffing needs by Q1, 2022.

DNVFRS Training Division provides mandated support services to personnel. A pool of Acting Captains are utilized to provide the depth of training and lesson plan development that is required to maintain personnel proficiencies. The pending Maplewood Fire Rescue Centre will have enhanced training facilities to support robust internal delivery of programs, offer increased interagency opportunities, and may provide for revenue generation options through external program delivery. Relocation of the Training Centre to the new location will require a great deal of planning and implementation.
Performance objectives to meet Goal #3 are related to: data analytics, stakeholder engagement, and communications. Actions are required to meet objectives, and are expected to align with the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025. Anticipated actions include:

- Incorporate data analytics to support mid-range and long-range functional capacity needs of the Training Division through creation of a five-year staffing plan.
- Assess and identify staffing strategies to enhance the internal focus on diversity and inclusion within recruitment and outreach efforts.
- Seek ways to embed best practices with regard to diversity and inclusion throughout the DNVFRS.

GOAL #4 – Implement a comprehensive risk-based inspection program based on data analytics by Q1, 2022.

Performance objectives to meet Goal #4 are related to: availability of data sets, data analytics, internal/external collaboration, and communications. Actions are required to meet objectives, and are expected to align with the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025. Anticipated actions include:

- Participate in a proof of concept program with OPTA/FUS for the use of predictive analysis within a risk-based inspection program.
- Through partnership with DNV GIS and IT Services, seek to incorporate leading edge technology that supports use of data analytics within evidence-based decision making for the DNVFRS.
- Identify a mobile inspection application that will meet the needs of DNVFRS.
- Utilize data analytics to support a pilot project focused on low risk occupancies undertaking self-inspection or third-party inspection programs.

GOAL #5 – Develop a regular review program for all Fire Department related bylaws and operating guidelines by Q4, 2021.

DNVFRS and the DNV legal department have been working on an updated Fire Bylaw. The current Fire Bylaw was created in 2009 and does not reflect all current services. A revised DNV Fire Bylaw is expected to be ready for presentation to DNV Council in 2021. The Radio Communications Bylaw is also under review. The Fees and Charges Bylaw is updated annually and was thoroughly reviewed by DNVFRS in 2020.

Performance objectives to meet Goal #5 are related to: internal and external stakeholder collaboration, community risk reduction, and communications. Actions are required to meet objectives, and are expected to align with the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025. Anticipated actions include:

- Collaborate with DNV legal to update the Fire Bylaw to reflect current business practices.
- Work with DNV staff on updates to the Fireworks Bylaw to reflect the wants/needs of Council and the community.
- Review bylaws to include relevant components of accreditation documents.
- Advocate with NVCFD and WVFR to align all fire bylaws amongst the Cooperate Fire/Rescue Services partners.
- Ensure a rigorous review and revision process is completed annually for all department operating guidelines.

**GOAL #6 – Collaborate with DNV Utilities Division to support further enhancement of the water distribution system in the DNV by Q2, 2022.**

DNV has been rated by the Fire Underwriters Survey 2016 (FUS) as having a high performance for water distribution. Areas that have been noted in the past that have limited access to the water distribution network include the highway, and the remote/wildland areas on Indian River Drive. DNV has a network of water tank/reservoirs strategically located throughout the DNV. One of these tanks has been decommissioned but is still in place along Indian River Drive.

Performance objectives to meet Goal #6 are related to: internal and external stakeholder collaboration, community risk reduction, predictive analytics, and communications. Actions are required to meet objectives, and are expected to align with the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025. Anticipated actions include:

- Work collaboratively with DNV Utilities Division to address potential gaps in water distribution system (i.e. Highway Right-of-Way) and placement of fire hydrants in the DNV.
- Undertake a thorough needs assessment and identify options for water distribution in remote residential areas such as the Woodland/Sunshine Falls/Cascade areas.
- Collaborate with DNV Utilities Division on a long-term plan to ensure back-up power for the water distribution pumping stations.
- Identify any potential use that DNVFRS could recommend for the water tank/reservoir that has been decommissioned in the Indian River Drive area.

**GOAL #7 – Develop and implement a five (5) year comprehensive stakeholder engagement program by Q2, 2022.**

DNVFRS does not have a formal stakeholder engagement program. In the fall of 2020, DNVFRS staff commenced collaboration with DNV Communications Division to establish a robust stakeholder engagement program.

Performance objectives to meet Goal #7 are related to: community risk reduction, collaboration with internal/external stakeholders, and communications. Actions are required to meet objectives, and are expected to align with the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025. Anticipated actions include:

- Engage with the Communications Division to identify internal and external stakeholders with potential interest in the fire service for follow up consultation.
• Implement a pilot project to establish a stakeholder working group in the form of a Fire Service Advisory Group. Establish terms of reference that ensure expectations, and length of service are clear for all participants.
• Consider what the best format would be for information sharing and gathering.
• Empower the Fire Service Advisory Group to examine and report on opportunities regarding DNVFRS recruitment, outreach, diversity, and inclusion.

GOAL #8 – Initiate a comprehensive and collaborative review process for the Cooperative Fire/Rescue Services Letter of Understanding by Q1, 2022.

The current Letter of Understanding for the three North Shore Fire Departments has an end of term date of December 31, 2022.

Performance objectives to meet Goal #8 are related to: collaboration, data analytics, stakeholder engagement, and communications. Actions are required to meet objectives, and are expected to align with the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025. Anticipated actions include:

• Seek and support active participation of all three participating North Shore Fire Services (DNVFRS, NVCFD, and WVFR) in the review/revision process.
• Conduct a review of service provision and performance using data analytics.
• Conduct a gap analysis of service provision in comparison with industry best practices.
• Engage internal/external stakeholders in a review of the current LOU.

GOAL #9 – Identify opportunities to align fire rescue service provision that supports and empowers Indigenous peoples by Q2, 2021.

DNVFRS supports reconciliation efforts and sustaining a mutually respectful relationship with all Indigenous peoples. Aligning services and promoting fire safety will build a more resilient community for all. The current service agreement with the Tsleil Waututh Nation (TWN) expired on December 31, 2020. The TWN has a Fire Bylaw but does not have its own fire department. The Squamish Nation agreement does not have an established expiration date.

Performance objectives to meet Goal #9 are related to: community risk reduction, collaboration, internal/external stakeholder engagement, and communications. Actions are required to meet objectives, and are expected to align with the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025. Anticipated actions include:

• Utilize data analytics to conduct a performance review of services provided to Indigenous peoples on their lands.
• Perform a review of fire service operational agreement(s) to identify gaps with service provision and identify areas to align services across the North Shore.
• Collaborate with internal and external stakeholders from the TWN and the Squamish Nation, inter-agency partners and the North Shore Fire Departments to identify opportunities to align services.
• Support cultural safety and humility across the DNV in partnership with Indigenous peoples and in alignment with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Canada (UNDRIP)
• Capitalize on innovative solutions to empower DNVFRS partnership with the Indigenous peoples of the North Shore, i.e. community risk reduction, public education, inspections, training, etc.

GOAL #10 – Create a process to annually monitor, evaluate, and report on progress with: CRA/SOC goals, Strategic Plan priorities, Community Wildfire Protection Plan recommendations, Fire Underwriters’ Survey recommendations, and CFAI Commissioners’ recommendations by Q3, 2021.

Performance objectives to meet Goal #10 are related to: administration, internal/external stakeholder collaboration, professional development, data analytics, and communications. Actions are required to meet objectives, and are expected to align with the DNVFRS Strategic Plan 2020-2025. Anticipated actions include:

• Report annual performance to internal and external stakeholders via DNVFRS Annual Report.
• Ensure annual reporting process aligns with CFAI Accreditation Model for reporting methodology.
• Annually assign a DNVFRS Accreditation Manager to oversee CRA/SOC Goal #10.
• Support Quality Improvement through Accreditation (QITA) and Peer Assessor Training of interested personnel.
• Support Peer Assessors for accreditation reviews of other fire service agencies.
• Develop and implement a DNVFRS Operating Guideline for Annual Compliance Monitoring.

CONCLUSION

As an innovative and progressive fire service, DNVFRS is committed to building a process for continuous improvement across all divisions of the department. While components of the process have been in place for some time, formally recognizing methodologies, and aligning with CFAI have resulted in a consistent approach across the organization. It is recognized that the path to accreditation involves the work of many internal and external stakeholders to achieve success in both the short-term working towards accreditation, and the long-term of building a sustainable process that will be achievable into the future.

DNVFRS values its personnel and the relationship its people have with the community and stakeholders. The organization continues to move forward and build its capacity and resiliency with its emergency and non-emergency services, to support its shared services partners, and to be a leader towards collaboration and innovation beyond the borders of the DNV.

Sharing the CRA/SOC and its companion documents of fire service accreditation is the DNVFRS story of service to the community. Both the Executive Version and the full CRA/SOC are available on DNV.org/FireAccreditation. Feedback and questions about these documents and fire service accreditation is welcome and encouraged at FireAccreditation@dnv.org.
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The District of North Vancouver

REPORT TO COUNCIL

February 8, 2021
File: 10.5080.00/000.003

AUTHOR: Eirikka Brandson, Community Planner

SUBJECT: UBCM Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program – North Shore Application

RECOMMENDATION:
PURSUANT to the report of the Community Planner, dated February 8, 2021, entitled “UBCM Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program – North Shore Application”:

THAT Staff be directed to work with the City of North Vancouver and District of West Vancouver to submit a joint regional application for the North Shore under Stream 1 of the UBCM Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program for 2021;

AND THAT Council supports the District of West Vancouver as the primary applicant for the North Shore application to apply for, receive, and manage the 2021 UBCM Poverty Reduction and Action Program grant funding on the District of North Vancouver’s behalf.

REASON FOR REPORT:
This report provides information on the UBCM Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program\(^1\) for the purpose of obtaining Council approval to submit an application due March 5, 2021. The grant application would be for $75,000 so that the District of North Vancouver can work in partnership with the City of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver on a regional Poverty Reduction Plan for the North Shore. The District of North Vancouver staff, will be a member of the project task force that will lead the program.

BACKGROUND:
Eradicating poverty calls for a commitment from all levels of government. The Government of Canada’s Opportunity for All: Canada’s First Poverty Reduction Strategy\(^2\) was published in 2018 with commitments to many poverty reduction actions, such as the new Canada Child Benefit and an increase to the Guaranteed Income Supplement. The Strategy targets a 20

---

\(^1\) Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program Guide. https://www.ubcm.ca/assets/Funding-Programs/LGPS/PovRed/poverty-reduction-planning-action-2021-program-guide.pdf

percent reduction in poverty by 2020 and a 50 percent reduction in poverty by 2030, relative to 2015 levels. It is based on three pillars that focus government actions to reduce poverty:

1. Dignity: Lifting Canadians out of poverty by ensuring basic needs – such as safe and affordable housing, healthy food, and health care are met;  
2. Opportunity for Inclusion: Helping Canadians join the middle class by promoting full participation in society and equality of opportunity; and  
3. Resilience and Security: Supporting the middle class by protecting Canadians from falling into poverty and by supporting income security and resilience.

Provincially, Together BC³ was developed and released in March 2019 in response to the Poverty Reduction Strategy Act (passed in November 2018) and is based on four principles: affordability, opportunity, reconciliation, and social inclusion. The Strategy sets targets to reduce the overall poverty rate in British Columbia by at least 25 percent, and the child poverty rate by at least 50 percent by 2024. Six priority action areas are set out below. These areas include policy initiatives and investments designed to break the cycle of poverty.

1. Making housing more affordable;  
2. Supporting families, children and youth;  
3. Expanding access to education and training;  
4. More opportunities, more jobs;  
5. Improving affordability; and  
6. Investing in social inclusion.

While there has been progress reported in the Province’s 2019 Annual Report⁴, there is still much to do and BC continues to have the second highest overall poverty rate in Canada.

There are many synergies among the federal and provincial poverty reduction actions, for example their focus on social inclusion, resilience, affordable housing, and support for families and the middle class. However, the impacts of poverty are most acutely felt at the community level - place matters.

On the North Shore, some examples of groups that are struggling include single parent families, people with disabilities, recent immigrants and refugees, First Nations, and other equity priority groups. Some compelling statistics are as follows:

- 31 percent of all renter households in the District have an income under $35,000⁵;  
- In most District neighbourhoods, lone parent families with children have a median after tax income that is less than half than that of couple economic families with children⁶;  
- Lone parent households are disproportionately headed by females⁷; and  

⁵ Renter Household Income by Income Groups in Metro Vancouver Municipalities (Metro Vancouver Housing Data Book 2015).  
⁶ 2016 Census and subsequent bullets  
⁷ 2016 Census
• District neighbourhoods with more lone-parent households tend to have a higher proportion of renters to owners than other neighbourhoods, and a higher proportion of people who spend more than 30% of their income on housing\(^8\)

EXISTING POLICY:

Council Directions 2019-2022:
• Increasing Housing Diversity and Addressing Affordability

Official Community Plan:
• Social Well-Being objective – to foster a safe, socially inclusive and supportive community that enhances the health and well-being of its residents.

The four key strategic areas of the Targeted OCP Review (housing, climate emergency, transportation and economy and employment lands) also intersect with poverty. For instance: low-incomes prevent access to many potential housing options; climate change causes more frequent and extreme heat waves that disproportionately impact low-income households without air-conditioning and sufficient insulation to keep cool, which increases health risks such as heat stroke; commuting times, the cost of owning a vehicle and poor public transportation options perpetuates inequalities; and lastly, poverty is a socio-economic issue. Unemployment and lack of education, as examples, influence a person’s economic activity.

ANALYSIS

Grant opportunity – UBCM Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program

This program is a 3-year (2020-2023) provincial investment of up to five million dollars to support local governments in reducing poverty at the local level. There are two streams of funding available:

Stream 1: Poverty Reduction Plans and Assessments
• $25,000 for a single applicant and $150,000 for regional applications

Stream 2: Poverty Reduction Action (Implementation)
• $50,000 for a single applicant and $150,000 for regional applications

The proposed North Shore application would be for $75,000 under Stream 1: Poverty Reduction Plans and Assessments as a regional application with the City of North Vancouver and District of West Vancouver. Should the application be successful in 2021, consideration would be made in 2022 to apply for the implementation Stream 2: Poverty Reduction Action.

Projects must focus on one or more of six priority action areas identified in Together BC: Housing, Education and training, Income and supports, Families, children and youth, Employment, and Social supports. Additional priorities within these focus areas can also be addressed, including mental health and addictions, food security, transportation, and/or access to health care.

\(^8\) 2016 Census
Proposed North Shore Application - North Shore Poverty Reduction Plan

Staff from the three municipalities have outlined the following activities that would help inform the development of a North Shore Poverty Reduction Plan:

1.) Form a North Shore Poverty Reduction Task Force to guide the project. Participants may include members of the North Shore Homelessness Task Force and other sector partners with mandates relevant to the poverty focus areas (e.g. Ministry of Child and Family Development, business community, faith organizations, labour groups and or unions, school districts, and non-profit partners). The Task Force would have a distinct and time limited mandate;

2.) Assemble benchmark information – collect and analyse data related to poverty on the North Shore, inventory existing resources, assets, and services;

3.) Create a North Shore poverty reduction vision, definition of poverty, and key indicators to monitor and evaluate progress over time;

4.) Actively build partnerships and expand relationships related to poverty reduction among agencies;

5.) Develop and undertake a poverty education and awareness campaign to inform the Poverty Reduction Plan and share findings with the broader community. This work will be undertaken with the input of Communications staff from each municipality;

6.) Engagement to inform the Plan:
   a. Input and solutions from people experiencing poverty. This will involve working through groups that serve residents, outreach to ensure that a diversity of voices are heard, and meeting people where they are in the community.
   b. Focused interviews and input from agencies on the North Shore that have expertise and deep knowledge about poverty on the North Shore.

7.) Action Planning Process – one or more solutions workshops (facilitated with the support of a project consultant) to develop the Poverty Reduction Plan;

8.) Writing of the Plan – the Plan would focus on actions, priorities and projects that reduce poverty on the North Shore. The Poverty Reduction Plan is envisioned to be a 10-year action plan, supported by a sustainable implementation strategy and appropriately resourced. An application for Stream 2 funding (Poverty Reduction Action – Implementation) would be anticipated in 2022 to support implementation of the Plan’s actions; and

9.) Endorsement of the Plan by District of North Vancouver, City of North Vancouver and District of West Vancouver.

Project activities will be further refined through the grant submission process and with the collaboration of all partners. Grant funds ($75,000 to be requested) would be used for data
collection and analysis, engagement, and fees for a consultant to assist with the process of developing the Plan.

The District of West Vancouver has committed to submitting the application on behalf of the three municipalities and would manage the funds and any associated contracts and disbursement. All partners Councils would be apprised of the process and findings at key intervals in the process.

**Relationship to Existing SPARC Homelessness Community Action Grant**
In 2019, the North Shore Homelessness Task Force⁹ was awarded $25,000 by the Social Planning and Research Council of BC to carry out a poverty reduction strategy related to homelessness on the North Shore. This work is underway, with a project consultant to be hired in February 2021. The UBCM Poverty Reduction Plan (wider scale and scope) would be developed in parallel to, and build upon, the homelessness-focused poverty reduction strategy. The two plans will complement and strengthen each other, without unnecessary duplication.

**Timing/Approval Process:**
The application deadline for the UBCM 2021 Poverty Reduction Planning & Action Program is March 5, 2021. A Council resolution is required. Successful applicants will be notified within 90 days of the application deadline. The grant requirements stipulate that the project must be completed within one year. If successful, it is anticipated that background work, including collecting and analysing data would begin in summer 2021 or earlier. Community engagement activities would also take place in 2021, with a draft of the Poverty Reduction Plan to be available in early 2022.

The District will be in a position to apply for the UBCM Stream 2 Poverty Reduction Action funding in early 2022. The timeline for the 2022 grant program is not known at this time and the choice to submit a regional versus single application would be determined and based upon the actions identified in the final Plan.

**Financial Impacts:**
The District's contributions to the Poverty Reduction Plan project would be comprised of in-kind staff resources. Implementation of actions resulting from the Plan, as well as ongoing monitoring of outcomes, will be brought forward to Council with project-specific funding requests as required.

**Conclusion:**
Staff recommend the submitted application to the UBCM 2021 Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program be endorsed. The UBCM Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program would provide an appropriate source of funding for a regional North Shore Plan to better understand the needs of residents living across the three municipalities.

---

⁹ North Shore Homelessness Task Force: Terms of Reference (Document 957366)
Options:

1. THAT staff are directed to submit an application to UBCM Poverty Reduction Planning and Action Program (District of West Vancouver as primary applicant), for $75,000 in grant funding to support a joint regional North Shore Poverty Reduction Plan.
   OR

2. THAT Council provides staff with alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted:

Eirikka Brandson
Community Planner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th>External Agencies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Community Planning</td>
<td>☐ Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Development Planning</td>
<td>☐ NS Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Development Engineering</td>
<td>☐ RCMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Utilities</td>
<td>☐ NVRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Engineering Operations</td>
<td>☐ Museum &amp; Arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Parks</td>
<td>☐ Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Review and Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Clerk’s Office</td>
<td>☐ Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Communications</td>
<td>☐ Fire Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Fire Services</td>
<td>☐ ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Solicitor</td>
<td>☐ Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ GIS</td>
<td>☐ GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Real Estate</td>
<td>☐ Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Bylaw Services</td>
<td>☐ Bylaw Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Planning</td>
<td>☐ Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COUNCIL

February 9, 2021
File: 09.3900.20/000.000

AUTHOR: Genevieve Lanz, Deputy Municipal Clerk

SUBJECT: Bylaws 8489, 8490 and 8491: Street and Traffic Bylaw, Fees and Charges
Bylaw and Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw Amendments – E-bike Share

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT “District of North Vancouver Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8489, 2021 (Amendment 22)” is ADOPTED;

AND THAT “Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8490, 2021 (Amendment 71)” is ADOPTED;

AND THAT “Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8491, 2021 (Amendment 59)” is ADOPTED.

BACKGROUND:
Bylaws 8489, 8490 and 8491 received First, Second and Third Readings on February 8, 2021.

The bylaws are now ready to be considered for Adoption by Council.

OPTIONS:
1. Adopt the bylaws;
2. Give no further Readings to the bylaws and abandon the bylaws at Third Reading; or,
3. Rescind Third Reading and debate possible amendments to the bylaws.

Respectfully submitted,

Genevieve Lanz
Deputy Municipal Clerk
Attachments:
1. Bylaw 8489
2. Bylaw 8490
3. Bylaw 8491
4. Staff report dated January 13, 2021

REVIEWED WITH:

- Community Planning
- Development Planning
- Development Engineering
- Utilities
- Engineering Operations
- Parks
- Environment
- Facilities
- Human Resources
- Review and Compliance
- Clerk's Office
- Communications
- Finance
- Fire Services
- ITS
- Solicitor
- GIS
- Real Estate
- Bylaw Services
- Planning
- Library Board
- NS Health
- RCMP
- NVRC
- Museum & Arch.
- Other:
The Council for The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver enacts as follows:

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "District of North Vancouver Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8489, 2021 (Amendment 22)".

Amendments

2. Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 is amended by:

2.1 adding the following definitions to section 302 in alphabetical order:

**Cycle** means a device having any number of wheels that is propelled by human power and on which a person may ride but does not include a play vehicle;

**E-Bike Share Permit** means a permit issued by the Municipal Engineer under section 743 of this bylaw;

**E-Bike Share Service** means a legal entity whose business is to provide access to a fleet of E-Bikes for a fee;

**E-Bike Share Zone** means the area or space on a roadway designated by a Traffic Control Device and established for the exclusive use of a specified E-Bike Share Service;

**E-Bike or Motor Assisted Cycle** means a type of cycle:

(a) with two or three wheels to which pedals or hand cranks are attached that allow for the cycle to be propelled by human power;
(b) on which a person may ride;
(c) to which is attached an electric motor that has an output not exceeding 500 W;
(d) that meets the other criteria prescribed under the Motor Vehicle Act, RSBC 1996, c. 318, the Motor Vehicle Act Regulations and the Motor Assisted Cycle Regulation, all as may be amended or replaced.

**Inter-Municipal Bike Share Program** means an E-Bike share program to
facilitate the operation of E-Bike Share Services in the District and other municipalities that is jointly operated by the District with other partnering municipalities;

**Motor Assisted Cycle Regulation** means the *Motor Assisted Cycle Regulation*, BC Reg 151/2002;

**Motor Vehicle Act Regulations** means the *Motor Vehicle Act Regulations*, BC Reg. 26/58;

2.2 deleting section 516 and substituting the following:

516. The Municipal Engineer may direct the placement of Traffic Control Devices to designate a portion of a Highway as a Loading Zone, Passenger Zone, Commercial Loading Zone or E-Bike Share Zone and to define the rights, duties and obligations of traffic with respect to that zone.

2.3 inserting the following as section 520A after section 520:

520A. No person shall stop, stand or park a vehicle in an E-Bike Share Zone except for the purpose of loading or unloading persons or materials.

2.4 deleting “without a valid and subsisting Highway Use Permit issued by the District pursuant to this Bylaw” at the end of section 702 and substituting “without a valid and subsisting Highway Use Permit or E-Bike Share Permit issued by the District pursuant to this Bylaw.”

2.5 deleting section 716 and substituting the following:

716. Except as set out in sections 406, 707 – 715, 742 and 744, a person must not undertake any construction or planting on a Highway except as specifically authorized by a Highway Use Permit, Highway Construction and Planting Permit, E-Bike Share Permit or other District approval and, without limiting the foregoing, a person must not do any of the following on a Highway:

2.6 inserting the following after section 742:

**E-Bike Share Services**

743. The Municipal Engineer may issue an E-Bike Share Permit to an E-Bike Share Service where the Municipal Engineer is satisfied that the E-Bike Share Service has received approval through an Inter-Municipal Bike Share Program.
744. The Municipal Engineer may establish and designate Geo-fenced Areas for use by the holder of an E-Bike Share Permit and the permit holder will, at its own expense, install such pavement markings and signage as approved by the Municipal Engineer to identify the Geo-fenced Area or, if installed by the District, will reimburse the District for such costs.

745. The Municipal Engineer may, by directing the placement of Traffic Control Devices, regulate and control the operation of E-Bike Share Services within a Geo-fenced Area, including the speed of E-Bikes and the regulation or prohibition of parking of any E-Bikes within a Geo-fenced Area.

746. A person or legal entity may only operate an E-Bike Share Service with a valid E-Bike Share Permit and in accordance with all of the conditions of such permit and the requirements of this bylaw.

747. A person must not operate or park an E-Bike contrary to the regulations in any Traffic Control Device.

748. The holder of an E-Bike Share Permit may deploy a fleet of E-Bikes in any location where parking is permitted and where authorized by the Municipal Engineer for the purpose of making E-Bikes available to reserve for use.

749. Successful applicants for the E-Bike Share Permit must pay the E-Bike Share Permit fee and the security for performance fee set out in the Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, as amended from time to time, prior to being issued a permit. The security for performance is refundable, less any deductions in accordance with section 747.

750. The Municipal Engineer may deduct the following fees from the security for performance fee:

750.1 **E-Bike retrieval fee:** all costs incurred by the District (including staff time plus an administrative fee of 15%) related to the retrieval of any E-Bike owned or operated by an E-Bike Share Service; and

750.2 **E-Bike impoundment fee:** $50 per E-Bike plus $1 per day for storage. If the E-Bike Share Service fails to retrieve the E-Bike after 30 days, the District will recycle the E-Bike and charge any recycling costs incurred.

If the fees imposed under section 750 exceed the total of the security for performance, the District is authorized to charge fines.
and fees directly to the E-Bike Share Service, to require payment of an additional security for performance, or to cancel the Permit.

2.7 amending section 1201 by adding "(including but not limited to an E-Bike)" after "Any chattel, obstruction or vehicle".

READ a first time February 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2021

READ a second time February 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2021

READ a third time February 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2021

ADOPTED

______________________________
Mayor

______________________________
Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

______________________________
Municipal Clerk
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8490

A bylaw to amend Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as “Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8490, 2021 (Amendment 71)”.

Amendments

2. Schedule F of Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 is amended by inserting the following new fees and charges in the table immediately following the fee for Highway Construction and Planting Permit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Bike Share Permit Application Fee*</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Bike Share Permit Fee*</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>Paid annually; Per E-Bike deployed (not including E-Bikes in storage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*These fees waived if paid to other municipality in inter-municipal E-bike share program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Bike Security for Performance</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

READ a first time February 8th, 2021

READ a second time February 8th, 2021

READ a third time February 8th, 2021

ADOPTED

Mayor

Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

Municipal Clerk
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8491

A bylaw to amend Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as “Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8491, 2021 (Amendment 59)”.

Amendments

2. Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 is amended by inserting the following violations for the Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 in numerical order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bylaw Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A1 Penalty Amount ($)</th>
<th>A2 Discounted Penalty: Within 14 days ($)</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment: After 28 days ($)</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
<th>A5 Compliance Agreement Discount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520A</td>
<td>Park in E-Bike Share Zone</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td>Operate E-Bike Share Service contrary to permit</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>Operate E-Bike contrary to Traffic Control Device</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

READ a first time February 8th, 2021

READ a second time February 8th, 2021

READ a third time February 8th, 2021

ADOPTED

Mayor

Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

Municipal Clerk
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AGENDA INFORMATION

☐ Regular Meeting
☐ Other:

The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COUNCIL

January 13, 2021
File: 16.8620.01/025.000

AUTHOR: Zachary Mathurin, North Shore Mobility Options Coordinator

SUBJECT: Proposed Bylaw Amendments to Enable E-Bike Share

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT "Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004, Amendment Bylaw 8489, 2021 (Amendment 22)" is given FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT "Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992, Amendment Bylaw 8490, 2021 (Amendment 71)" is given FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT "Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004, Amendment Bylaw 8491, 2021 (Amendment 59)" is given FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT the E-Bike Share Permit be implemented on a pilot basis for two years from the time of permit issuance;

AND THAT staff be directed to limit the number of permits the District jointly issues with participating North Shore municipalities to one E-Bike Share operator during the pilot.

REASON FOR REPORT:

The purpose of this report is to introduce bylaw amendments that will enable the District to participate in an electric bicycle (e-bike) share pilot with other North Shore municipalities.

SUMMARY:

Participation in an e-bike share pilot in partnership with participating North Shore municipalities is enabled through proposed amendments to the following bylaws:

- Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004
- Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992
- Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004
BACKGROUND:

At the February 4, 2019 workshop, Council supported recommendations from the INSTPP process directing staff to collaborate with City of North Vancouver (CNV) and District of West Vancouver (DWV) staff on the development of an e-bike share program. Following an initial attempt to identify an appropriate third-party vendor to operate a system through an RFP in 2019 that resulted in no award, staff from all three North Shore municipalities began developing a permitting and licensing framework to enable supportive conditions for third-party e-bike share operators.

As outlined in the October 29, 2020 information report to Council entitled “Update on E-Bike Share Planning Efforts”, attached to this report as Appendix A, the permitting framework jointly developed by tri-municipal staff is comprised of:

1. **Bylaw amendments** to authorize the permit and business license, and create enforcement mechanisms in the following bylaws:
   a. Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 (see Appendix C);
   b. Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 (see Appendix D);
   c. Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 (see Appendix E);

2. **Permit Guidelines** to outline the application process and the District’s preferred operating requirements for the selected operator regarding safety, operations, insurance, liability, and enforcement (see Appendix B); and

3. **E-Bike Share Policy** - an administrative policy outlining the goals and expectations of e-bike share services that staff will use to assess applications and monitor performance.

This framework would provide the District and participating North Shore municipalities with flexibility in negotiating with operators during the application process and setting permit conditions for operations. The bylaw amendments are the primary enabling tool and would be implemented on a pilot basis for two years, beginning approximately in spring 2021. At the conclusion of the pilot period, staff may recommend that the bylaws be amended, repealed, or expanded. This regulatory model is common in many jurisdictions in North America, including Kelowna, Calgary, and Montreal and is also favoured by industry due to being familiar administrative process across jurisdictions.

In December 2020, CNV Council adopted enabling bylaws for the e-bike share pilot, and e-bike share application process will open on January 20, 2021. The window to receive applications from operators will remain open for four weeks, and DNV and DWV staff will be part of the official review process owing to the tri-municipal nature of the pilot. Should Council adopt the enabling bylaws attached to this report, staff anticipate the timing will allow for CNV and DNV to coordinate permit issuance at the conclusion of the application process. At the time of writing, DWV will remain engaged with CNV and DNV on the pilot’s progress but has no immediate plans to pursue Council adoption. DWV could join the pilot at a later date should its Council adopt the enabling bylaw amendments.
Street and Traffic Bylaw amendments to support e-bike share

New and Updated Definitions

The proposed amendments to the Street and Traffic Bylaw, No. 7125 include new and updated definitions for e-bikes, including minimum performance specifications based on BC's Motor Assisted Cycle Regulation, and to authorize the new permit and parking zones detailed below (see Appendix C).

New E-Bike Share Permit

Staff propose creating a new street use permit using our existing authority in the Street and Traffic Bylaw, No. 7125 (see Appendix C). This new permit will allow staff to review applications received by CNV on our joint behalf based on DNV's preferred operational requirements outlined in the supporting Permit Guidelines (see Appendix B). The primary purpose of the permit is to authorize an e-bike share operator to establish and use e-bike share zones, explained later in this report, located on municipally-owned public space.

Creation of the new street use permit category will allow staff to require detailed plans covering safety, operations, parking and staging, data sharing, and liability obligations from prospective operators as outlined in the Permit Guidelines. As with other street use permits, the single operator selected for the permit will be required to provide proof of valid commercial and liability insurance. CNV plans to open applications on January 20 and that the application period will close on February 17, 2021.

Related amendments in the Fees and Charges Bylaw, No. 6481 introduce the fees associated to the permit, which are highlighted in Table 1 below (see Appendix D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee reason</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Application</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Paid upon submitting a complete Permit application form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Bike Share Permit</td>
<td>$40 + GST per e-bike deployed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>The fee is based on the total number of deployed e-bikes. Additional e-bikes in storage that are kept in reserve are not part of the active fleet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security for Performance</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Non-recurring, refundable minus deductions. Paid to each participating municipality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The permit application fee will help offset the administrative cost associated with reviewing applications and is not refundable in the event an applicant is unsuccessful.

The E-Bike Share Permit fee will be based on the size of the active e-bike fleet, which is the number of e-bikes deployed and available for rental by the public. There is a minimum of 120 e-bikes available during the peak season of May-September, inclusively. Staff propose to set...
the fee at $40 per e-bike for the whole North Shore, which is comparable with fees in other jurisdictions in Canada. Should an operator seek to expand the fleet, which will be subject to staff approval, the operator will pay the E-Bike Share Permit fee for each additional e-bike. E-bikes kept in storage for re-balancing, equipment or battery swaps, or in reserve for future fleet expansions will not count for the purpose of charging the E-Bike Share Permit fee. It is expected that CNV will act as the central permitting authority on behalf of participating municipalities and will collect the required permit fees. In that case, DNV will collect its share of permit fee revenues from CNV. This revenue will help offset administrative costs associated with data analysis and reporting, as well as occasional monitoring by staff.

The permit conditions contained in the Permit Guidelines will form the basis of staff monitoring and enforcement. Should staff need to respond to an issue following failure by the operator to act, costs to DNV and any additional penalties may be charged against the Security for Performance. The remaining balance in the Security for Performance is refundable at the end of the two-year pilot, which is intended to incentivize the operator to respond to issues in an appropriate and timely manner. Similar strategies have yielded a high level of compliance from operators in other jurisdictions, such as UBC.

New E-Bike Share Zone

Staff propose introducing a new type of zone in the Street and Traffic Bylaw, No. 7125 called an 'e-bike share zone' in the public right-of-way which will allow DNV to designate reserved areas for e-bike share parking and staging (see Appendix C). E-bike share zones may be located on municipal infrastructure such as DNV streets and public spaces and will be marked using traffic control devices such as pavement markings and signage. The operator selected for a permit will be expected to cover all costs associated with establishing e-bike share zones, including materials and labour.

The Permit Guidelines contain the minimum standards for e-bike share zones, including sizing information, permitted materials for pavement markings, signage positioning and required information for display. As part of the application process, operators are expected to outline potential locations for e-bike share zones for consideration. Final locations will be negotiated with the operator selected for a permit prior to launch.

Introducing business licensing fees to allow inter-municipal operations

Staff propose adding “E-Bike Share Services” to the inter-municipal business licence (IMBL) schedule as an eligible business type in the Fees and Charges Bylaw, No. 6481 (see Appendix D). Staff anticipate the operator selected for a permit will obtain the IMBL from CNV and the revenue will be shared based on the existing IMBL provisions.

Enforcement measures to ensure compliance by the operator and the public

The proposed amendment to the Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw, No. 7458 introduce violations associated with the operation of the e-bike share zones as well as penalties for the selected operator for non-compliance with permit conditions, with minimal fine levels that match those adopted by CNV (see Appendix E).
SUBJECT: Proposed Bylaw Amendments to Enable E-Bike Share  
January 25, 2021

EXISTING POLICY:

Transportation initiatives in the DNV are generally guided by the Transportation Plan, adopted by Council in 2012. A goal under Transportation Demand Management is to implement strategic and practical measures to make walking, cycling and transit viable options to driving. Launching an e-bike share pilot was endorsed as a DNV priority at the INSTPP Council workshop on February 4, 2019. DNV’s Community Energy and Emissions Plan also recommends implementing bike share as a measure for achieving long-term emissions reductions.

ANALYSIS:

Timing/Approval Process:
CNV plans to launch applications during the week of January 20 and collect applications for four weeks. Tri-municipal reviews will occur after the application period ends and it is during this time staff anticipate Council will consider the bylaw amendments outlined in this report. This timeline would allow DNV staff to jointly issue a permit with CNV in winter or spring 2021, with e-bike share services launching in the spring or early summer. The pilot start date would be determined by the permit date; the pilot would last for two years.

Concurrence:
Staff from the District’s Engineering, Parks, and Facilities department developed the bylaw amendments outlined in this report, with input from the District’s Solicitor, Community Planning, and Manager of Bylaws. Staff have also worked with colleagues at the CNV and DWV. These departments and colleagues from neighbouring municipalities will continue to be involved in reviewing permit applications, implementing, and monitoring e-bike share services.

Financial Impacts:
Staff expect any shared service operator to absorb all program costs, including equipment, operating, and promotional costs. Revenue from permit fees will help offset staff time associated with administration and enforcement.

Liability/Risk:
As with other street use permits, the holder of an e-bike share permit will be required to provide evidence of holding the appropriate commercial and liability insurance for their business activities in DNV. The selected operator will also be required to comply with all conditions and requirements of thee-bike share Permit Guidelines, which cover rider education, safety, operations, parking, and data collection and sharing. Riders will be required to comply with provincial helmet regulations and the operator will be responsible for informing and enforcing helmet-wear. The operator will be the primary contact for all concerns and issues, and most costs to DNV for responding to issues will be paid by the operator through the Security for Performance.

Social Policy Implications:
A bike share program can improve accessibility to transportation services and promote active transportation which supports wellness and healthy communities. Applicants will have to
include an equity program as part of the application process and service; this is an opportunity to improve accessibility for some users.

Environmental Impact:
Emissions related to the Transportation sector currently make up 52% of all emissions in DNV. The primary source of these emissions are derived from the use of single-occupant vehicles and existing travel behaviour. To meet DNVs GHG reduction targets a shift toward more active transportation trips is required. Bike share also helps to address first- and last-mile challenges associated with transit. Enabling these shifts to transit and cycling can have a positive environmental impact; studies have found that roughly 20% of all bike share trips in other cities would have been made by automobile.

Public Input:
North Shore staff previously engaged with stakeholders such as the North Vancouver Chamber of Commerce and North Shore HUB prior to the RFP process. Following the cancellation of the RFP, North Shore staff consulted with industry to understand their perspective on the process, which helped inform adjustments to some features of the e-bike share pilot requirements including fees and the relationship workflow between the municipalities and the operator. Staff also sought feedback from the Advisory Committee on Disability Issues, while CNV staff consulted with their Integrated Transportation Committee as well. Once the pilot has launched, staff will be involved in ongoing program monitoring including by conducting user surveys to assess its quality and success.

Conclusion:
Council’s adoption of the proposed enabling bylaw amendments outlined in this report would facilitate the DNV joining the participating North Shore municipalities in a joint e-bike share pilot program. This would make it possible for an E-Bike Share permit to be issued to a qualified operator in the coming months and for that operator to launch operations in spring or early summer 2021.

Options:
1. Give the bylaws First, Second, and Third Readings; (RECOMMENDED)
2. Refer the bylaws back to staff; or,
3. Give no Readings to the bylaws.

Respectfully submitted,

Zachary Mathurin
North Shore Mobility Options Coordinator
Attached documents include the following:
- Appendix B: E-Bike Share Permit Guidelines
- Appendix C: Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004, Amendment Bylaw 8489, 2021 (Amendment 22)
- Appendix D: Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992, Amendment Bylaw 8490, 2021 (Amendment 71)
- Appendix E: Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004, Amendment Bylaw 8491, 2021 (Amendment 59)

REVIEWED WITH:

- Community Planning
- Development Planning
- Development Engineering
- Utilities
- Engineering Operations
- Parks
- Environment
- Facilities
- Human Resources
- Review and Compliance
- Clerk’s Office
- Communications
- Finance
- Fire Services
- ITS
- Solicitor
- GIS
- Real Estate
- Bylaw Services
- Planning

External Agencies:
- Library Board
- NS Health
- RCMP
- NVRC
- Museum & Arch.
- Other:
The District of North Vancouver
INFORMATION REPORT TO COUNCIL

October 29, 2020
File: 16.8620.01/025.000

AUTHOR: Zachary Mathurin, North Shore Mobility Options Coordinator
SUBJECT: Update on E-Bike Share Planning Efforts

REASON FOR REPORT:
The purpose of this report is to update Council on staff efforts to attract third-party electric bicycle ("e-bike") share operators to the District of North Vancouver (DNV) and the North Shore.

SUMMARY:
In spring 2019, DNV partnered with the City of North Vancouver (CNV) and the District of West Vancouver (DWV) on a request-for-proposals (RFP) for an e-bike share program for the North Shore. In summer 2019, tri-municipal staff agreed to cancel the RFP with no award due to concerns about the bids received shared by CNV’s legal counsel. Following the cancellation of the e-bike share RFP, DNV staff have continued to engage with colleagues in CNV and DWV to develop a permitting and licensing framework to manage and support third-party operators of shared e-bike fleets across the North Shore. The change in approach from an RFP to a permitting framework is based on industry feedback staff received after the RFP, consultation with jurisdictions in Canada with similar systems such as Kelowna and Calgary, and due to its flexibility in allowing staff to negotiate with prospective operators to deliver e-bike share that meets the needs of the North Shore and DNV.

Staff have prepared enabling bylaw amendments to the Street and Traffic Bylaw, the Fees and Charges Bylaw, the Business Licence Bylaw, and the Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw; a goal-oriented policy to guide implementation; and guidelines and conditions for operations that are intended to support an e-bike system across the North Shore. This framework would be implemented on a pilot basis for two years from the launch of operations. CNV Council will be considering the enabling changes and bylaw amendments in November 2020 with the aim of being able to begin reviewing applications and issuing a permit in late 2020 or early 2021. CNV is moving forward first due to its role as the North Shore’s regional town centre and the level interest signaled by the industry. Based on conversations with industry stakeholders, this timeline would allow e-bike share operators to launch by spring or summer 2021.
In parallel to CNV moving forward, DNV staff are drafting the enabling changes to our bylaws and plan to bring them to Council for consideration in Q1 2021. This would allow DNV to participate in the e-bike share pilot as a full partner from the launch of services in spring or summer 2021. DNV staff acknowledge it is possible proposals may not immediately include DNV upon launch, but this permitting and licensing framework positions DNV to respond to proposals and e-bike share service expansions.

BACKGROUND:

Prior efforts to attract e-bike share

In 2018, a key finding and recommended action that resulted from the INSTPP process was the creation of an e-bike share program to support active trips in the DNV and on the North Shore through partnering with our neighbouring municipalities. At the February 4, 2019 workshop, Council supported the recommendations as a DNV priority and staff began collaborating with CNV and DWV staff on a RFP to establish an e-bike share program. Attempts to identify an appropriate third-party vendor to operate a system through the 2019 RFP process were unsuccessful. While the tri-municipal partnership received bids on the RFP, each posed issues according to CNV legal counsel which resulted in staff cancelling the RFP with no award.

Beginning in fall 2019, staff from all three North Shore municipalities began developing a permitting and licensing framework to enable supportive conditions for third-party e-bike share operators. A permitting framework would provide staff with flexibility in negotiating with operators during the application process and setting permit conditions for operations. This regulatory model is common in many jurisdictions in North America, including Kelowna, Calgary, and Montréal and is also favoured by industry due to being familiar administrative process across jurisdictions.

Overview of e-bike share planning framework

The key elements of the proposed e-bike share planning framework are:

1. Enabling bylaw amendments to authorize the permit and business license, and create enforcement mechanisms. These bylaw amendments are forthcoming and will affect the Street and Traffic Bylaw, the Fees and Charges Bylaw, the Business Licence Bylaw, and the Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw.
2. E-Bike Share Policy, which will outline the goals and expectations of e-bike share services that staff will use to assess applications and performance evaluation.
3. Permit Guidelines, which will outline the application process and the third-party operators’ permit conditions staff expect operators to meet regarding operations, insurance, liability, safety, and enforcement.

The permitting and licensing framework is ultimately envisioned to be a model for coordinated management and regulation of e-bike share services across the North Shore. To this end, the permitting framework was developed collaboratively with staff at the CNV and
DWV. The framework is being brought to the CNV Council for consideration in November, as the City's density and position as the Regional Urban Centre makes the logical first phase of any shared mobility system. DNV staff will bring forward the enabling amendments soon after to participate in the permitting process and be prepared for any proposal to launch in the District or expand in a subsequent phase of the pilot. Should CNV be in a position to receive and review applications prior to DNV or DWV fully adopting and joining the e-bike share framework, staff from both Districts will still be able to participate in the review and provide feedback on applications. The final decision to issue a permit will remain with CNV and any of the other North Shore municipalities that have fully adopted the framework by that time.

Overview of e-bike share permit process

The E-Bike Share Permit Guidelines will detail the minimum operating requirements for e-bike share, including device staging and parking, safe use on streets, liabilities and obligations, equity and sustainability practices, and data sharing. Applications will be evaluated based on the level of detail provided and their capacity to meet the requirements established in the Permit Guidelines and ability to achieve the goals outlined in the Policy. Providers will need to complete an application form and submit the following additional information:

- Detailed description of their e-bike with an emphasis on its safety and performance;
- Detailed operations and maintenance plans covering parking and staging, device relocation and rebalancing, maintenance standards, customer education, safety, payments, data sharing, and sustainability and equity measures.

The proposed framework has multiple benefits for both the municipalities and prospective operators, including: a simplified application process, flexibility for the municipalities to respond to issues and adjust permit conditions to reflect what staff observe through monitoring, and clear delineation of the municipalities' and operators' roles and obligations regarding operations, enforcement, and liability. The policy and permit framework does not guarantee that operators would be interested in applying once the framework is adopted. However, it positions DNV and, eventually, our North Shore partner municipalities, to be ready to review and accept applicants in the future.

The planning framework will be implemented on a limited pilot basis in order to better assess potential uptake and manage District efforts

Staff recommend that the e-bike share permit framework be initially implemented as a pilot running for 24 months during which DNV and its partner municipalities would only issue a single permit to one operator. The purpose of the pilot phase is to understand demand for e-bike share services, measure their impacts in the community and the public realm, and manage risks, cost and resource implications for staff to mitigate issues which may be caused by e-bike share services. In the pilot phase, permits would initially be available for e-bike share as it is one of the few forms of shared micromobility with a performance history staff can reference when evaluating the safety of devices proposed for deployment.
Staff are proposing to pilot the introduction of private e-scooters in partnership with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI), but e-scooters will not be included in the E-Bike Share Policy. The performance of the private e-scooter pilot will help staff evaluate whether e-scooters, and other device types, may be deployed for shared use in the future.

The planning framework will be enabled through amendments to District bylaws

The permitting process will be enabled primarily through amendments to DNV's Street and Traffic Bylaw to create a new street use permit class to authorize and regulate the deployment and parking of e-bikes on municipal infrastructure. Provincial regulations on how e-bikes are to be used on municipal roadways will apply and staff will evaluate whether there is a need for additional local regulations (including speed restrictions and designating streets, roadways, or facilities permitted for their use in order to safely and effectively manage potential conflicts with other road users).

Additional amendments will be necessary to add e-bike share providers to the business schedule in the Business License Bylaw, to create the appropriate fees in the Fees and Charges Bylaw, and to create penalties for operators under our Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw. These proposed bylaw amendments will be brought back to Council for consideration and approval in Q1 2021.

EXISTING POLICY:

Transportation initiatives in the DNV are generally guided by the Transportation Plan, adopted by Council in 2012. A goal under Transportation Demand Management is to implement strategic and practical measures to make walking, cycling and transit viable options to driving. Launching an e-bike share pilot was endorsed as a DNV priority at the INSTPP Council workshop on February 4, 2019. DNV's Community Energy and Emissions Plan also recommends implementing bike share as a measure for achieving long-term emissions reductions.

ANALYSIS:

Timing/Approval Process:
The e-bike share planning framework involves introducing new definitions, permits, and fees in order to regulate and monitor the e-bike share operator. Based on discussions with the industry about the lead time needed to launch an e-bike share service, staff are targeting Q1 2021 for Council adoption of the enabling bylaw amendments, which would allow for enough time to launch in spring or summer 2021.

Concurrence:
Staff from the DNV's Engineering & Parks department developed the e-bike share planning framework with input from the Municipal Solicitor, Community Planning, Bylaws, and Business Licensing departments. Staff have also worked with colleagues at CNV and DWV. These departments and colleagues from neighbouring municipalities will continue to be involved in implementing and monitoring e-bike share services.
Financial Impacts:
Staff expect any shared service operator to absorb all program costs, including equipment, operating, and promotional costs. Revenue from permit fees will help offset staff time associated with administration and enforcement. While the operator will be expected to cover all costs of installing the parking and staging areas, it is possible that DNV could support this effort by completing some of the work on the operator's behalf and charging them for the work. Pending selection of an operator, additional funding is not expected to be required.

Constraints on DNV operational staff and services resulting from COVID-19 may limit staff's ability to respond to issues associated with any e-bike share service in a timely manner. As such, the proposed e-bike share planning framework is designed to limit potential exposure to risks and other impacts. Staff propose to limit the number of permits to one e-bike operator for ease of monitoring, and to require operators to provide a performance deposit to cover costs to the municipality should the operator not meet the agreed upon terms and conditions. Experience from other jurisdictions has demonstrated that these financial mechanisms are effective in yielding high compliance.

Liability/Risk:
As with other street use permits, the holder of an e-bike share permit will be required to provide evidence of holding the appropriate commercial and liability insurance for their business activities in DNV. Operators will also be required to comply with all conditions and requirements of the e-bike share Permit Guidelines, which cover rider education, safety, operations, parking, and data collection and sharing. Operators will be the primary contact for all concerns and issues, and any costs to DNV for responding to issues will be paid by the operator through the Performance Deposit.

Social Policy Implications:
A bike share program can improve accessibility to transportation services and promote active transportation which supports wellness and healthy communities. Applicants will have to include an equity program as part of the application process and service; this is an opportunity to improve accessibility for some users.

Environmental Impact:
Emissions related to the Transportation sector currently make up 52% of all emissions in DNV. The primary source of these emissions are derived from the use of single-occupant vehicles and existing travel behaviour. To meet DNV's GHG reduction targets a shift toward more active transportation trips is required. Bike share also helps to address first- and last-mile challenges associated with transit. Enabling these shifts to transit and cycling can have a positive environmental impact; studies have found that roughly 20% of all bike share trips in other cities would have been made by automobile.

Public Input:
North Shore staff previously engaged with stakeholders such as the North Vancouver Chamber of Commerce and North Shore HUB prior to the RFP process. Following the cancellation of the RFP, North Shore staff consulted with industry to understand their perspective on the process, which helped inform adjustments to some features of the e-bike share pilot requirements including fees and the relationship workflow between the
municipalities and the operator. Staff also sought feedback from the Advisory Committee on Disability Issues, while CNV staff consulted with their Integrated Transportation Committee as well. Once the pilot has launched, staff will be involved in ongoing program monitoring including by conducting user surveys to assess its quality and success.

Conclusion:
The proposed e-bike share framework is based on widely used regulatory strategies and has the needed flexibility to deliver an e-bike share program for the North Shore. DNV staff intend to bring forward the enabling amendments to our bylaws to Council in Q1 2021, which would allow DNV to participate as a partner ahead of potential service launch in spring or summer 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

Zachary Mathurin
North Shore Mobility Options Coordinator
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1. E-BIKE SHARE PERMIT GUIDELINES OVERVIEW

These Permit Guidelines intend to assist Operators in understanding the process for obtaining an E-Bike Share Permit (a “Permit”) from the City. The Permit Guidelines outline the City’s preferred requirements relating to operations, parking and staging, data sharing, and compliance and liability for E-Bike Share Permits. Operators should follow these Permit Guidelines when filling out the Permit application form and preparing the application materials. An E-Bike Share Permit may be issued to an applicant who demonstrates compliance with these requirements.

When a Permit is issued, the specific final requirements for that Permit will be appended as conditions to the Permit. Failure to meet any of the Permit conditions to the satisfaction of the City could result in fines, suspension of the Permit, or cancellation of the Permit. A sample of the Permit is available in the application form.

A. COMPONENTS OF THE PERMIT GUIDELINES

The E-Bike Share Permit Guidelines are divided into the following three sections:

- SECTION 2 Definitions
- SECTION 3 Application guidance for prospective Operators
- SECTION 4 Operator requirements

In addition to the E-Bike Share Permit Guidelines, the City expects Operators to familiarize themselves with the contents of the E-Bike Share Policy and the Permit Application before applying.

B. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE E-BIKE SHARE PERMIT

The Policy and Permit Guidelines are in force on a pilot basis. The pilot period of the E-Bike Share program will last 24 months from the issuance of a Permit (the “Pilot Period”). Prior to the start of the Pilot Period, the City will accept applications for the E-Bike Share services. The City will only issue one (1) permit.

Prior to the end of the Pilot Period, the City will review and assess the performance and success of the program in delivering E-Bike Share services in the City. At that time, the City may cease or suspend the Policy and Permit or update them to extend the Pilot Period, expand the maximum number of Permits that can be issued to Operators, make the Policy and Permit Guidelines permanent, or make other updates or revisions to the program as necessary for the ongoing success of E-Bike Share in the City.
2. DEFINITIONS

"Broken E-Bike" means an E-Bike that is no longer reasonably safe to operate on public roadways, fails to meet standards of the E-Bike specifications as defined by the City's Street and Traffic bylaw, or is unable to be unlocked by a Customer.

"City" means the municipal corporation of the City of North Vancouver. In the event that another municipality adopts equivalent E-Bike Share programs, the term City will also mean the municipal corporation of that municipality.

"Customer" means a person or corporation that rents an E-Bike from the Operator for any amount of time within the boundaries of the City.

"Data" means the information defined in the Data specifications section of the Permit supplied by the Operator to the City at regular time intervals.

"E-Bike" means a Motor Assisted Cycle as defined by the B.C. Motor Vehicle Act approved by the City for use in a Fleet.

"E-Bike Share" means a service and platform owned and managed by an Operator offering a Fleet of E-Bikes intended for rent by the public for transportation Trips on an on-demand basis, typically accessed through a Mobile App.

"Fleet" means all E-Bikes publicly available to rent by Customers and deployed by an Operator holding a valid Permit.

"Geo-fence" means a virtual boundary between two geographic areas or a virtual perimeter around a geographic area, the location and delineation of which shall be determined by the City for implementation by the Operator in the Mobile App.

"Helmet" means protective equipment which is required to be worn on the head when riding an E-Bike.

"Licence" means a business licence issued by the City to an Operator after approval of the Permit granting the Operator permission to operate an E-Bike Share business in the City for a specific length of time.

"Mobile App (or Application)" means the Operator's software installed on a Customer's phone to connect to the Operator's E-Bike Share service.

"Operator" means a person or corporation that holds a valid Permit issued by the City and that owns, operates, and maintains an E-Bike Share service.

"North Shore" refers to the area located north of the Burrard Inlet that includes the area contained within the municipal boundaries of the City of North Vancouver, the District of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver.

"Permit" means the permit issued to an Operator by the City pursuant to the Street and Traffic Bylaw, No. 6234, granting permission to provide E-Bike Share services within the City. A sample of the Permit is available in the application form.

"Personal Information" means recorded information about an identifiable individual as defined by the B.C. Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (RSBC 1996, c. 165).

"Policy" means the E-Bike Share Policy that describes the goals and scope of the E-Bike Share program.

"Trip" means a trip on an E-Bike by a Customer, including renting the E-Bike by unlocking it ('Trip start'), travelling for a period of time ('Trip time') and ending the rental by parking the E-Bike in its final parking location ('Trip end').
3. PERMIT APPLICATION GUIDANCE

A. PROCESS

The Permit authorizes the holder to operate E-Bike Share services in the City of North Vancouver. Applicants must complete the Permit application form and submit it to the City along with any additional documents required by the City. The City may request additional information from the Operator to make an evaluation. The City may shortlist applications and conduct interviews with finalists prior to issuing a Permit. Applicants may notify the City their intent to withdraw their application at any time prior to Permit issuance.

The application period begins on January 20, 2021 and ends on February 17, 2021 at 5:00 PM PST. The City may extend the application period if no completed applications are received by the deadline.

An application is considered fully completed when the following are submitted:

(a) This application form (application cover page);
(b) All required attachments as listed in the Guidelines;
(c) E-bike sample for independent testing by the City.

Please note, an applicant must arrange to provide an E-bike sample for independent testing by the City when submitting the application materials. Application materials must be submitted in English, by email to bikeshare@cnv.org, in PDF format. There is a 30 MB limit on files submitted via email.

The applicant is not guaranteed the issuance of a Permit and the City may refuse, in its sole discretion, to issue a Permit for any reason, including and not limited to:

(d) If the Operator has failed to comply with the laws of any other jurisdiction;
(e) If the Operator is unable or unwilling to agree to any of the terms and conditions of the Policy or the Permit; and,
(f) If the City for any other reason believes the Operator will be unable to provide safe, equitable or reliable E-Bike Share services.

An applicant who is approved for a Permit must submit the following additional materials and fees before the Permit will be issued:

(a) Proof of insurance meeting the requirements set out in the Policy and in the Permit conditions;
(b) The fees corresponding to the initial Fleet size as outlined in the Fee Schedule;
(c) The Security for Performance as outlined in the Fee Schedule; and,
(d) Application to the City of North Vancouver for a Business Licence, including the required fee.

The evaluation of applications will be based on the criteria set out in Section 3C - Application Assessment, which includes the readiness of a potential Operator to deploy its E-Bikes in the City, the Operator's ability to achieve the goals outlined in this Policy, and the quality of the application materials submitted.

As part of the Permit application form, the City requests consent from the potential Operator to share the application package materials with the District of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver for the purpose of reviewing the applications and providing feedback to the City. The E-Bike Share Permit is intended to allow Operators to provide E-Bike Share services across the North Shore as outlined below in Section 3D - Program Expansion and North Shore Coordination. As such, consulting with the District of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver is a key piece of enabling this partnership. Operators will also be asked to consent to sharing application package materials with TransLink to allow planning and coordination around transit services and facilities.
B. REQUIRED INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTS

The Operator must submit the following information and documents for the City to consider an application to be complete. See Section 4 – E-Bike Share Requirements for further details on program requirements.

(a) Completed Permit application form (used as the application package cover page);

(b) Brief company history and management team background emphasizing capabilities to manage an E-Bike Share system at a municipal scale, including at least two (2) past client references;

(c) Description and images of all E-Bike models that will be used in the Fleet and evidence that E-Bike models meet or exceed safety standards in the B.C. Motor Vehicle Act, including:
   i. Detailed description of the E-Bike's dimensions, features, breaking performance, and motor specifications;
   ii. Detailed description of the E-Bike's locking mechanism;
   iii. Detailed description of the Helmet wear plan for Customers to ensure compliance with provincial Helmet regulations as outlined in the B.C. Motor Vehicle Act;
   iv. Detailed description of E-Bike maintenance standards;
   v. Operator's proposed initial fleet size (minimum of 120 E-Bikes upon launch) and fleet expansion plans, including key performance indicators the Operator will use to inform when expansions may be considered;

(d) Operations and maintenance plan, covering:
   i. Operator's qualifications for operating an E-Bike Share service;
   ii. Map of initial service area and any possible or planned service area expansions, including key performance indicators the Operator will use to inform when expansions may be considered;
   iii. Description of staff team positions and responsibilities for E-Bike Share services and liaising with City staff;
   iv. Description of E-Bike sanitization activities;
   v. Description of enforcement activities to ensure Customer compliance with federal, provincial, and City regulations and operating conditions;
   vi. Description of response protocols and estimated response times for addressing issues arising from Customer and City complaints;
   vii. Description of digital tools and features to manage E-Bike permissions and Customer behaviour (e.g. geofencing capabilities, motor speed control, security controls)
   viii. E-Bike recharging plan;

(e) Parking and relocation plan, covering:
   i. Proposed staging and parking locations;
   ii. Physical description of parking areas and their features;
   iii. Description of digital tools and features to manage E-Bike share parking locations;
   iv. Proposed plan and timeline for implementing parking areas prior to service launch;
   v. Operational parameters for rebalancing E-Bikes to adequately serve the service area;
   vi. Description of key performance indicators the Operator will use to inform when and where additional parking areas may be considered;

(f) Customer education and safety plan, covering:
   i. Rules and conditions for Customers using E-Bikes;
   ii. Customer education and outreach activities;
   iii. Enforcement and accountability measures for Customers not in compliance with rules and conditions;

(g) Customer payments plan, covering:
   i. E-Bike Share rental costs and fare rates;
   ii. Accepted payment methods;
   iii. Alternatives for those without smartphones and those without a credit card, debit card, or bank account to access the E-Bike Share service;
B. REQUIRED INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTS (CONTINUED)

(h) Data collection and management plan, covering:
   i. Description of Data sharing process including how the Operator will share Data with the City;
   ii. Description of privacy protection measures for Customer Personal Information.

(i) Sustainability plan, covering:
   i. Estimates for E-Bike lifecycle emissions;
   ii. Description of operations emissions reporting plan; and,

(j) Equity plan, covering:
   i. Options for low-income individuals and those with alternate mobility needs; and,
   ii. How geographic equity will be practiced to serve all community members.

C. APPLICATION ASSESSMENT

The City will only consider complete applications from potential Operators that provide all the information required by these Permit guidelines by the end of the open call period. A complete application includes the Permit application form, the documents listed above in section 3 B - Required Information and Documents, and an E-Bike sample for testing as described in section 3 D - E-Bike Testing. As part of the application process, the City may develop a shortlist of finalists from the application pool after an initial round of review. The purpose of the shortlist is to conduct interviews with finalists to make a final determination prior to issuing a single (1) permit.

The City reserves the right not to consider an incomplete application, but may, in its discretion, advise applicants of any missing application materials and accept such materials during the open call period to rectify an incomplete application. The City further reserves the right to reject any application.

The Operator must demonstrate through its application that it can deliver on the goals and expectations established in the Policy and meet all of the requirements described in the Permit guidelines. The key criteria the City uses during the application assessment and evaluation are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Whether the Operator is a fit and proper organization for the purposes of</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing E-Bike Share services in the City taking into account the experience of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Operator, financial capacity, local presence, reputation, and staffing levels;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The quality of the E-Bike(s) proposed for deployment, specifically</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrated ability to respond to safety needs in North Shore conditions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) The quality of the information provided in the plans included in the</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Demonstrated responsiveness to the needs of and benefits to the City</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community; and,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Quality of proposed value-add program features.</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. E-BIKE TESTING

As part of the application package, the City expects potential Operators to demonstrate the E-Bike they propose to use on the North Shore. The demonstration, for the purpose of considering an application complete, consists of providing an E-Bike to the City for testing in North Shore conditions. The potential Operator must provide a sample E-Bike prior to end of the application period for independent testing by the City. The City reserves the right to deny a Permit to any Operator who fails to provide an E-Bike sample in a timely manner.

E. PROGRAM EXPANSION AND NORTH SHORE COORDINATION

The Permit Guidelines were developed jointly by staff at the City of North Vancouver, District of North Vancouver, and District of West Vancouver. The City is the first municipality to adopt the E-Bike Share framework, and there is the potential for expansion to these other municipalities on the North Shore. Should the other North Shore municipalities endorse an E-Bike Share framework, references to the City in these Permit Guidelines may be expanded to include the other participating municipalities. Should the program be expanded, it is anticipated that the City will be the central permit receiving authority acting on behalf of the participating municipalities.

Potential Operators should take into consideration the potential for E-Bike Share services and service area expansions to cover parts or all of the North Shore in the application materials they submit to the City. Staff from all three municipalities will participate in the review process.

NORTH SHORE JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES
4. E-BIKE SHARE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

A. SAFETY

The Operator is responsible for the safe and secure deployment of E-Bikes in its service area, including all operations and staging activities related to the management of its E-Bike Share service. The Operator is responsible to ensure the safe use of its E-Bikes by Customers on public and private spaces where they are permitted for use, as defined by the City's Street & Traffic bylaw. The Operator is the first point of contact for issues or complaints related to E-Bike Share operations.

In addition, the City expects the Operator to meet the following safety requirements:

(a) The Operator must comply with all applicable federal, provincial and municipal laws, bylaws, and regulations;
(b) The Operator is responsible for conducting their own due diligence, including reviewing all relevant legislation;
(c) The Operator must have visible language on each E-Bike, within the Mobile App, and on its website, that requires Customers to follow all relevant laws including Federal, Provincial, and municipal legislation and regulations;
(d) The Operator is responsible for informing all Customers about all Helmet laws applicable based on E-Bike class and ensuring Customers comply with Helmet requirements;
(e) The Operator must provide contact information on all E-Bikes and all other communications materials for Customers and members of the public to report a complaint or inquire about the service;
(f) The Operator must immediately remotely lock down any E-Bike that is inoperable, unresponsive or not safe to operate once notified;
(g) Once notified of an issue, the Operator should remove any Broken Device from the public right-of-way within 6 hours and remove the Broken Device from the Fleet or have the Broken Device repaired; and,
(h) The Operator must provide ongoing inspection, maintenance, and cleaning of all E-Bikes.

B. SERVICE AVAILABILITY

The City expects a minimum of 120 E-Bikes to be publicly available in the initial Fleet upon launch; the Operator is encouraged to keep additional E-Bikes in reserve. The City expects the Operator to maintain the minimum Fleet size from May through September inclusively. The City's preference is to maintain E-Bike Share service availability throughout the year.

The City acknowledges that some forms of E-Bike Share may not be suitable for 24-hour per day use and therefore expects the Operator to establish regular business hours and display them appropriately on all E-Bikes and within the Mobile App.

In addition, the City expects the Operator to meet the following requirements:

(a) The Operator must inform the City of any changes to the availability of its services at least 10 business days in advance;
(b) The Operator's Mobile App must be available 24 hours per day for Customer sign up, support requests, and information;
(c) The Operator must have operations support staff available during regular business hours at minimum, and should have support staff available 24 hours per day;
B. SERVICE AVAILABILITY (CONTINUED)

(d) The Operator must provide its communications and Mobile App in English and French, and preferably provide other language options, including Farsi, Mandarin, and Cantonese;

(e) The Operator should make different payment methods available to Customers in addition to those typically found in the Mobile App such as using a pre-loaded balance credit, over the phone, debit transaction, or others deemed feasible; and,

(f) The Operator should provide at least 1 paid membership account to the City for enforcement purposes and describe the features of the membership to the City.

C. OPERATIONS AND PARKING

The Operator is responsible for informing Customers on how to operate and park E-Bikes properly and in approved locations. The Operator has the responsibility to ensure its operations and its Customers follow the rules of the road.

The City expects the Operator to establish, with approval by the City, designated parking and staging areas that are demarcated physically and virtually through the Mobile App. The City prefers compact parking and staging areas intended for a handful of E-Bikes, but will consider proposals for larger zones at the neighbourhood level in certain circumstances and depending on neighbourhood characteristics. Parking and staging locations and their dimensions must be approved by the City. The City will also allow for the use of lock-to solutions for parking and staging. Operators who use E-Bikes equipped with lock-to capability in their Fleet must provide the City with the means to unlock E-Bikes for no charge.

PARKING AND STAGING AREAS

Parking areas are subject to approval by the City and must, at minimum, meet the following physical parameters:

(a) Parking areas must accommodate E-Bike(s) standing upright and be sized to accommodate the full size of the E-Bike(s);

(b) No part of the E-Bike(s) can extend beyond the parking area;

(c) Parking areas must be delineated with pavement markings showing the boundary of the parking area;

(d) Pavement markings must be approved by the City and must be one of the following materials:
   i. Paint;
   ii. Pavement marking tape; or,
   iii. Chloroplast seal;

(e) Parking areas must be identified with a sign that states;
   i. The name of the Operator and their contact information;
   ii. The Operator's general rules and instructions on the use of the E-Bike Share service; and,
   iii. The parking rules that apply to the parking area.

Example of a bike share parking area
Source: City of Bellevue
C. OPERATIONS AND PARKING (CONTINUED)

OPERATING AND PARKING REQUIREMENTS

In addition, the City requires the Operator to meet the following operating and parking requirements:

(f) The Operator will contribute to all costs associated with establishment and installation of parking areas;

(g) The Operator must Geo-fence its designated parking areas, no parking, slow zones, and no riding zones, and The Operator is responsible for ensuring Customers are informed on how to use E-Bikes in special zones;

(h) The Operator must not allow Customers to end a Trip outside of designated parking areas;

(i) The Operator must have the ability to communicate with Customers to notify them if an E-Bike is outside a parking area at the Trip end and that the Customer is not permitted to end the Trip outside parking areas;

(j) Any parked E-Bike must remain within designated parking areas and must not obstruct the path of travel of other road users;

(k) All E-Bikes and parking areas must be marked with the Operator’s contact information to allow Customers and members of the public to report obstructive E-Bikes to the Operator;

(l) All E-Bikes which are not parked properly must be re-parked to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;

(m) The Operator must re-park E-Bikes not properly parked within 6 hours of a complaint and should strive to respond faster than the maximum timespan;

(n) The City may remove or re-park any E-Bike parked in violation of the requirements specified or other municipal bylaws at any time and the costs to the City related to such actions will be charged against the Performance Deposit, as outlined in the Fee Schedule;

(o) If a hazard or lack of legal access prevent an Operator from responding within the times required, the Operator must:
   i. Remove the E-Bike at the next reasonable opportunity;
   ii. Bear the removal costs, including reimbursement for any costs to the City; and,
   iii. Report the location of the irretrievable E-Bike to the City if the Operator cannot safely and legally remove the E-Bike.

D. INSURANCE AND LIABILITY

LIABILITY

The Operator will be required to indemnify, defend and save harmless the City, its elected officials, employees and agents (the “Municipal Parties”) from and against any and all liability, damages, losses, liens, charges, claims, demands, payments, suits, causes of action, proceedings, actions, recoveries and judgments, including without limitation all costs of defending or denying the same (including all legal, expert and consultant fees and disbursements) (collectively, “Claims”) which arise out of or result from:

(a) Any act or omission, negligent or otherwise, of the Operator, its Customers, invitees, employees, subcontractors or agents or others for whom it is responsible at law in connection with the Operator’s operation of the E-Bike Share service;

(b) Any breach by the Operator of the terms, conditions, obligations, requirements, representations and warranties of this Policy, the Permit, or of any bylaw, statute, rule, regulation or policy applicable to the operation of the E-Bike Share service; and,

(c) Any damage to property or any personal injury, including death, resulting directly or indirectly from the Operator’s use or occupation of land for the E-Bike Share service.
D. INSURANCE AND LIABILITY (CONTINUED)

In no event will the Municipal Parties be liable to the Operator or any of its Customers, invitees, employees, subcontractors or agents for any indirect, special, incidental, punitive or consequential damages (including lost profits or revenues) arising out of or in any way related directly or indirectly to the Permit or the operation of the E-Bike Share service.

The Operator releases the Municipal Parties from and against any and all Claims which the Operator may at any time have against the Municipal Parties in respect of the Permit and the rights granted under it and the operation of the E-Bike Share service, except to the extent the same has resulted from the sole negligence of the Municipal Parties.

REQUIRED INSURANCE

The Operator will at the Operator's expense maintain at all times during the Permit period the following insurance:

(a) Commercial General Liability Insurance with limits not less than $10 million per occurrence, covering all operations of the Operator under the Permit including claims for bodily injury, death and property damage. Such insurance will include a non-owned automobile liability, products and completed operations liability and contractual liability of sufficient scope to include the liability assumed by the Operator under the Permit. Such insurance must:
   i. Be endorsed to include the City and its administrators, successors, assigns, insurers, officials, officers, employees, servants and agents as additional insureds;
   ii. Contain a cross liability clause;
   iii. Be written by insurers licensed to do business in the Province of British Columbia;
   iv. Contain a waiver of the insurer's rights of subrogation against the City;
   v. Be primary (and non-contributory) to any insurance maintained by the City;
   vi. Contain a 30-days written notice of cancellation of or material change to the policy provision;

(b) Automobile Liability Insurance of not less than $5 million dollars in any one accident, covering all licensed motor vehicles owned or leased by the Operator and used in connection with the Permit; and

(c) Workers' Compensation Coverage in respect of all Operator's employees, workers and servants engaged in the operations under the Permit.

Certificates of insurance evidencing the specified insurance must be delivered to the City prior to the issuance of the Permit and subsequent renewals must be delivered to the City not later than 10 days following the expiry of the prior policy.

In the event of any notice of loss, damage, occurrence, accident, claim or suit (collectively "Claim"), the Operator will notify within five (5) business days the insurer and the City of such Claim. The Operator and or the Operator's insurer will assume the defense of any such Claim, including the City's defense. The Operator will be responsible for all costs of the City relating to the defense of the Claim, including the costs of an independent investigator, and ensure that the City is kept appraised of the status of the Claim.

The Operator may not transfer a Permit to any other entity. The Operator must notify within five (5) business days the City of any material changes to the Operator's corporate structure or ownership. Failure to do so will cause for revocation of the Permit. For purposes of this paragraph, "transfer" will include the sale or other exchange of 50% or more of the ownership or control of the Operator to a third party.
E. DATA SHARING AND REPORTING

The Operator is required to meet the following Data sharing and reporting requirements:

(a) The Operator must share all Data on North Shore operations with the City;
(b) The Operator must supply an E-Bike inventory list to the City complete with each unique identifier number and serial numbers before making any E-Bikes available for rent;
(c) The Operator must comply with the Mobility Data Specification (MDS) (https://github.com/openmobilityfoundation/mobility-data-specification) and provide raw information in a format acceptable to the Municipal or City Engineer on Fleet, Trip, location, parking, incident, and maintenance Data that must be secured with a token or authentication that is shared with the City;
(d) The Operator must provide the City monthly summary reports on key metrics as required by the City Engineer;
(e) The Operator must provide the City access to a dashboard, software interface, or Application Programming Interface (API) that shows anonymized real-time information on E-Bike locations and usage (e.g. number of trips on a given E-Bike in the previous 24 hours), condition status, and battery level;
(f) The Operator must ensure that E-Bike locations are known, including when on a Trip, by incorporating a location tracking component into all E-Bikes (this excludes phone-based location services information e.g. Bluetooth technology);
(g) Raw Data feeds supplied by the Operator must be consumable by third-party software if the Operator does not maintain its own dashboard for use by the City or if the City chooses to partner with a third-party partner;
(h) The Operator and the City will maintain all Data use rights for at least three (3) years after the date when the Operator ceases operation in the City;
(i) Personal Information will not be shared with the City or any other entity and the Operator must ensure the privacy and non-disclosure of the Personal Information of its Customers;
(j) Raw Data consumed through the API by third-party software providers specified by the City must not be publicly available without consent from the Operator; and,
(k) The Operator must conduct surveys upon request by the City and include questions from the City in surveys as requested.

I. USER PROTECTIONS

The Operator must ensure Customer Data privacy, including all financial and Personal Information. The Operator inform Customers about how their data will be collected, stored, used, and shared. Any Customer Data collected must not be shared with third parties without express consent from the Customer.

The Operator must provide a written justification to the Customer explaining why it needs access to each type of Customer file (e.g. contacts, camera, photos, location, interaction with other software or apps, etc.).

The Operator must provide Customers with clear, prominent information about what Data will be accessed (e.g. location services, camera, contacts, photos, etc.) and explain how and why Data will be used. Information must not be hidden in longer terms-of-service notifications.

If the Operator has the desire to access such features, the Operator must provide Customers with an opt-in option feature within the Mobile App, where they can agree to provide access to their contacts, camera, photos, files, and other private Data and third-party Data sharing.
F. ENFORCEMENT

In case of emergency or immediate threat to public safety, the City may take any action as deemed necessary to remove the emergency or threat.

If the Operator fails to comply with any of the requirements of the Policy or the conditions of the Permit, in addition to revocation of the Permit, the City may modify the Permit conditions including reducing Fleet sizes and/or adding additional Permit conditions. If the Permit is revoked for failure to comply with the requirements of the Policy or the conditions of the Permit or for any other reason, the Operator must remove its entire Fleet from all City streets, parks and pathways within 30 calendar days of notice, unless otherwise directed by the City. If this is not completed, the City will remove the Operator's Fleet from municipal property and deduct the costs of removal and/or storage from the remaining Security for Performance balance.

Any changes to the Permit will be communicated via email to the address provided at the time of application or other email address provided by the Operator subsequently for notification.

G. FEE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEE REASON</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Application</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Paid upon submitting a complete Permit application form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Bike Share Permit</td>
<td>$40 + GST</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>The fee covers the total number of deployed E-Bikes. Operators may have additional E-Bikes in storage that are kept in reserve and therefore not part of the active fleet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security for Performance</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Non-recurring, refundable minus deductions. Paid to each participating municipality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEDUCTIONS

Fees deducted from Security for Performance

(a) E-Bike retrieval fee: The City will deduct any costs incurred by the City (including staff time plus 15%) related to retrieving any E-Bike; and,

(b) E-Bike impoundment fee: $50 per E-Bike plus $1 per day for storage. If the Operator fails to retrieve the E-Bike after 30 days, the City will recycle the E-Bike and charge any recycling costs incurred.

If fees exceed the value of the Security for Performance, the City reserves the right to charge fines and fees directly to the Operator, to require payment of an additional Security for Performance, or to pursue cancellation of the Permit.

Separately, fines for non-compliance with Permit conditions will be charged directly to the Operator. A schedule of all fines is available in the City's Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw, No. 8675
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The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8489

A bylaw to amend Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as “District of North Vancouver Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8489, 2021 (Amendment 22)".

Amendments

2. Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 is amended by:

2.1 adding the following definitions to section 302 in alphabetical order:

**Cycle** means a device having any number of wheels that is propelled by human power and on which a person may ride but does not include a play vehicle;

**E-Bike Share Permit** means a permit issued by the Municipal Engineer under section 743 of this bylaw;

**E-Bike Share Service** means a legal entity whose business is to provide access to a fleet of E-Bikes for a fee;

**E-Bike Share Zone** means the area or space on a roadway designated by a Traffic Control Device and established for the exclusive use of a specified E-Bike Share Service;

**E-Bike or Motor Assisted Cycle** means a type of cycle:

(a) with two or three wheels to which pedals or hand cranks are attached that allow for the cycle to be propelled by human power;
(b) on which a person may ride;
(c) to which is attached an electric motor that has an output not exceeding 500 W;
(d) that meets the other criteria prescribed under the *Motor Vehicle Act*, RSBC 1996, c. 318, the Motor Vehicle Act Regulations and the Motor Assisted Cycle Regulation, all as may be amended or replaced.

**Inter-Municipal Bike Share Program** means an E-Bike share program to...
facilitate the operation of E-Bike Share Services in the District and other municipalities that is jointly operated by the District with other partnering municipalities;

**Motor Assisted Cycle Regulation** means the *Motor Assisted Cycle Regulation*, BC Reg 151/2002;

**Motor Vehicle Act Regulations** means the *Motor Vehicle Act Regulations*, BC Reg. 26/58;

2.2 deleting section 516 and substituting the following:

516. The Municipal Engineer may direct the placement of Traffic Control Devices to designate a portion of a Highway as a Loading Zone, Passenger Zone, Commercial Loading Zone or E-Bike Share Zone and to define the rights, duties and obligations of traffic with respect to that zone.

2.3 inserting the following as section 520A after section 520:

520A. No person shall stop, stand or park a vehicle in an E-Bike Share Zone except for the purpose of loading or unloading persons or materials.

2.4 deleting "without a valid and subsisting Highway Use Permit issued by the District pursuant to this Bylaw" at the end of section 702 and substituting "without a valid and subsisting Highway Use Permit or E-Bike Share Permit issued by the District pursuant to this Bylaw."

2.5 deleting section 716 and substituting the following:

716. Except as set out in sections 406, 707 – 715, 742 and 744, a person must not undertake any construction or planting on a Highway except as specifically authorized by a Highway Use Permit, Highway Construction and Planting Permit, E-Bike Share Permit or other District approval and, without limiting the foregoing, a person must not do any of the following on a Highway:

2.6 inserting the following after section 742:

**E-Bike Share Services**

743. The Municipal Engineer may issue an E-Bike Share Permit to an E-Bike Share Service where the Municipal Engineer is satisfied that the E-Bike Share Service has received approval through an Inter-Municipal Bike Share Program.
The Municipal Engineer may establish and designate Geo-fenced Areas for use by the holder of an E-Bike Share Permit and the permit holder will, at its own expense, install such pavement markings and signage as approved by the Municipal Engineer to identify the Geo-fenced Area or, if installed by the District, will reimburse the District for such costs.

The Municipal Engineer may, by directing the placement of Traffic Control Devices, regulate and control the operation of E-Bike Share Services within a Geo-fenced Area, including the speed of E-Bikes and the regulation or prohibition of parking of any E-Bikes within a Geo-fenced Area.

A person or legal entity may only operate an E-Bike Share Service with a valid E-Bike Share Permit and in accordance with all of the conditions of such permit and the requirements of this bylaw.

A person must not operate or park an E-Bike contrary to the regulations in any Traffic Control Device.

The holder of an E-Bike Share Permit may deploy a fleet of E-Bikes in any location where parking is permitted and where authorized by the Municipal Engineer for the purpose of making E-Bikes available to reserve for use.

Successful applicants for the E-Bike Share Permit must pay the E-Bike Share Permit fee and the security for performance fee set out in the Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, as amended from time to time, prior to being issued a permit. The security for performance is refundable, less any deductions in accordance with section 747.

The Municipal Engineer may deduct the following fees from the security for performance fee:

750.1 **E-Bike retrieval fee:** all costs incurred by the District (including staff time plus an administrative fee of 15%) related to the retrieval of any E-Bike owned or operated by an E-Bike Share Service; and

750.2 **E-Bike impoundment fee:** $50 per E-Bike plus $1 per day for storage. If the E-Bike Share Service fails to retrieve the E-Bike after 30 days, the District will recycle the E-Bike and charge any recycling costs incurred.

If the fees imposed under section 750 exceed the total of the security for performance, the District is authorized to charge fines.
and fees directly to the E-Bike Share Service, to require payment of an additional security for performance, or to cancel the Permit.

2.7 amending section 1201 by adding "(including but not limited to an E-Bike)" after "Any chattel, obstruction or vehicle".

READ a first time
READ a second time
READ a third time
ADOPTED

Mayor

Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

Municipal Clerk
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8490

A bylaw to amend Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8490, 2021 (Amendment 71)".

Amendments

2. Schedule F of Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 is amended by inserting the following new fees and charges in the table immediately following the fee for Highway Construction and Planting Permit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Fee Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Bike Share Permit Application Fee*</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Bike Share Permit Fee*</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>Paid annually; Per E-Bike deployed (not including E-Bikes in storage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Bike Security for Performance</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These fees waived if paid to other municipality in inter-municipal E-bike share program.

READ a first time

READ a second time

READ a third time

ADOPTED

Mayor

Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

Municipal Clerk
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8491

A bylaw to amend Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8491, 2021 (Amendment 59)".

Amendments

2. Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 is amended by inserting the following violations for the Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 in numerical order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bylaw Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A1 Penalty</th>
<th>A2 Discounted Penalty: Within 14 days</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment: After 28 days</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
<th>A5 Compliance Agreement Discount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520A</td>
<td>Park in E-Bike Share Zone</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td>Operate E-Bike Share Service contrary to permit</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>Operate E-Bike contrary to Traffic Control Device</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

READ a first time

READ a second time

READ a third time

ADOPTED

Mayor

Certified a true copy

Municipal Clerk
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The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COUNCIL

February 4, 2021
File: 08.3060.00/003

AUTHOR: Daniel Broderick, Development Planning Assistant

SUBJECT: Update to Public Notification Signage Requirements

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT "District of North Vancouver Development Procedures Bylaw 8144, 2017 Amendment Bylaw 8480, 2021 (Amendment 1)" be given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings;

THAT "Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8495, 2021 (Amendment 1)" be given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT the Corporate Policy titled "Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications" is approved by Council.

REASON FOR REPORT:

Consistent with the Official Community Plan (OCP) policies to “Periodically review and assess regulations for relevance and ease of use” (Policy 8.2 4.) and to “Provide opportunities for all citizens to meaningfully participate in civic affairs and community life” (Policy 6.1 1.), staff propose to update public notification sign requirements in the Development Procedures Bylaw 8144, 2017. The proposed changes are focused on providing clear and consistent public notice, to ensure clear communication, and to assist in meaningful community engagement. A companion update is proposed to the relevant corporate policy on non-statutory notification to ensure consistency in signage.

SUMMARY:

Local governments which have adopted OCP’s and Zoning Bylaws must enact a procedures bylaw to establish the mechanism for land owners to apply for a change to the OCP or Zoning Bylaw, or to apply for the issuance of a permit under Part 26 of the
Local Government Act (e.g. development permits and development variance permits). The procedures bylaw establishes public notification requirements which may augment the statutory public notification provisions found in the Local Government Act.

Proposed Bylaw 8480 amends the specific notice requirements of the District's existing Development Procedures Bylaw 8144 (2017) to provide clarity on the number and placement of notification signs required for statutory purposes. Corporate Policy on Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications would be updated similarly for non-statutory signage requirements. Proposed Bylaw 8495 amends the Fees and Charges Bylaw to reflect an updated sign installation process and sign requirements and to ensure the District is compensated for increased signage costs.

BACKGROUND:

The Development Procedures Bylaw 8144 was adopted in 2017. This is the first amendment proposed for Development Procedures Bylaw 8144 since its adoption.

The Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481 was adopted in 1992 and is amended annually to reflect inflation and any changes in District processes and best practices.

The Corporate Policy on Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications was adopted in 2017 and was amended in 2019.

The District currently retains a local sign company to produce and install signs for Public Hearings. To date, the signage installations for Early Input Meetings (at the Preliminary Planning Application stage) and Public Information Meetings (at the Detailed Application stage) have been the responsibility of the development applicant, and the applicant is provided guidelines for sizing, format, and siting of the signs.

Under the proposed updated process, all notification signs for Public Hearings, Early Input Meetings, and Public Information Meetings would be produced and installed by the District's sign company at the request of the District. The District would provide the sign company with sign templates for each type of sign, as well as direction on best practices for locating and orienting signs to ensure visibility.

EXISTING POLICY:

The Local Government Act requires local governments which have adopted OCP's and Zoning Bylaws to define application review procedures. The District's existing Development Procedures Bylaw 8144 and the proposed amending Bylaw 8480 fulfil this requirement.
ANALYSIS:

The proposed amendments to the Development Procedures Bylaw and the proposed updates to the District's Corporate Policy on Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications will provide for consistency across all public notices for development applications including Public Hearing signs, Public Information Meeting signs, and other non-statutory public notifications.

The proposed Fees and Charges Bylaw amendments reflect the updated process and will account for the additional cost to the District for the design and installation of the required notification signs.

Timing/Approval Process:
The amendments to Development Procedures Bylaw 8144 and Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481 are to take effect immediately following bylaw adoption. Implementation of the provisions of the Corporate Policy on Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications would occur following approval of the policy.

Concurrence:
Bylaws 8480 and 8495, and the Corporate Policy on Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications, have been reviewed by the Development Planning and Strategic Communications & Community Relations Departments.

Should Council approve the proposed changes, the District’s information hand-out to development applicants on requirements for public meetings would be revised to reflect the updated process for installation of notification signage for development proposals. The proposed amendments to Bylaw 8144 ensure that all public notice requirements for development proposals are consistent.

Public Input:
As this is an administrative process to ensure broad public engagement, no public consultation measures have been undertaken for this bylaw and policy update.

CONCLUSION:

Staff recommend updating the signage requirements of Development Procedures Bylaw 8144 and the Corporate Policy on Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications, and recommend adding additional signage fees to the Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481 to reflect increased costs to the District. The amendments will help support consistent bylaw and policy interpretation, high-quality service delivery, and continued community engagement as part of the District’s development review procedures.
OPTIONS:

The following options are available for Council's consideration:

1. Give Bylaw 8480, 2020 (Amendment 1) & Bylaw 8495, 2021 (Amendment 1) First, Second and Third readings, and approve the Corporate Policy titled "Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications"; or

2. Provide alternate direction to staff.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Daniel Broderick
Development Planning Assistant

Attachments:
1. District of North Vancouver Development Procedures Bylaw 8144, 2017 Amendment Bylaw 8480, 2020 (Amendment 1)
2. District of North Vancouver Development Procedures Bylaw 8144, 2017 Amendment Bylaw 8480, 2020 (Redline Version)
3. District of North Vancouver Fees and Charges Bylaw, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8495, 2021 (Amendment 1)
4. District of North Vancouver Corporate Policy: Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications
5. District of North Vancouver Corporate Policy: Non-Statutory Public Consultation for Development Applications (Redline Version)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th>External Agencies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Clerk's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Planning</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Engineering</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Fire Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Operations</td>
<td>ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Bylaw Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Compliance</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A bylaw to amend Development Procedures Bylaw 8144, 2017

The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8480

A bylaw to amend Development Procedures Bylaw 8144, 2017

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "Development Procedures Bylaw 8144, 2017 Amendment Bylaw 8480, 2020 (Amendment 1)".

Amendments

2. Development Procedures Bylaw 8144, 2017 is amended as follows:

   a) Subsection 8(1) is deleted and replaced with the following new subsection 8(1):

      "8(1) In circumstances where the Local Government Act requires the delivery of a notice of public hearing to owners and tenants in occupation, except when the public hearing is waived, at least 12 days before the public hearing:

         (a) the District must post a minimum of two notices on the area or on a highway adjacent to the area that is the subject of the bylaw alteration, one of the notices to be viewable by traffic in one direction and the other of the notices to be viewable by traffic in the opposite direction; and

         (b) where an area that is the subject of the bylaw alteration is located near a major arterial the District may post additional notices viewable from both directions on the arterial."

   b) By deleting the words “posted notice” in subsection 8(3) and replacing those words with the following: "posted notices required pursuant to subsection 8(1)(a)";

   c) Subsection 8(5) is deleted and replaced with the following new Subsection 8(5):

      "8(5) The posted notice must at a minimum contain the following:

         (a) a title containing the words "Development Proposal";"
(b) the date, time and location of the public hearing;

(c) the civic address of the parcel that is subject of the proposed development;

(d) a map showing the location of the proposed development;

(e) a brief description of the development in general terms; and

(f) District contact information:

d) Subsection 8(6) is deleted;

e) In Schedule A to Bylaw 8144, replacing the sign template with the template in Schedule A to Bylaw 8480.

READ a first time

READ a second time

READ a third time

ADOPTED

_____________________________  ________________________________
Mayor                                Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

______________________________
Municipal Clerk
**Development Proposal**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**
Xpm, Day of week, Month X, Year

**Location**
Address of meeting

**PROPOSAL:**
Address of Proposal

[insert location map]

**Contact:**
Name, Development Planner
e-mail or phone number
DNV.org/public-hearing
THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8144

A bylaw to define development review procedures for the District of North Vancouver

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as “Development Procedures Bylaw 8144, 2017”.

Definitions

2. In this bylaw:

   (a) “abutting” means sharing a common boundary of at least one point, or would share a common boundary of at least one point, if not for a shared highway which does not exceed 20 m in width;

   (b) “applicant” means the owner or a representative of the owner duly authorized to act on the owner’s behalf in relation to an application;

   (c) “application” means a written request by an applicant to amend the Official Community Plan or Zoning Bylaw, or to enter into a heritage revitalization agreement, or phased development agreement or for the issuance of a development permit, development variance permit, or temporary use permit, in a form and content prescribed by the General Manager and this bylaw;

   (d) “Fees and Charges Bylaw” means the District of North Vancouver Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, as amended or replaced;

   (e) “General Manager” means the General Manager of Planning, Properties & Permits and his lawful deputy, as defined in the Officers and Employees Bylaw, and any person designated in writing by the General Manager of Planning, Properties & Permits to carry out any administrative act or function under this bylaw;

   (f) “Official Community Plan” means the District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan Bylaw 7900, as amended or replaced;

   (g) “Officers and Employees Bylaw” means the District of North Vancouver Officers and Employees Bylaw 7052, as amended or replaced;

   (h) “owner” means a person listed in the land titles office as the owner of a parcel;
(i) "parcel" means any lot, block or other area of land that is the subject of an application;

(j) "Zoning Bylaw" means the District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965, as amended or replaced.

Delegation

3. Council delegates to the General Manager the powers of Council to administer this bylaw including prescribing the form of permits issued and agreements approved under this bylaw.

Application

4. (1) An applicant who wishes to seek District approval for an amendment to the Official Community Plan or Zoning Bylaw, and an applicant who wishes to seek District approval for a heritage revitalization agreement or phased development agreement, and an applicant who applies for issuance of a development permit, development variance permit or temporary use permit must:

(a) seek approval from Council or the General Manager in accordance with the bylaw;
(b) complete an application and submit it to the General Manager; and,
(c) pay the application fee, at the time of application submission, in accordance with the Fees and Charges Bylaw.

(2) The applicant must provide the following information, at the applicant's expense, to the General Manager at the time of application submission:

(a) owner's authorization for the applicant to act on the owner's behalf with respect to the application;
(b) documents and plans which describe the proposal;
(c) documents and plans that demonstrate compliance with the existing or proposed regulations, as applicable; and,
(d) any additional information the General Manager determines is required to assist the Council or the General Manager in their consideration of the application.
Application Review and Consideration

5. (1) Upon receipt of a complete application the General Manager may, as applicable:

(a) review the application;
(b) prepare a report, amending bylaw, or permit for Council’s consideration;
(c) issue, amend, refuse, impose requirements, set conditions and standards, supplement a bylaw, and impose conditions for the sequence and timing of construction for the development permits in accordance with the Local Government Act and Part 1 of Schedule B of the Official Community Plan; or,
(d) issue, renew, refuse, set conditions, establish the permit expiration date, require security, and require an undertaking in respect of a temporary use permit in accordance with the Local Government Act and Zoning Bylaw except for lands which are located outside of the District’s four growth centres and zoned one of the Single Family Residential (RS) zones.

For the purposes of defining the District’s four growth centres, reference is made to the District Official Community Plan Bylaw 7900 Schedule A “Town and Village Centres” Lynn Valley, Lower Lynn, Maplewood and Lower Capilano-Marine.”

(2) Upon receipt of a complete application, General Manager’s report, amending bylaw or permit, Council must consider the application in accordance with the Local Government Act, and may as applicable:

(a) give the amending bylaw first reading;
(b) forward the amending bylaw to a public hearing or waive the holding of a public hearing;
(c) authorize the heritage revitalization agreement or phased development agreement;
(d) authorize the issuance of a development permit, development variance permit or temporary use permit;
(e) reject or refuse the application; or
(f) defer or otherwise deal with the application;

and after having given the bylaw 3 readings, adopt the bylaw.

Application Reconsideration

6. Within 10 days of the General Manager’s decision to issue, amend, refuse, impose requirements, set conditions and standards, supplement a bylaw, impose conditions for the sequence and timing of construction and require development approval information for a development permit or require security or undertaking in respect of a temporary use permit the applicant may request that Council reconsider the decision subject to the following:
(1) the request shall be in writing, and include reasons in support of the reconsideration;
(2) upon receipt of a complete written request for Council’s reconsideration, the General Manager shall prepare and forward a report to Council attaching the application and setting out the reasons for the decision;
(3) at a date and time set by Council the applicant shall have the opportunity to appear before Council and be heard regarding the decision of the General Manager; and
(4) following this, Council shall reconsider the decision of the General Manager and either uphold the decision or substitute the Council’s decision for the General Manager’s.

Delivery of Notice

7. (1) The distance for mailing or delivery of Notice of a Public Hearing under section 466 of the Local Government Act is 100 metres from that part of the area that is subject to an amendment to the Official Community Plan or Zoning Bylaw, a heritage revitalization agreement, or phased development agreement and 75 metres for an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for single-family subdivision.

(2) The distance for mailing or delivery of notice under section 493 [Temporary Use Permits] and section 498 [Development Variance Permits] of the Local Government Act includes all parcels abutting that part of the area that is the subject of the permit application.

Posting of Notice

8. (1) In circumstances where the Local Government Act requires the delivery of a notice of public hearing to owners and tenants in occupation, except when the public hearing is waived, the District must, at least 12 days before the public hearing post a notice on the area, or on a highway adjacent to the area, that is the subject of the applicable bylaw.

8. (1) In circumstances where the Local Government Act requires the delivery of a notice of public hearing to owners and tenants in occupation, except when the public hearing is waived, at least 12 days before the public hearing:

(a) the District must post a minimum of two notices on the area or on a highway adjacent to the area that is the subject of the bylaw alteration, one of the notices to be viewable by traffic in one direction and the other of the notices to be viewable by traffic in the opposite direction; and

(b) where an area that is the subject of the bylaw alteration is located near a major arterial the District may post additional notices viewable from both directions on the arterial.”
(2) Noncompliance with subsection (1) due to the removal, destruction or alteration of the notice by unknown persons, vandalism or natural occurrence will not affect the validity of the applicable bylaw.

(3) The posted notices required pursuant to subsection 8(1)(a) must have a minimum dimension of 1.2 m x 2.4 m.

(4) The form of the posted notice must be substantially the same as Schedule A, as applicable to the application.

(5) The posted notice must state the following, as applicable to the application:

   (a) time and date of the public hearing;
   (b) place of the public hearing;
   (c) a phrase which in general terms describes the proposal;
   (d) civic address of the parcel that is subject of the application; and,
   (e) a District website address and phone number.

(5) The posted notice must at a minimum contain the following:
   (a) a title containing the words “Development Proposal”;
   (b) the date, time and location of the public hearing;
   (c) the civic address of the parcel that is subject of the proposed development;
   (d) a map showing the location of the proposed development;
   (e) a brief description of the development in general terms; and
   (f) District contact information:

(6) Subject to subsection (1) minimum of one notice must be posted on the area or on a highway adjacent to the area that is the subject of the bylaw alteration.

Severability

9. If any section, subsection or clause of this bylaw is for any reason held to be invalid by the decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision will not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Bylaw.

Repeal

10. Development Procedures Bylaw 7738, 2008, and all amendment thereto are repealed.
READ a first time March 27th, 2017
READ a second time May 8th, 2017
READ a third time May 8th, 2017
ADOPTED July 10th, 2017

______________________________  ________________________________
Mayor                                      Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

______________________________
Municipal Clerk
Remove template:

Proposal: (Insert a phrase which in general terms describes the proposal)

(Insert an image of the proposal)

(Insert the time and date of the public hearing)

(Insert the place of the public hearing)

dnv.org/public_hearing
604-990-2387
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8495

A bylaw to amend Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8495, 2021 (Amendment 72)".

Amendments

2. Schedule B of Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 is amended as follows:

   a) In the section entitled "Preliminary Planning Application," the "Early Input Meeting where required" fee is increased to $3,130.00.

   b) In the section entitled "Rezoning (including text or map amendments but not including Complex Site Rezoning), Heritage Revitalization Agreements, and creation of new Temporary Use Permit Area," the following replaces the fee for "Public Hearing Fee (refundable as per provisions in the "Refund of Fees" section."

   Public Hearing Fee (refundable as per provisions in the "Refund of Fees" section) | $3,520.00 | Includes first bidirectional sign
   Public Information Meeting Signage Fee (where required) | $900.00

   c) In the section entitled "Official Community Plan Amendment," the following replaces the fee for "Public Hearing Fee (refundable as per provisions in the "Refund of Fees" section."

   Public Hearing Fee (refundable as per provisions in the "Refund of Fees" section) | $3,520.00 | Includes first bidirectional sign
   Public Information Meeting Signage Fee (where required) | $900.00

   d) The section entitled "Additional Public Hearing Fees" is replaced with the following:
### Additional Public Hearing, Meeting, or Signage Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Public Hearing (where required for a Rezoning, or Official Community Plan Amendment application)</td>
<td>$3,520.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Public Hearing, Public Information Meeting, or Early Input Meeting Signs (where required)</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>per additional bidirectional sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-statutory Public Notification Signs (where required)</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>per bidirectional sign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**READ** a first time

**READ** a second time

**READ** a third time

**ADOPTED**

__________________________  __________________________
Mayor                                        Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

__________________________
Municipal Clerk
POLICY

It is the policy of the District to:
• encourage applicants for Official Community Plan amendments, Zoning Bylaw amendments, development permits, development variance permits, and liquor license applications to notify the public of development applications and solicit feedback prior to the proposal being considered by Council,
• encourage applicants for Official Community Plan amendments, Zoning Bylaw amendments, and certain development permits to hold one or more public information meetings prior to the proposal being considered by Council,
• provide notice of public information meetings in accordance with this policy, and
• provide Council with an information report prior to the holding of a public information meeting.

REASON FOR POLICY

1. To establish early dialogue with the community and identify specific issues of concern.
2. To expand the opportunities for public consultation.
3. To ensure that factual information is conveyed to the community.
4. To enable staff and Council to gauge public opinion on a particular application.
5. To inform Council of development applications in process.

PROCEDURE

The following table summarizes the recommended public notification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Proposal</th>
<th>Notification Delivery Area</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official Community Plan &amp; Zoning Bylaw Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary application</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>2 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Meeting</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Development Permit for Commercial, Industrial &amp; Multi-Family Form and Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary application</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>2 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Meeting</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Permit and Approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Variance Permit</td>
<td>Abutting land</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Licence (requiring a resolution)</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis Retail Licence</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The notification delivery area includes the lands subject to the bylaw alteration, permit or approval.
2 When an Early Input Meeting is held, a sign is required.

The above table does not apply if 10 or more parcels owned by 10 or more persons are the subject of the bylaw alteration, permit or approval. In such cases, newspaper notice will be sufficient.
When public notification signs are required:

a. A minimum of two public notification signs must be posted on the area or on a highway adjacent to the area that is the subject of the development proposal. One of the notices to be viewable by traffic in one direction and the other of the notices to be viewable by traffic in the opposite direction.

b. Where an area that is the subject of the bylaw alteration is located near a major arterial, the District may post additional secondary signs viewable from both directions on the arterial to ensure adequate notice of the development proposal.

When required, the public notification sign or signs:

1. Must have a minimum dimension of 1.2 m x 2.4 m when posted on the area or on a highway adjacent to the area that is the subject of the development proposal.

2. Must at a minimum contain the following:
   a. a title containing the words "Development Proposal";
   b. the date, time and location of the public hearing;
   c. the civic address of the parcel that is subject of the proposed development;
   d. a map showing the location of the proposed development;
   e. a brief description of the development in general terms; and
   f. District contact information:

3. Must be substantially the same as the template provided by the Development Planner.

AUTHORITY TO ACT

Delegated to Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Date:</th>
<th>July 10, 2017</th>
<th>Approved by:</th>
<th>Regular Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amendment Date:</td>
<td>October 7, 2019</td>
<td>Approved by:</td>
<td>Regular Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Amendment Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY

It is the policy of the District to:
- encourage applicants for Official Community Plan amendments, Zoning Bylaw amendments, development permits, development variance permits, and liquor license applications to notify the public of development applications and solicit feedback prior to the proposal being considered by Council,
- encourage applicants for Official Community Plan amendments, Zoning Bylaw amendments, and certain development permits to hold one or more public information meetings prior to the proposal being considered by Council,
- provide notice of public information meetings in accordance with this policy, and
- provide Council with an information report prior to the holding of a public information meeting.

REASON FOR POLICY

1. To establish early dialogue with the community and identify specific issues of concern.
2. To expand the opportunities for public consultation.
3. To ensure that factual information is conveyed to the community.
4. To enable staff and Council to gauge public opinion on a particular application.
5. To inform Council of development applications in process.

PROCEDURE

The following table summarizes the recommended public notification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Proposal</th>
<th>Notification Delivery Area</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official Community Plan &amp; Zoning Bylaw Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary application</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>2.No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Meeting</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Development Permit for Commercial, Industrial &amp; Multi-Family Form and Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary application</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>2.No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Meeting</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Permit and Approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Variance Permit</td>
<td>Abutting land</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Licence (requiring a resolution)</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis Retail Licence</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The notification delivery area includes the lands subject to the bylaw alteration, permit or approval.
2 When an Early Input Meeting is held, a sign is required.
The above table does not apply if 10 or more parcels owned by 10 or more persons are the subject of the bylaw alteration, permit or approval. In such cases, newspaper notice will be sufficient.

When public notification signs are required:
   a. A minimum of two public notification signs must be posted on the area or on a highway adjacent to the area that is the subject of the development proposal. One of the notices to be viewable by traffic in one direction and the other of the notices to be viewable by traffic in the opposite direction.
   b. Where an area that is the subject of the bylaw alteration is located near a major arterial, the District may post additional secondary signs viewable from both directions on the arterial to ensure adequate notice of the development proposal.

When required, the public notification sign or signs:
   1. Must have a minimum dimension of 1.2 m x 2.4 m when posted on the area or on a highway adjacent to the area that is the subject of the development proposal.
   2. Must at a minimum contain the following:
      a. a title containing the words “Development Proposal”;
      b. the date, time and location of the public hearing;
      c. the civic address of the parcel that is subject of the proposed development;
      d. a map showing the location of the proposed development;
      e. a brief description of the development in general terms; and
      f. District contact information;
   3. Must be substantially the same as the template provided by the Development Planner.

AUTHORITY TO ACT

Delegated to Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Date:</th>
<th>July 10, 2017</th>
<th>Approved by:</th>
<th>Regular Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amendment Date:</td>
<td>October 7, 2019</td>
<td>Approved by:</td>
<td>Regular Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Amendment Date:</td>
<td>Approved by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COUNCIL

February 9, 2021
File: 16.8310.00/000.000

AUTHOR: Steve Carney, PEng, PTOE

SUBJECT: Lynn Canyon Pay Parking Pilot Bylaw Amendments

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT "District of North Vancouver Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8498, 2021 (Amendment 23)" is given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT "Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8499, 2021 (Amendment 73)" is given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT "Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8500, 2021 (Amendment 60)" is given FIRST, SECOND and THIRD Readings.

REASON FOR REPORT:
To enable DNV Park annual parking pass availability for DNV residents as per January 25, 2021 Council resolution. Timing of bylaw amendment is related to the launch of the Lynn Canyon Pay Parking Pilot Project.

SUMMARY:
DNV residents will be eligible to purchase an annual $10.00 DNV Resident Pay Parking (DRP) Exemption Pass for exemption from Lynn Canyon Pay Parking Pilot hourly fees. In order to enable the collection of fees related to the introduction of a DNV Park parking permit system for DNV residents, amendments to DNV Street and Traffic Bylaw, Fees and Charges Bylaw, and Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw are required. Amended bylaws are attached to this report.

BACKGROUND:
THAT the plan for the Lynn Canyon Park Pay Parking Pilot is approved by Council for implementation as per January 25, 2021 Council resolution.

EXISTING POLICY:
- District of North Vancouver Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8498
- Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8499
ANALYSIS:

Timing/Approval Process:
Endorsement of the proposed bylaw amendments is critical to enabling the availability of DNV Park parking permits for DNV residents for March 2021 as per January 25, 2021 Council resolution.

Concurrence:
DNV parks, DNV Finance, DNV Communications, and DNV Bylaws.

Financial Impacts:
The cost of implementing the DNV Park permitting system ($10.00 annual fee) exempting DNV residents from hourly parking fees is largely expected to be cost-neutral. Any cost overruns associated with administering this permitting system will be offset by Lynn Canyon pay parking pilot revenues.

Conclusion:
Amendments to DNV Street and Traffic Bylaw, Fees and Charges Bylaw, and Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw are required to enable the collection of fees related to the introduction of a DNV Park parking permit system for DNV residents.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Carney, PEng, PTOE
Transportation Section Manager
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8498

A bylaw to amend Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "District of North Vancouver Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8498, 2021 (Amendment 23)".

Amendments

2. Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125, 2004 is amended by:

2.1. adding the following definitions to section 302 in alphabetical order:

DNV Resident Pay Parking (DRP) Exemption Pass means an exemption pass issued in accordance with section 528 of this bylaw;

DNV Resident Pay Parking (DRP) Exemption Zone means an area designated by the Municipal Engineer in accordance with this bylaw as being a resident exempt zone such that the holders of DRP Permits are exempted from paying to park a vehicle in such area for a specified period of time;

Resident Exempt (RE) Permit means an exemption permit issued in accordance with section 528 of this bylaw;

Resident Exempt (RE) Zone means an area designated by the Municipal Engineer in accordance with this bylaw as being a resident exempt zone such that the holders of RE Permits are exempted from the time limits for parking a vehicle in such area;

2.2. deleting the definitions of Resident Parking Permit and Resident Parking Zone in section 302 and substituting the following:

Resident Parking Only (RPO) Permit means a parking permit issued in accordance with this bylaw which authorizes parking in a Resident Parking Only (RPO) Zone;

Resident Parking Only (RPO) Zone means a part of a Highway set apart for the standing, stopping and parking of vehicles that display a Resident Parking Only (RPO) Permit;
2.3. deleting sections 528 through 535 inclusive and substituting the following:

528. The Municipal Engineer may: a) make orders for the designation of Resident Parking Only (RPO) Zones, Resident Exempt (RE) Zones and DNV Resident Pay Parking (DRP) Exemption Zones; b) make orders for the form of applications for RPO Permits, RE Permits, DRP Passes and Resident Guest Passes, the form and terms and conditions of RPO Permits, RE Permits, DRP Passes and Resident Guest Passes and may rescind, revoke, amend and vary such orders.

529A. RPO Permits will only be issued to and may only be used by individuals who permanently reside in the dwelling units immediately adjacent to the RPO Zone in which they reside.

529B. DRP Passes will only be issued to and may only be used by individuals who permanently reside in the District.

530. Upon receipt of a completed application form and payment of the applicable fees as prescribed in the Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, the Municipal Engineer may issue an RPO Permit, RE Permit or DRP Pass, as applicable, to the applicant provided the applicant meets all of the requirements for such permit or pass.

531. The holder of an RPO Permit, RE Permit or DRP Pass:

531.1 shall affix such permit to the lower front driver's side windshield of that person's vehicle; and

531.2 must not use such permit or pass for parking in a zone other than the zone for which the permit or pass was issued.

532. The holder of an RPO Permit, RE Permit or DRP Pass must not transfer or allow the use of that permit or pass by any other person.

533. A person who resides in an RPO and RE Zone that allows for the issuance of a Resident Guest Pass may apply for a Resident Guest Pass for use by that person's guests.

534. A person using a Resident Guest Pass shall display the Resident Guest Pass hanging from the rear view mirror of that person's vehicle at all times while parked in an RPO and RE Zone.

535. A person must not park a vehicle in an RPO Zone:

535.1 that does not display, in the manner required, a valid RPO Permit or Resident Guest Pass for that RPO Zone; or
535.2 which displays a valid RPO Permit but is not a vehicle owned or possessed by the holder of that RPO Permit.

535A. A person must not use an unauthorized, counterfeit, fabricated or imitation permit or pass purporting to be an RPO Permit, RE Permit or DRP Pass.

535B. A person must not park a vehicle in a DRP Zone for longer than the time permitted in that zone.

READ a first time
READ a second time
READ a third time
ADOPTED

Mayor

Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

Municipal Clerk
THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8499

A bylaw to amend Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as “Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 Amendment Bylaw 8499, 2021 (Amendment 73)".

Amendments

2. Schedule F of Fees and Charges Bylaw 6481, 1992 is amended by:

   a) Inserting the text “and Resident Exempt Decal” immediately following “Resident Parking Only Decal”; and,

   b) inserting the following new fee in the table immediately following “Resident Parking Only and Resident Exempt Decal”:

   | DNV Resident Pay Parking Exemption Pass | $10.00 | Per year |

READ a first time

READ a second time

READ a third time

ADOPTED

____________________________________________________________________

Mayor

Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

____________________________________________________________________

Municipal Clerk
THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8500

A bylaw to amend Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8500, 2021 (Amendment 60)."

Amendments

2. Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 is amended by amending the table of Designated Bylaw Contraventions and Penalties in Schedule A in relation to the Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125 by deleting the violations for sections 531 through 535.2 inclusive and substituting the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street and Traffic Bylaw 7125</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bylaw Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
READ a first time

READ a second time

READ a third time

ADOPTED

________________________________________  _________________________________
Mayor                                                                                               Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

______________________________________________
Municipal Clerk
The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COUNCIL

January 28, 2021
File: 08.3060.20/012.19

AUTHOR: Genevieve Lanz, Deputy Municipal Clerk

SUBJECT: Bylaws 8472 and 8476: Standards and Regulations in Single Family Zones

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1404 (Bylaw 8472)” is given SECOND and THIRD Readings;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1405 (Bylaw 8476)” is given SECOND and THIRD Readings.

BACKGROUND:
Bylaws 8472 and 8476 received First Reading on November 23, 2020. A Public Hearing for Bylaws 8472 and 8476 was held and closed on January 26, 2021.

The bylaws are now ready to be considered for Second and Third Readings by Council.

OPTIONS:
1. Give the bylaws Second and Third Readings;
2. Give no further Readings to the bylaws and abandon the bylaws at First Reading; or,  
3. Debate possible amendments to the bylaws at Second Reading and return Bylaws 8472 and 8476 to a new Public Hearing if required.

Respectfully submitted,

Genevieve Lanz
Deputy Municipal Clerk
Attachments:
1. Bylaw 8472
2. Bylaw 8476
4. Staff report dated September 29, 2020

REVIEWED WITH:

- Community Planning
- Development Planning
- Development Engineering
- Utilities
- Engineering Operations
- Parks
- Environment
- Facilities
- Human Resources
- Clerk's Office
- Communications
- Finance
- Fire Services
- ITS
- Solicitor
- GIS
- Real Estate
- Bylaw Services
- Library Board
- NS Health
- RCMP
- NVRC
- Museum & Arch.
- Other:

External Agencies:
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8472

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

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1404 (Bylaw 8472)”. 

Amendments

2. District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965 is amended by deleting Section 409(3) and replacing with:

“(3) Retaining walls may be constructed within the required setback area of a lot when the wall or walls do not extend above a line commencing 3.0 feet above the lesser of natural grade and finished grade at the outer face of the outermost wall and subsequent walls do not extend above a line 8.0 feet above the lesser of natural grade and finished grade and projected upward and inward on the lot at an angle of 35° as illustrated by the following diagram:

![Diagram showing retaining wall construction guidelines]
READ a first time November 23rd, 2020

PUBLIC HEARING held January 26th, 2021

READ a second time

READ a third time

Certified a true copy of “Bylaw 8472” as at Third Reading

__________________________
Municipal Clerk

APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure on

ADOPTED

__________________________     ____________________________
Mayor                                     Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

__________________________
Municipal Clerk
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8476

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

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1405 (Bylaw 8476)”.

Amendments

2. District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965 is amended by deleting the interpretation of “height” in Part 2 and replacing with:

   “height” means:

   (i) with respect to a building or structure in a single family residential zone the greatest vertical distance measured from the building height base line to the topmost part of the building or structure, except that in the case of an accessory building or structure it shall be the vertical distance measured from the floor level to the highest point of the building or structure except in no case shall the floor level of the structure be more than 4 feet above natural grade at any point.”

READ a first time November 23rd, 2020

PUBLIC HEARING held January 26th, 2021

READ a second time

READ a third time

Certified a true copy of “Bylaw 8472” as at Third Reading

______________________________
Municipal Clerk
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure on

ADOPTED

__________________________  ____________________________
Mayor                                      Municipal Clerk

Certified a true copy

__________________________
Municipal Clerk
DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
PUBLIC HEARING

Standards and Regulations in Single Family Zones
Zoning Bylaw Amendments

REPORT of the Public Hearing held on Tuesday, January 26, 2021 commencing at 7:04 p.m. The meeting was held virtually with participants appearing via video and telephone conference.

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

Staff:
Mr. B. Dwyer, Assistant General Manager – Regulatory Review and Compliance
Mr. J. Gordon, Manager – Administrative Services
Ms. G. Lanz, Deputy Municipal Clerk
Ms. S. Dale, Confidential Council Clerk
Ms. C. Archer, Clerk Typist 3
Ms. S. Clarke, Clerk Typist 3
Ms. S. Ferguson, Customer Service Representative

1. OPENING BY THE MAYOR

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

He further noted that this Public Hearing is being convened pursuant to Section 464 of the Local Government Act and Ministerial Order M192.

This hearing will be held virtually with all participants, including Council, staff, applicant, signed up speakers and observers all doing so by electronic means.

Public participation in this hearing is being accommodated by speakers having signed up in advance, as stated in the Notice of Hearing, as well as being streamed live over the internet. In addition, those observing over the internet who did not sign up in advance to speak but decide to do so once the hearing is underway, may dial-in via telephone to speak. Information on how to do this will be shared over the live stream once we have exhausted the speakers list of first time speakers.

The electronic means being employed for this hearing allow for effective two-way audio communications while those who have signed up in advance will also receive video of the hearing via the Zoom software.
As always, written submissions will be received by the Municipal Clerk, on behalf of, and shared with, Council, at any time up to the time the hearing is closed. These may be submitted to input@dnv.org

Therefore, in this manner, all persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by the proposed bylaws will be afforded a reasonable opportunity to be heard and to present written submissions.

Mayor Little stated that:

- We will first go through the established speakers list. At the end of the speakers list, the Chair may call for any other speakers not on the speakers list – these are the dial-in speakers if any;
- You will have 5 minutes to address Council for a first time. Begin your remarks to Council by stating your name and approximate street address;
- After everyone who wishes to speak has spoken once, speakers will then be allowed one additional five minute opportunity;
- Any additional presentations will only be allowed at the discretion of the Chair;
- Please do not repeat information from your previous presentations and ensure your comments remain focused on the bylaws under consideration this evening;
- If you have provided a written submission there is no need to read it as it will have already been seen by Council. You may summarize or briefly reiterate the highlights of your submission but ensure your comments pertain to the bylaws under consideration at this hearing;
- Council is here to listen to the public, not to debate the merits of the bylaws. Council may ask clarifying questions;
- The Clerk has a binder containing documents and submissions related to the bylaws which Council has received and which you are welcome to review. This is available online at DNV.org/agenda;
- Everyone at the hearing will be provided an opportunity to speak. If necessary, we will continue the hearing on a second night;
- At the conclusion of the public input Council may request further information from staff which may or may not require an extension of the hearing; or, Council may close the hearing after which Council should not receive further new information from the public; and,
- This hearing is being streamed live over the internet and recorded in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

### 2. INTRODUCTION OF BYLAWS BY CLERK

Ms. Genevieve Lanz, Deputy Municipal Clerk, introduced the proposed bylaws, stating that Bylaw 8472 proposes to amend the District’s Zoning Bylaw to change how retaining wall heights are measured. She further stated that Bylaw 8476 proposes to amend the District’s Zoning Bylaw to change how the height of detached accessory buildings, including garages, are measured.

### 3. PRESENTATION BY STAFF

Mr. Brett Dwyer, Assistant General Manager – Regulatory Review and Compliance, provided an overview of the proposal elaborating on the introduction by the Deputy Municipal Clerk. Mr. Dwyer advised that:
Bylaw 8472, if adopted, would change the way retaining walls are regulated under the siting exceptions section in the District's Zoning Bylaw.

The Zoning Bylaw currently limits retaining walls in required setbacks as follows:

- The first wall is limited to a maximum height of 4';
- Any subsequent retaining wall must be contained within a height envelope of 45 degrees projected from the top of the first retaining wall; and,
- There is no height limit on subsequent retaining walls provided they are contained within the 45 degree height envelope;

If adopted, the revision to the retaining wall siting exception regulation would be as follows:

- The first wall is limited to a maximum height of 3';
- Subsequent retaining walls must be contained within a height envelope of 35 degrees projected from the top of the first retaining wall; and,
- Subsequent retaining walls are limited in height to 8';

This may result in more requests for variances, particularly on steep cross-sloping lots;

Bylaw 8476, if adopted, would change the way the height of detached accessory buildings, including detached garages, is regulated in the District's Zoning Bylaw;

The Zoning bylaw currently does not limit the floor height of detached accessory buildings including garages and this can result in very high foundation wall heights on steeply sloping sites;

If adopted, the revision to the heights of detached accessory structures and buildings would be as follows:

- The floor height of accessory buildings could be no more than 4' from natural grade and this may result in more requests for variances, particularly on steeply sloping sites;

Staff have carried out both the standard statutory public notification procedures for a public hearing and additional public outreach;

Staff completed outreach by requesting input via a letter, from design professionals (five companies who work in the District);

Staff sent a letter with information to community associations which also informed them of the public hearing should they, as a community association or as individual members, want to provide input;

Staff also created a news article with link available on the home page of the District’s website;

Any public input received has been included in the public input section on District’s web page containing information about the public hearing. Responses received outlined the following concerns:

- Results in more variance applications;
- Additional stress/cost/time on developers and owners of steep sites;
- Retaining wall change impedes usability of site-substandard yard space and space between walls is unusable;
- Retaining wall reduced height plane may be challenging to achieve in side yards;
- Considering the unchanged definitions of maximum eave height and lower floor net area calculations this proposal is counterproductive when considering an intent of reducing visible building bulk;
- Accessory building change causes issues with negative drainage: increasing the potential chances of water damage and drainage issues. By creating
bylaws that force buildings into the ground with negative slopes, you are
increasing maintenance requirements and potential problems;

- Increases the concrete requirement towards the front and side of the
accessory building, and for concrete requirement for the retaining walls
leading up to the garage doors as it causes issues with cost and access. By
installing the concrete retaining walls, the turning circle access to the garage
door is significantly affected especially rear lane access only. An additional
consideration is that to maintain that concrete curb, excavation for a footing
will have to be completed which is not allowed to encroach into the rear lane
(public property) further complicating the process;

- Can negatively impact neighbor relationships through DVP/BOV process
- Support was due to safety and esthetics;

- The bylaws are not retroactive and should the bylaws be adopted by Council any
retaining wall or accessory structure legally existing at the time of bylaw adoption
would be grandfathered under the non-conforming provisions contained in the Local
Government Act (section 529);

- These provisions allow such structures to be maintained, repaired, extended or
altered provided there is no further contravention of the new bylaw;
- Regarding existing permits and approvals, any permit issued, under review or
submitted before the date of bylaw adoption would be subject to review and
compliance with the existing regulations; and,

- The new regulations would only apply to applications submitted after the date of
adoption of the new bylaws.

4. REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

4.1. Mr. Peter Teevan, 1900 Block Indian River Crescent:
- Spoke to the complexity of building a new home;
- Spoke to the lengthy process of obtaining a building permit and its associated
costs; and,
- Suggested creating a committee to expedite and delegate the issuance of
development variances permits that don’t comply with the bylaw without
having to come forward to Council.

4.2. Mr. Corrie Kost, 2800 Block Colwood Drive:
- Spoke in opposition to reducing the height of retaining walls on property lines
from 4 ft. to 3 ft.;
- Spoke in opposition to reducing the slope of retaining walls from 45 degrees
to 35 degrees; and,
- Questioned how many lots would be effected in the District of North
Vancouver.

4.3. Mr. Peter Teevan, SPEAKING A SECOND TIME:
- Commented that the information presented is technical;
- Questioned how the heights in this regulation match up with the heights of
coach houses;
- Expressed concern with water management and flooding, and,
- Spoke to the issue of non-conforming retaining walls.
In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the proposed amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to change how retaining walls are measured apply to front, back and side yard setbacks.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that properties with challenging topography may have difficulty meeting regulations.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that an outreach was completed by requesting input via a letter, from design professionals and five companies who work in the District were contacted.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that a Public Hearing is a statutory process that allow residents to provide their views on the proposed amendment to the Zoning Bylaw and Council cannot debate the merits of the bylaw until second and third readings.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that approximately ten retaining wall permits were issued in 2020.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the Local Government Act prohibits the delegation of development variance permits because a notification process is required. It was further noted that there are two methods to seek a variance to a Zoning Bylaw:

- Council can approve a development variance permit; or,
- The Board of Variance committee can order a minor variance to address a hardship related to siting, size or dimensions of a building or structure.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that there is no current regulation related to exposed foundation wall face between floor elevation and grade resulting from a sloping lot.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that at the time a new land use regulation bylaw is adopted, if an existing use of land or a building is lawfully used and it does not conform to the bylaw, then it may be continued as legally non-conforming. In most cases, legally non-conforming use cannot be expanded however it can be maintained under certain circumstances. If the use and density of an existing building conforms to a new land use regulation bylaw, but the building's siting, size or dimensions do not, the building may be maintained, extended or altered as long as it does not result in further contravention of the bylaw.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the Wedge House and property on Skyline Drive are situated on challenging sites.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that previous Council's have generally been supportive of issuing development variance permits for retaining wall structures.

In response to a question from Council with regards to water management, staff advised that water would not be attracted from the road and a trench or a cut-off drain can be used.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the majority of accessory buildings that are not parking structures are generally at grade.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the proposed regulation on retaining walls would not apply to coach houses.
In response to a question from Council, staff advised that the Zoning Bylaw restrict building size, coverage, setbacks, building depth, and upper floor area.

Council expressed concerns regarding the loss of green space and permeable surface area.

In response to a question from Council, staff advised that applications would be considered on a case-by-case basis and would consider the specific proposal and site against relevant District regulations.

4.4. Mr. Mitchell Baker, 600 Block Mt. Seymour Drive:
   • Expressed concern that very few properties are impacted by the proposed bylaw and questioned if this is necessary;
   • Opined that not enough detail was provided in the proposed bylaw;
   • Commented on the importance of educating residents; and,
   • Suggested that more research needs to be done.

4.5. Mr. Corrie Kost, SPEAKING A SECOND TIME:
   • Questioned if minor repairs require applying for a building permit; and,
   • Suggested any unintended consequences be identified and addressed prior to adoption.

Staff clarified that minor repairs do not require building permits.

4.6. Mr. Peter Teevan, SPEAKING A THIRD TIME:
   • Commented that new single-family dwelling and retaining walls are expensive and are not affordable housing options; and,
   • Encouraged Council to listen to the public's concerns.

5. COUNCIL RESOLUTION

MOVED by Councillor MURI
SECONDED by Councillor BACK
THAT the January 26, 2021 Public Hearing is closed;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1404 (Bylaw 8472)” be returned to Council for further consideration;

AND THAT “District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1405 (Bylaw 8476)” be returned to Council for further consideration.

CARRIED
(8:21 p.m.)

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

Confidential Council Clerk
The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COUNCIL

November 10, 2020
File: 13.6700.20/000.000

AUTHOR: Brett Dwyer, Assistant General Manager Regulatory Review and Compliance

SUBJECT: Standards and Regulations in Single Family Zones

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1404 (Bylaw 8472)" is given FIRST Reading;

THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1405 (Bylaw 8476)" is given FIRST Reading;

THAT "District of North Vancouver Nuisance Abatement Bylaw 7325, 2002 Amendment Bylaw 8473, 2020 (Amendment 5)" is given FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD Reading;

THAT "District of North Vancouver Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8474, 2020 (Amendment 56)" is given FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD Reading;

THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1404 (Bylaw 8472)" be referred to a Public Hearing;

AND THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1405 (Bylaw 8476)" be referred to a Public Hearing.

REASON FOR REPORT:
Council has directed staff to bring forward options for changes to District bylaws, policies and regulations to address areas of concern with current single family residential standards and regulations. Staff are now bringing forward recommended bylaw amendments in response to that direction together with requested additional information.
BACKGROUND:
At the September 16th, 2019, Council Workshop, Council provided direction to staff to explore options for changes to District bylaws, policies and regulations to address concerns and/or issues raised with regards to the following single family residential standards and regulation “target” areas:
1. retaining structures;
2. height of accessory structures (particularly detached garages);
3. nuisance noise;
4. nuisance lighting; and
5. landscape retention and hard surfaces.

At a Council workshop on November 19th, 2019 staff presented options for Council’s consideration. Council indicated support for some of the options presented and requested information on two additional areas of interests; single family basement floor space exemptions and maximum house sizes.

Background on Single Family Zones in the District:
The District’s five single family (RS1–RS5) and 14 neighbourhood zones were created over many years through robust community engagement. This process sought a balance between individual property owners’ rights and broad community interests.

Previous Council Workshops on Single Family Home Renewal:
A chronology of previous Council Workshops on single family home renewal is provided as an attachment to this report (Attachment A).

ANALYSIS:
For each of the target single family residential standards and regulation areas, staff completed the following research: review of the District’s current approach, the legislative authority to regulate, and a municipal scan of other jurisdictions’ approaches to regulating these areas. This information was presented in the Report to Committee dated November 6th, 2019 (Attachment B).

During the November 19th, 2019 Council Workshop, Council expressed interest in some of the options presented by staff. Staff then created recommendations for each target area based on input received from Council and further research completed by staff. In addition, staff completed a municipal scan comparing how the District regulates basement floor space exemptions and maximum house sizes to other municipalities which is included in Attachments G and H.

This report presents the following information and proposed bylaw amendments broken down into each of the five target areas plus the two additional areas of interest; basement floor space exemptions and maximum house sizes. The proposed bylaw amendments and additional information on basement floor space exemptions and maximum house sizes are found in Attachments to this report.

• An amendment to the District’s Zoning Bylaw to change to how retaining structures are regulated (Bylaw 1404, Attachment C)
• An amendment to the District’s Zoning Bylaw to change how accessory structures (including garages) are regulated (Bylaw 1405, Attachment D).
• An amendment to the District’s Nuisance Abatement Bylaw to change how nuisance lighting is regulated (Bylaw 8473, Attachment E).
• An amendment to the District’s Notice Enforcement Bylaw for the purpose of creating new fines to do with regulating nuisance lighting (Bylaw 8474, Attachment F).
• Information on the current steps staff are carrying out to address nuisance noise.
• Information on how the District currently regulates floor space exemptions for basements (Attachment H) and maximum house sizes in comparison to other municipalities (Attachment G).

Target Area 1- Retaining Walls

The District currently regulates the siting and height of retaining walls through the Zoning Bylaw, in the following manner:

Section 409 Siting Exceptions

(3) Retaining Walls
Retaining walls may be constructed within the required setback area of a lot when the wall or walls do not extend above a line commencing 4.0 feet above the lesser of natural grade and finished grade at the outer face of the outermost wall and projected upward and inward on the lot at an angle of 45°…

This regulation allows the first retaining wall to be a maximum of 4 ft. in height with subsequent retaining walls to be contained within a height plane of 35° as illustrated below.

Current retaining wall regulation (4’ and 45 degree height plane)
Although the District’s Zoning Bylaw currently regulates the angle and height of retaining walls, it does not have a maximum height for a secondary or subsequent retaining wall above finished grade. For example, if a secondary retaining wall is set back 4 ft., the wall can be 4 ft. in height, if it is setback 8 ft., it can be 8 ft. in height, and so on. The District’s current regulation establishes height from the lesser of natural or finished grade which prevents artificially raising the grade.

Council expressed interest in “Option 1” as presented in the November 6th, 2019 Report to Committee (Attachment B). This option proposes to amend the Zoning Bylaw to limit the first retaining wall in a series of retaining walls to 3 ft. in height and subsequent retaining walls to be contained within a height plane of 35° and to a maximum height of 8 ft., in all required setbacks as illustrated below.

Proposed retaining wall regulation (3’ and 35 degree height plane)

Staff have prepared a proposed amendment to the Zoning Bylaw which reflects the above direction from Council - “Option 1”. This proposed regulation would result in a lower first retaining wall and lower secondary retaining walls setback further from the property lines. The proposed amendment is provided in Attachment C in this report (Bylaw 1404).

Target Area 2- Height of Detached Accessory Buildings (including garages)

The District regulates how the height of accessory buildings and structures are measured through the Zoning Bylaw in the following manner:
"height" means:

(i) With respect to a building or structure in a single family residential zone...in the case of an accessory building or structure it shall be the vertical distance measured from the floor level to the highest point of the building or structure;

This height measurement is used for both detached and attached garages and accessory structures. The District uses top of slab as the floor elevation which is the finished grade at vehicular access. This means that height for accessory buildings is measured from the floor or slab surface regardless of natural or pre-existing grades.

There is no current regulation related to exposed foundation wall face between floor elevation and grade resulting from a sloping lot.

Current regulation on natural grade (no height limit to foundation wall)

Council expressed interest in “Option 1” as presented in the November 6th, 2019 Report to Committee (Attachment B). This option amends the Zoning Bylaw to require detached parking structures and other accessory buildings and structures be measured from the floor level to the highest point of the building or structure, but in no case shall the floor level of the structure be more than 4 ft. above natural grade at any point.
Proposed regulation (4’ maximum foundation wall height)

In establishing a maximum height of 4 ft. above natural grade for the floor level of accessory buildings this may force these type of structures to be recessed into the ground on sloping sites. As indicated by staff at the previous workshop, this will create an increase in the number of variances that Council and the Board of Variance will see for parking structures, as on steeply sloping lots compliance may be challenging due to limitations of driveway grades.

Staff have prepared a proposed amendment to the Zoning Bylaw which reflects the above direction from Council - "Option 1". The proposed amendment is provided in Attachment D in this report (Bylaw 1405).

Target Area 3- Nuisance Lighting

The following general application regulations in the District’s Nuisance Abatement Bylaw apply to regulate nuisance lighting:

“Light Source” means a light bulb, light tube or floodlight lamp;

“Outdoor Light” means any Light Source that is not fully enclosed in a building or structure;

“Shade” means a non-transparent light shade that does not form part of a Light Source;

Prohibitions
6. d) No person shall allow an Outdoor Light to be placed or lit on a parcel such that the Light Source is visible from a different parcel in a Residential Zone;
Requirements

8. Without limiting the generality of section 7, every person who is the owner or occupier of Real Property or their agent shall

e) ensure that an Outdoor Light on the Property is shielded by a Shade or fixture such that the Light Source is not visible from another parcel located in a Residential Zone.

9. The prohibitions in section 6(e) and the requirement in section 8(e) do not apply to the following:

   a) Christmas or holiday lights between November 15 and January 15;

In the November 6th, 2019 Report to Committee (Attachment B), staff described the enforcement challenges with responding to some nuisance complaints of lighting, that municipal regulation is of general application and such regulations must be easily understood and applied. A lighting professional was contracted to help with understanding the issues and in developing options for consideration.

Council expressed interest in “Options 2 and 3” as presented in the November 6th, 2019 Report to Committee (Attachment B). These options amend the Nuisance Abatement Bylaw to limit the hours seasonal/holiday display lighting may be illuminated and for staff to research more options. Seasonal or landscape lighting is generally permitted in other municipalities as this personalized lighting is challenging to regulate with diverse landscaping, personal preferences, family schedules, etc.

Following Council’s preferred option, staff have prepared a proposed amendment to the Nuisance Abatement Bylaw and Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw, which reflects the above direction of “Option 2”. The proposed amendments adds that in addition to Christmas or holiday lights, Halloween lights are restricted to the number of days they may be displayed, and that both must be turned off nightly by 11:00PM. Christmas or holiday lights are currently restricted to November 15-January 15, and it is proposed that Halloween lights be displayed between October 15 to November 7. In addition to these proposed changes, general housekeeping revisions to the Nuisance Abatement Bylaw are included. The proposed amendments are in Attachment E and Attachment F in this report.

Target Area 4- Nuisance Noise

The District currently regulates single family residential outdoor mechanical equipment with the Noise Regulation Bylaw in the following manner:

Objectionable Noises or Sounds

5. Without limiting the generality of section 3, the following noises or sounds are believed by the Council to be objectionable or liable to disturb the quiet, peace, rest, enjoyment, comfort or convenience of individuals or the public and are prohibited:
(b) any of the following noises or sounds during the Night, where such noise or sound is audible from Premises other than the Premises from which the noise or sound originates:
   (iii) noise or sound from mechanical equipment, including heat pumps, ventilation equipment, air conditioning systems, vents or pool or hot tub pumps, compactors or other ancillary equipment or vehicles;

(f) any noise that exceeds the Sound Levels set out below:
   (i) any Continuous Sound that exceeds the following Sound Levels at the Point of Reception:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. in a Quiet Zone during the Day 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. in a Quiet Zone during the Night 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bylaw staff enforce these sound levels generally in response to complaints with the use of sound meters. These provisions are generally not enforced in emergency situations such as during power outages for the operation of equipment such as backup generators.

Staff are currently working with an acoustic consultant to review the District's Noise Regulation Bylaw and present other strategies to minimise and/or address noise issues moving forward. The acoustic consultant has worked with our Noise Regulation Bylaw previously and upon first review they consider the bylaw to be a very sound and well-constructed bylaw. Additional review is being undertaken to compare our bylaw with current industry standards and best practices in acoustical regulation. Should the consultants recommend any revisions to improve the efficacy of the bylaw this will be brought forward to a future Regular Council meeting for consideration of possible amendments.

Additional work that is being undertaken with the acoustic consultant is to develop guidelines and instructional material that will be made available to residents and contractors to assist in understanding the noise related issues with varied mechanical equipment such as backup generators and heat pumps. Material produced will be both proactive in nature to assist prior to installation as well as providing options to reduce noise after installation. Staff will also be engaging the services of the acoustic consultant to provide appropriate refresher training on the taking of noise readings to ensure staff are being consistent and accurate in taking such readings.

**Target Area 5- Landscape Retention and Reduction of Hard Surfaces**

The District is currently completing an Integrated Stormwater Management Plan (ISMP) with the primary goal of improving watershed health. Mitigating the impacts of stormwater runoff from single family residential lots will have an important role in helping to achieve the goals of the ISMP.

It is anticipated that the ISMP will be brought forward to Council for consideration early in 2021. Staff believe that this work will inform an appropriate response to regulation regarding the amount of hardscaping and landscaping on single family lots. This will
ensure any regulation introduced will be based on scientific study and community feedback.

CONCURRENCE:
This report was reviewed with the District Bylaw Enforcement Department, Building Department, and Development Planning Department.

The District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1404 (Bylaw 8472) and The District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1405 (Bylaw 8476) affects land within 800m of a controlled access intersection and therefore approval by the Provincial Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure will be required to approve the bylaw.

CONCLUSION:
This report presented bylaw amendments and presented further information to address the five target areas identified at the September 16, 2019 Council Workshop and two additional areas of interest.

OPTIONS:

1. Give Bylaws 8472 and 8476 First Reading, give Bylaws 8473 and 8474 First, Second and Third Reading, and refer Bylaws 8472 and 8476 to a Public Hearing (staff recommendation);

2. Give a select number bylaws the readings listed in option 1.

3. Provide alternate direction to staff.

Respectfully submitted,

Brett Dwyer
Assistant General Manager Regulatory Review and Compliance

Attachment A: Chronology of previous Council Workshops on single family home renewal
Attachment B: Report to Committee dated November 6th, 2019
Attachment C: District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1404 (Bylaw 8472)
Attachment D: District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1405 (Bylaw 8476)
Attachment E: District of North Vancouver Nuisance Abatement Bylaw 7325, 2002, Amendment Bylaw 8473 (Amendment 5)
Attachment F: District of North Vancouver Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004, Amendment Bylaw 8474 (Amendment 56)
Attachment G: Information on floor space exemptions for basements
Attachment H: Information on maximum house sizes
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**REVIEWED WITH:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Planning</th>
<th>Development Planning</th>
<th>Clerk's Office</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Fire Services</th>
<th>ITS</th>
<th>Solicitor</th>
<th>GIS</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
<th>Bylaw Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Agencies:**

- ☐ Library Board
- ☐ NS Health
- ☐ RCMP
- ☐ NVRC
- ☐ Museum & Arch.
- ☐ Other:

Document: 4530048
Attachment A: Chronology of Previous Workshops

November 19, 2019 – Staff presented research on Standards and Regulations in Single Family Zones, in four key research areas: nuisance lighting; nuisance noise; retaining structures; and grade for accessory buildings/garages. The fifth topic area, Landscape retention and hard surfaces, was deferred to a future Workshop.

September 16, 2019 – Council discussed Standards and Regulations in Single Family Zones, directing staff to research five key areas: nuisance lighting; nuisance noise; landscape retention and hard surfaces; retaining structures; and grade for accessory buildings/garages.
Video: http://app.dnv.org/council/default.aspx?filename=20190916CR&type=MP4&start=0&end=10042

July 8, 2019 – Council discussed three areas of interest: nuisance noise; nuisance lighting; size, density, form and character of single family homes. Other topics were deferred to a planned future Workshop in the fall of 2019.

March 19, 2018 - Council discussed options to address four priority issues related to single family home renewal including improving enforcement, erosion and sediment control, preserving landscaping, and regulating the size, form and character of homes.
Video: http://app.dnv.org/council/default.aspx?filename=20180319cr&type=MP4&start=0000&end=6716

September 18, 2017 - Staff presented the results from a survey of Councillors to help prioritize issues related to single family home renewal in order to further define the issues and expand measures to mitigate impacts to the community.
March 6, 2017 - Staff provided an update on District initiatives and received direction from Council to prepare a list of issues to help prioritize future efforts.


June 21, 2016 - Staff presented the results of a public survey on issues and potential solutions related to single family home renewal.


October 5, 2015 - Staff provided a report to Council which summarizes key issues related to single family home renewal as well as policies and tools the District uses to manage these issues, and suggested actions to further mitigate negative impacts to residents.

The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COMMITTEE

November 6, 2019
File: 13.6700.20/000.000

AUTHOR: Brett Dwyer, Assistant General Manager Regulatory Review and Compliance

SUBJECT: Standards and Regulations in Single Family Zones

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the report entitled "Standards and Regulations in Single Family Zones" dated November 6, 2019 be received for information;

THAT the proposed options for changes to the single family standards and regulations be considered by Council; and

THAT Council provides direction to staff regarding preferred options.

REASON FOR REPORT:

At the September 16th, 2019, Council Workshop, the Council Committee provided direction to staff to explore options for making changes to District bylaws, policies and regulations to address concerns and/or issues raised with regards to the following single family residential standards and regulation areas:
1. retaining structures;
2. height of accessory structures (particularly detached garages);
3. nuisance noise;
4. nuisance lighting; and
5. landscape retention and hard surfaces.

This report provides options for Council’s consideration in each target area, as outlined under options for consideration within each section. Council may determine to provide alternate direction to staff, other than the options provided.
BACKGROUND:

Background on Single Family Zones in the District:
The District's five single family (RS1-RS5) and 14 neighbourhood zones were created over many years through robust community engagement. This process sought a balance between individual property owners' rights and broad community interests.

Previous Council Workshops on Single Family Home Renewal:
A chronology of previous Council Workshops on single family home renewal is provided as an attachment to this report (Attachment A).

ANALYSIS:

For each of the five target single family residential standards and regulation areas, staff completed the following research: review of the District's current approach, the legislative authority to regulate, and a municipal scan of other jurisdictions' approaches to regulating these areas. Staff have provided options for Council's consideration in the five identified areas.

Background research and supplementary information is included for each target area (Attachments B-F).

Target Area 1- RETAINING STRUCTURES

Issue Identification:

Council has identified retaining structures on single family residential lots to potentially cause negative impacts to neighbouring properties and residential streetscapes. Retaining walls, when too high, can cause concerns regarding overshadowing, single family neighbourhood aesthetic quality and character, and sightlines.

It is noted that the District has the authority to regulate siting and height of retaining walls. The District may not regulate retaining wall materials or method of construction beyond that prescribed in the BC Building Code. However, these matters may be regulated by the BC Building Code, enforced through the Construction Bylaw.

Municipal Comparison:

Retaining wall regulations in Metro Vancouver municipalities with similar topography to the District were surveyed by staff.

The results ranged from having no regulation other than the BC Building Code (to address structural integrity only), to a range of permutations in terms of height envelope angles and resulting heights permitted. Final permitted heights depend on factors such as zoning, location on a lot, whether the wall is shared between residential property lines, what grade the measurement is taken from, etc. Heights range from 2 ft. to approximately
11.8 ft. Retaining walls typically require a registered professional and a municipal building permit.

Further details on research can be found in Appendix B.

Current Approach:

The District regulates the siting and height of retaining walls through the Zoning Bylaw, in the following manner:

Section 409 Siting Exceptions

(3) Retaining Walls
Retaining walls may be constructed within the required setback area of a lot when the wall or walls do not extend above a line commencing 4.0 feet above the lesser of natural grade and finished grade at the outer face of the outermost wall and projected upward and inward on the lot at an angle of 45°...

Current

It is worth noting that the District's regulation establishes height from the lesser of natural or finished grade. This is beneficial in terms of managing impacts as it does not enable artificially raising the grade. Although the District's Zoning Bylaw currently regulates the angle and height of retaining walls, it does not have a maximum exposed height above finished grade. For example, if a secondary retaining wall is set back 4 ft., the wall can be 4 ft. in height, if it is setback 8 ft., it can be 8 ft. in height, and so on.

Options for Consideration:

These options are stand-alone options for amendments to the District's Zoning Bylaw.
1) Amend the District's Zoning Bylaw to limit a retaining wall or the first retaining wall in a series of retaining walls to 3 ft. in height and subsequent retaining walls be limited by a height plane of 35° to a maximum height of 8 ft., in all setbacks.

2) Amend the District's Zoning Bylaw to limit a retaining wall or the first retaining wall in a series of retaining walls to 3 ft. in height and subsequent retaining walls be limited by a height plane of 35° to a maximum height of 8 ft., in front and flanking required setbacks. For side and rear required setbacks, the existing retaining wall regulation would still apply with no wall having a maximum exposed height greater than 8 ft.
Comparison of Options:
These options would include amendments to the District’s Zoning Bylaw and potentially the Construction Bylaw. Zoning Bylaw and Construction Bylaw changes would only apply to new retaining walls and would not retroactively apply to residential properties.

It is noted that existing permitted retaining structures that did not comply with the new regulation would benefit from legal non-conforming status.

Both options reduce visual impact of large wall faces from the front of a property by limiting exposed retaining wall height to 8 ft. In both options, properties with challenging topography may have difficulty meeting regulations, in particular, steeply sloped lots or narrow cross-sloping lots. This challenge may result in an increase of Zoning Bylaw variance applications either to the Board of Variance or Development Variance Permits to Council.

Option 1: (all required setbacks 3 ft. for first wall, 35\(^\circ\) angle and 8 ft. subsequent max wall height)
- Lots with a significant slope that require retaining walls in the side yards may have difficulty meeting new regulation.
- Buildable area may be reduced more than option 2, for those lots with challenging topography.
- Sloping lots would not be able to achieve the same amount of level yard space.

Option 2: (front and flanking required setbacks same as option 1, in side and rear required setbacks 4 ft. for first wall, 45\(^\circ\) angle and 8 ft. subsequent max wall height)
- Does less to reduce visual impact for neighbours sharing side or rear property lines than option 1 while still introducing a maximum 8 ft. exposed height.
- Potentially less impact to buildable area than option 1, for those lots with challenging topography.
- Potentially less variances than option 1.
Target Area 2- HEIGHT OF DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS (INCLUDING GARAGES)

Issue Identification:

Council has identified that height measurement of detached accessory buildings (including garages) on single family residential lots with sloping topography may result in large lengths of exposed foundation wall between floor or slab elevation and grade. This may cause negative visual impacts to neighbouring and nearby properties. Detached garages having large amounts of exposed foundation walls have been cited to be inappropriate to neighbourhood aesthetic quality and character.

Municipal Comparison:

Accessory structure height regulations in Metro Vancouver municipalities with similar topography to the District were surveyed by staff.

The results ranged from accessory buildings and structures being limited to one storey, measured from finished grade or in the case of detached garages, measured from finished grade at vehicular access. Although some variation was found, detached garages are mostly measured from finished grade at vehicular access. This is the same as the District’s current regulation.

Further details on research can be found in Appendix C.

Current Approach:

The District regulates how the height of accessory buildings and structures are measured through the Zoning Bylaw in the following manner:

Part 2 Interpretation

“height” means:

(i) With respect to a building or structure in a single family residential zone...in the case of an accessory building or structure it shall be the vertical distance measured from the floor level to the highest point of the building or structure;
This height measurement is used for both detached and attached garages and accessory structures. The District uses top of slab as the floor elevation which is the finished grade at vehicular access. This means that height for accessory buildings is measured from the floor or slab surface regardless of natural or pre-existing grades.

There is no current regulation related to exposed foundation wall face between floor elevation and grade resulting from a sloping lot.

Options for Consideration:

These options are stand-alone options for amendments to the District’s Zoning Bylaw.

1) Amend the District’s Zoning Bylaw to require that detached parking structures and other accessory buildings and structures be measured from the floor level to the highest point of the building or structure, but in no case shall the floor level of the structure be more than 4 ft. above natural grade at any point.
2) Amend the District's Zoning Bylaw to require that detached parking structures and other accessory buildings and structures be measured from the floor level to the highest point of the building or structure, but in no case shall the floor level of the structure be more than 6 ft. above natural grade at any point.
Comparison of Options:

These options would require amendment to the District's Zoning Bylaw. Zoning Bylaw changes would only apply to new detached parking and accessory buildings and structures and would not retroactively apply to permitted structures that do not comply with new regulations.

It is noted that existing detached accessory buildings and structures that did not comply with the new regulation would benefit from legal non-conforming status.

New regulation may increase the difficulty in constructing accessory buildings and structures on sloping lots as the buildings will be 'pushed' into the ground to avoid exposed foundation walls. The proposed change may present challenges for lots which are down-sloping and provide vehicular access from a lane or street. This is due to the Development Servicing Bylaw maximum driveway grade. This could result in additional Board of Variance applications or Development Variance Permit applications to Council.

In steeply cross-sloping lots, pushing the structure into the ground may result in the need for more retaining walls; however, these would be 'down' retaining walls rather than 'up' retaining walls meaning visual impacts would be limited.

Option 1: (no greater than 4 ft. exposed foundation wall)
   - Will be easier for lots with minimal grade changes to comply than those with steep slopes.
   - Provides for better interface with neighbouring properties.

Option 2: (no greater than 6 ft. exposed foundation wall)
   - Allows more flexibility than option 1.
   - Will likely cause less need for variances than option 1.
   - Does less to reduce visual impact for neighbours than option 1 while still creating a modest maximum where one currently does not exist.
Target Area 3- NUISANCE LIGHTING

Issue Identification:

Council has expressed concern regarding the placement and intensity of outdoor lighting in single family residential areas particularly in relation to new construction of single family homes. This nuisance light may negatively impact residents’ quality of life and may have other negative impacts such as to wildlife, dark sky and increased energy consumption.

In the last five years (including 2019 thus far), 21 single family lighting complaints have been received by the Bylaw Department. These complaints each represent an individual property where a complaint about lighting was made. It is noted that multiple complaints may have been received in relation to an individual lighting complaint. Where a subsequent complaint differed in nature, for example, different lights were being complained about, this counted as a separate complaint. This results in an average of approximately four per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lighting Complaints</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recessed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood/Spot/Motion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouped/Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Municipal Comparison:

Residential outdoor lighting regulations in Metro Vancouver municipalities were surveyed by staff.

Five Metro Vancouver municipalities have regulation related to outdoor nuisance lighting. Regulations include requiring outdoor lights to be shielded by a shade or fixture and prevention of direct shining into living or sleeping areas of adjacent residential properties. Allowances for holiday lighting is generally permitted. Further details on research can be found in Appendix D.

Current Approach:

The following general application regulations in the District’s Nuisance Abatement Bylaw apply to regulate nuisance lighting:

"Light Source" means a light bulb, light tube or floodlight lamp;

"Outdoor Light" means any Light Source that is not fully enclosed in a building or structure;
"Shade" means a non-transparent light shade that does not form part of a Light Source;

Prohibitions
6. d) No person shall allow an Outdoor Light to be placed or lit on a parcel such that the Light Source is visible from a different parcel in a Residential Zone;

Requirements
8. Without limiting the generality of section 7, every person who is the owner or occupier of Real Property or their agent shall

   e) ensure that an Outdoor Light on the Property is shielded by a Shade or fixture such that the Light Source is not visible from another parcel located in a Residential Zone.

9. The prohibitions in section 6(e) and the requirement in section 8(e) do not apply to the following:

   a) Christmas or holiday lights between November 15 and January 15;

This is the current regulation Bylaw Enforcement Staff use to address light complaints caused by a residential house. It is effective to address the direct impact on a neighbour from unshielded fixtures or poorly directed flood lighting. In recent years, installation of purpose based, low output landscape lighting has taken the place of some of these brighter house-mounted fixtures, and staff have seen a decrease in complaints of this type.

In April 2002, the District's Nuisance Abatement Bylaw was amended to include glaring light regulations in residential zones. This amendment described types and wattages of various light sources and placed a maximum bulb wattage in a given light fixture. It also stipulated the length of time an outdoor light may be lit and between what hours. In September 2002, these regulations were removed, as aspects of the bylaw had proved to be difficult to enforce.

Bylaws must be easily understood and applied, enforceable and accomplish the desired goal. Differences in properties such as density and maturity of landscaping, topography, and other factors such as family schedules, lifestyles, individual personal sense of security are factors to also be considered to prevent unintended consequences and challenges to enforcement.

Options for Consideration:

Due to the complexities of measuring and regulating residential lighting, staff have contracted a lighting professional to aid with understanding the issues and developing options for consideration. For light spillage or light trespass typically occurring on residential properties, it can be difficult to determine the source of the light when measuring on the ground. Lighting can originate from several sources including
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landscape lighting, security lighting, decorative lighting and sources from outside the property.

The colour temperature or sometimes called 'temperament' of a particular light can contribute to its perceived intensity or brightness. Colour temperature is measured in degrees Kelvin with the brightest white light (appearing as white-blue) being in the 6000K range, while warmer light is in the 3000K range (appearing as yellowish-orange).

LED lighting can add to impact due to the bright point source of the fixture. The white-blue colour temperature of LED lighting adds to its perceived brightness, whereas the yellowish-orange colour temperature of high pressure sodium lighting is perceived as softer.

Lighting is measured in lux or lumens and there are challenges with setting a maximum lux/lumens level for residential properties. Measuring light output on site would not be accurate as other light sources outside of the property contribute to the readings. Attempting to measure the light level is time consuming, requires some technical training and the equipment can be costly. Attempting to model the light output from a residence is also difficult (for example, at the Building Permit stage), as most fixtures do not have readily available photometric files that are required to undertake digital modelling. In addition, how the light is mounted and orientated impacts the overall light output and distribution.

Having regard to the above, the following options may be used as stand-alone amendments to the District's Nuisance Abatement Bylaw or be used together.

1) Amend the District's Nuisance Abatement Bylaw to require that all outdoor single family residential light sources be pointed downwards.

Staff have identified lighting that is installed to shine up, onto the house as having a potential impact to neighbours. They must also comply with existing regulations that light source is shielded i.e., not visible from a different parcel.

2) Amend the District's Nuisance Abatement Bylaw to require that all outdoor holiday/seasonal/decorative lighting must be turned off during certain hours.

The Nuisance Abatement Bylaw contains regulation to do with holiday lighting based on time of year (November 15 to January 15). This would add a time of day to the bylaw.

3) Work with a lighting professional to develop further options.

This option would include continuing to work with a lighting expert to create alternative solutions.
Comparison of Options:

Depending how these options are drafted, Nuisance Abatement Bylaw changes could retroactively apply to all single family residential properties.

Option 1: (all outdoor lights pointed downwards)
- Creates a similar regulation to that already existing in the Nuisance Abatement Bylaw which staff may visually inspect from the ground.
- May impact ability of residents to have particular types of decorative lighting that cannot be directed downwards such as string lights.

Option 2: (all outdoor seasonal lighting turned off during certain times)
- Will require careful consideration of what is considered decorative/holiday/seasonal lighting.
- Will require staff to create parameters for time restrictions.

Option 3: (staff to continue working with a lighting professional to develop further options)
- Would allow staff to work with a lighting expert who can advise on feasibility and technical aspects of regulations.
- Staff must report back to Council on this option.
Target Area 4- NUISANCE NOISE

Issue Identification:

Council has expressed concerns regarding nuisance noise originating from outdoor mechanical equipment in single family residential zones in the District. Nuisance noise is cited as having negative impacts to residents' quality of life.

In the last five years (including 2019 thus far), 37 noise complaints have been recorded by District staff to do with outdoor mechanical equipment (air conditioning units, heat pumps, pool equipment, hot tub equipment, and generators). This gives an average of approximately seven per year. Note that one complaint received was repetitive (same complainant against the same property) and so this one complaint has been taken out of the below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Complaint</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Pump</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot tub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Generator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noise generating mechanical equipment is often located in side yard setbacks as these side yards provide for limited functional utility to homeowners. This placement, while convenient for home owners, is often in close proximity to an existing neighbouring dwelling.

Municipal Comparison:

Residential outdoor mechanical equipment regulations in Metro Vancouver municipalities were surveyed by staff.

Four municipalities were found to have siting regulations for residential outdoor mechanical equipment in their Zoning Bylaws. Some municipalities have general decibel level regulation, which would include this type of outdoor mechanical equipment.

Further details on research can be found in Appendix E.

Current Approach:

The District regulates the nuisance of single family residential outdoor mechanical equipment at night with the Noise Regulation Bylaw in the following manner:
Objectionable Noises or Sounds

5. Without limiting the generality of section 3, the following noises or sounds are believed by the Council to be objectionable or liable to disturb the quiet, peace, rest, enjoyment, comfort or convenience of individuals or the public and are prohibited:

(b) any of the following noises or sounds during the Night, where such noise or sound is audible from Premises other than the Premises from which the noise or sound originates:
   (iii) noise or sound from mechanical equipment, including heat pumps, ventilation equipment, air conditioning systems, vents or pool or hot tub pumps, compactors or other ancillary equipment or vehicles;

(f) any noise that exceeds the Sound Levels set out below:
   (i) any Continuous Sound that exceeds the following Sound Levels at the Point of Reception:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. in a Quiet Zone during the Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. in a Quiet Zone during the Night</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bylaw staff enforce these sound levels with the use of sound meters, however, operationally these provisions are generally not enforced during power outages for the operation of equipment such as backup generators in these emergency situations.

Recommended Options:

These options may be used as stand-alone amendments to the District’s Zoning Bylaw.

1) Amend the District’s Zoning Bylaw to require that residential outdoor mechanical equipment such as air conditioning units, heat pumps, pool equipment, hot tub equipment and generators are located to the rear of single family homes in single family residential zones.

This option places outdoor mechanical equipment to the rear of the home.

2) Amend the District’s Zoning Bylaw to require that residential outdoor mechanical equipment such as generators, heating systems for pools and hot tubs, air conditioning units, etc. are setback from shared lot lines in single family residential zones a minimum of 8 ft.

This option places outdoor mechanical equipment a minimum distance from all lot lines.
Comparison of Options:

These options would include amendment to the District's Zoning Bylaw. Zoning Bylaw changes would only apply to new mechanical equipment and would not retroactively apply.

It is noted that existing permitted mechanical equipment that did not comply with the new regulation would benefit from legal non-conforming status.

Introducing siting regulation for outdoor mechanical equipment may impact design and siting of structures.

Option 1: (siting outdoor mechanical equipment to the rear of the house)
- Reduces noise in the front yard of properties.
- May not reduce impact for neighbours sharing a rear lot line bearing in mind this type of lot configuration provides greater separation.

Option 2: (siting outdoor mechanical equipment a minimum of 8 ft. from shared lot lines)
- Reduces noise between all shared property lines.

Target Area 5 - LANDSCAPE RETENTION AND REDUCTION OF HARD SURFACES

Issue Identification:

Council has expressed concern regarding an increase of impermeable surface area and a loss of landscaping/greenspace on single family residential lots. These changes may negatively impact neighbourhood aesthetic quality and character and the natural environment through loss of vegetation and reduction in groundwater infiltration.

Municipal Comparison:

Hard surface and landscaping regulations in Metro Vancouver municipalities were surveyed by staff.

Ten Metro Vancouver municipalities have zoning bylaw regulations related to impermeable or permeable surface area coverages in single family residential lots. Two municipalities had regulations applicable to the front yard of a property.

Nine municipalities have a definition for landscaping. Some require that areas not covered by structures and other permitted surfaces in a residential front yard be landscaped.

Further details on research can be found in Appendix F.
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Current Approach:

The District’s Zoning Bylaw regulates the siting of structures on a lot and the portion of a lot that may covered with structures.

The Zoning Bylaw restricts the percentage of required front yards that may be covered with parking structures and surfaces capable of supporting parking in the RS1-5, RSE, RSCH and RSEW single family residential zones. These percentages differ depending on the zone. The existing language in the Zoning Bylaw may lead to difficulty in preventing more surfaces capable of supporting parking in required front yards than the Zoning Bylaw intended. At times, it has been unclear for staff and applicants which surfaces count towards these maximums, such as with gravel/permeable pavers, etc. or in the case of shared driveway access. For example, it is desirable to limit areas outside paving from having materials such as permeable pavers or gravel in that vehicles could then park on this surface in addition to a paved area. At the same time, allowance should be given for these materials to be used in place of paving. It is recommended that staff revise the existing language surrounding this regulation as a means of limiting front yard hard surfaces and bringing clarification for staff and applicants. This should be done at the same time as the recommended options.

The District is currently completing an Integrated Stormwater Management Plan (ISMP) with the primary goal of improving watershed health. One way to achieve this will be to mitigate the impacts of stormwater runoff from development. Single family residential lots will have an important role in helping to achieve the goals of the ISMP. One option being considered as part of the ISMP is to introduce a maximum impermeable surface area for single family residential lots to align with Metro Vancouver’s targets.

Staff recommend to use the ISMP, once completed, to implement appropriate infiltration measures for single family residential lots. This will ensure regulation is introduced which is based on scientific study and community feedback. It is anticipated the ISMP will be completed in 2020.

Options for Consideration:

These options may be used as stand-alone amendments to the District’s Zoning Bylaw or be used together.

1) Amend the District’s Zoning Bylaw to add maximum coverage regulations for front yard coverage (parking-related structures, paving and other buildings) to the eleven single family residential zones without such regulation.

Establishment of different percentages based on zoning, due to differing lot sizes, will likely be required.

This option should also include clarifying language surrounding which structures, surfaces and paved areas count towards maximums.
2) Amend the District’s Zoning Bylaw to add a definition of landscaping and require this to be applied to the remainder of required front yard areas after permitted coverages are deducted, in single family residential zones.

This option would include the creation of a definition for landscaping with the intention to focus on including permeable or natural materials/surfaces and decorative features. Further research by staff will be needed to establish an appropriate definition.

Comparison of Options:

These options would include amendment to the District’s Zoning Bylaw. Zoning Bylaw changes would only apply to new development and would not retroactively apply to residential properties.

Option 1: (add minimum coverage regulations for front yard coverage to those single family zones currently without)
- Extends regulation restricting required front yard coverages across single family residential zones in the District. This will limit some hard surface in front yards which in turn may help to create permeable or soft landscaped space.
- Provides opportunity to clarify which materials and structures count towards required front yard parking structures, surfaces and paved areas and how this coverage may be calculated.

Option 2: (add a definition of landscaping and require landscaping covers those areas not covered by other surfaces and structures)
- Introduces a method for achieving front yard landscaped area.
- Works to address Council’s concern regarding the lack of landscaping.
- May be difficult to enforce, outside of a building permit system linked to single family home redevelopment.

NEXT STEPS AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:

Once Council direction is received, staff will work with the District’s Communication Department to carry out appropriate public engagement on the changes. The proposed changes have the potential to impact numerous households depending on the nature and extent of the proposed changes. The type of public engagement is expected to differ depending on the selected options.

Staff will then prepare bylaw amendments, as required, and bring these changes with results of the public engagement for consideration at a Regular meeting of Council.
SUBJECT: Standards and Regulations in Single Family Zones

If Council selects options that require amendments to the Zoning Bylaw, a public hearing will also be required.

CONCLUSION:
This report outlines options to address the five target areas identified at the September 16, 2019 Council Workshop.

Respectfully submitted,

Brett Dwyer
Assistant General Manager Regulatory Review and Compliance
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Attachment A: Chronology of Previous Workshops

September 16, 2019 – Council discussed Standards and Regulations in Single Family Zones, directing staff to research five key areas: nuisance lighting; nuisance noise; landscape retention and hard surfaces; retaining structures; and grade for accessory buildings/garages.
Minutes: file:///C:/Users/adamsh/Downloads/190916CW.MIN%20(1).pdf
Video: http://app.dnv.org/council/default.aspx?filename=20190916CR&type=MP4&start=0&end=10042

July 8, 2019 – Council discussed three areas of interest: nuisance noise; nuisance lighting; size, density, form and character of single family homes. Other topics were deferred to a planned future Workshop in the fall of 2019.
Video: http://app.dnv.org/council/default.aspx?filename=20190708CC-1&type=MP4&start=0&end=5137 and
http://app.dnv.org/council/default.aspx?filename=20190708CC-2&type=MP4&start=0&end=4861

March 19, 2018 - Council discussed options to address four priority issues related to single family home renewal including improving enforcement, erosion and sediment control, preserving landscaping, and regulating the size, form and character of homes.
Video: http://app.dnv.org/council/default.aspx?filename=20180319cr&type=MP4&start=0000&end=6716

September 18, 2017 - Staff presented the results from a survey of Councillors to help prioritize issues related to single family home renewal in order to further define the issues and expand measures to mitigate impacts to the community.
Video: http://app.dnv.org/council/default.aspx?filename=20170918cr&type=MP4&start=0&end=3023

March 6, 2017 - Staff provided an update on District initiatives and received direction from Council to prepare a list of issues to help prioritize future efforts.
Video: http://app.dnv.org/council/default.aspx?filename=20170306cr&type=MP4&start=0&end=2588
June 21, 2016 - Staff presented the results of a public survey on issues and potential solutions related to single family home renewal.
Video: http://app.dnv.org/council/default.aspx?filename=160621cc&type=MP4&start=0000&end=9308

October 5, 2015 - Staff provided a report to Council which summarizes key issues related to single family home renewal as well as policies and tools the District uses to manage these issues, and suggested actions to further mitigate negative impacts to residents.
Attachment B: Retaining Structures

Legislative Authority:

Municipal governments may regulate the siting and height of residential retaining structures under Section 8 of the Community Charter.

Municipal governments may not regulate materials, construction standards, etc. that fall under Provincial authority- the BC Building Act- or other regulatory standards. Municipalities may enforce the BC Building Code through regulation. The District relies on the BC Building Code, other regulatory standards and qualified professionals to ensure some types of retaining structures are planned and constructed in an appropriate, safe manner.

Municipal Comparisons:

The relevant Zoning Bylaw sections for the City of Burnaby, City of Coquitlam, City of New Westminster, City of North Vancouver and District of West Vancouver are included below as these municipalities have topographical similarities to the District. Links are included to Zoning Bylaw sections or public handouts.

City of Burnaby

Permitted retaining wall heights for individual walls range from 3.51 ft. for walls located anywhere on a lot and 5.91 ft. located to the rear of a required front yard. Some differences exist dependant on zoning.


City of Coquitlam

Permitted retaining wall heights range from 3.28 ft. within 19.69 ft. of an exterior lot corner to 7.87 ft. under certain conditions for individual walls. An individual retaining wall up to 11.8 ft. maximum is permitted between lots sharing a side or rear yard lot line, with two of these walls combined not being permitted higher than 15.75 ft.

https://www.coquitlam.ca/docs/default-source/zoning-bylaw/Part_05_-_General_Regulations.pdf

City of New Westminster

Permitted retaining wall heights include 2 ft. for walls running along a shared interior or rear lot line, 6 ft. for a window well, 9.84 ft. for bounding pedestrian entrances and 4 ft. for all other retaining walls.


City of North Vancouver

No regulations found in the Zoning Bylaw, relies on the BC Building Code.
District of West Vancouver

Permitted retaining wall heights are measured by angles, with a requirement of 3.94 ft. in with a 75% slope for front site line or flanking side site lines. 3.94 ft. in with 100% slope is permitted for other site lines. The exposed face of any permitted retaining wall heights may not exceed 7.87 ft. Retaining walls exceeding 3.94 ft. in height must be at least 7.87 ft. from a front or rear site line.

https://westvancouver.ca/sites/default/files/bylaws/ZONING_BYLAW_4662_SECTION_120_GENERAL_REGULATIONS_FOR_ALL_ZONES_2.pdf

https://westvancouver.ca/sites/default/files/bylaws/ZONING_BYLAW_4662_SECTION_130_GENERAL_REGULATIONS_FOR_RESIDENTIAL_ZONES_AND_USES_ONLY_0.pdf
Attachment C: Grade for Detached Garages

Legislative Authority:

Municipal governments may choose the method of measuring height for detached accessory structures under their regulatory bylaws under Section 8 of the Community Charter.

Municipal governments may not regulate materials, construction standards, etc. falling under Provincial authority—the BC Building Act—or other regulatory standards. The District relies on the BC Building Code, other regulatory standards and qualified professionals to ensure buildings are designed and constructed in an appropriate, safe manner.

Municipal Comparisons:

Accessory buildings are typically either measured from finished grade, or finished grade at point of vehicular access.

The relevant Zoning Bylaw section for the City of Burnaby, City of Coquitlam, City of New Westminster, City of North Vancouver and District of West Vancouver are included below as these municipalities have topographical similarities to the District.

City of Burnaby

Zoning Bylaw Section 6.4(6)- Height of Buildings or Structures
The height of a detached accessory building shall be measured from the calculated average natural grade of all sides of the building to the highest point of the structure, subject to the applicable exceptions in subsections (3) and (4), except that the height of a detached garage or carport may be measured from the finished grade at the point used for vehicular access.

City of Coquitlam

Zoning Bylaw Section 1001 10(6)- RS-1 One-Family Residential
Detached buildings and structures for accessory residential or accessory off-street parking must not exceed a height, measured from finished grade, of:
(i) 3.7 metres; or
(ii) 4.6 metres, for an accessory building that has a roof with a pitch of 4 in 12 or greater for an area of at least 80% of all roof surfaces.

City of New Westminster

Zoning Bylaw Section 310.21- Detached Accessory Building without Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit Regulations
Detached accessory buildings that do not contain a detached accessory dwelling unit:
(a) shall not exceed one storey, and:
(i) in the case of a peaked roof, no portion of the roof shall exceed a height of 4.57 metres (15 feet), or
(ii) in the case of a roof having a pitch of 4.12 or less, no portion of the roof shall exceed a height of 3.6 metres (12 feet);

City of North Vancouver

Zoning Bylaw Section Part 2- Interpretation

“Height” with reference to an Accessory Structure or a Landscape Screen means the vertical distance between the top of such Structure and the highest finished ground elevation within 0.014 metres (3 feet) of such Structure;

District of West Vancouver

Zoning Bylaw Section 130.01(3)- Accessory Buildings and Structures

An accessory building or structure shall not exceed a height of:
(a) one storey plus basement; and
(b) 3.7 metres from the lower of the average natural or average finished grade, measured around the accessory building or structure, except on sites which include lands identified in Section 204.14 accessory buildings or structures located entirely in the rear 10 metres of the site shall not exceed a height of 3.7 metres from the elevation of the travelled lane surface directly adjacent the subject site.
Attachment D: Nuisance Lighting

Legislative Authority:

Municipal governments may regulate nuisance caused by illumination under Sections 8(3)(h) and 64(b) of the Community Charter.

Municipal governments may not regulate aspects of residential lighting that falls under Provincial authority or other regulatory/manufacturing/safety standards. The District relies on these standards and qualified professionals to ensure lighting is installed in an appropriate, safe manner.

District Residential Lighting Complaints:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lighting Complaints</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints by Permanence</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints by Type</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recessed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood/Spot/Motion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouped/Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Municipal Comparisons:

Of the 22 surveyed Metro Vancouver municipalities, and the City of Victoria, approximately five had regulation or policy to do with regulating nuisance lighting on single family residential properties.

The relevant regulations for the City of New Westminster, City of Vancouver, District of West Vancouver, Village of Belcarra and Village of Lions Bay are included below as these municipalities were found to have regulation to do with residential outdoor lighting.

City of New Westminster

Light Intrusion Bylaw Section 2.

No owner or occupier of real property shall allow or permit an outdoor light to shine directly into the living or sleeping areas of an adjacent residential property in such a way as to disturb the quiet, peace, rest, enjoyment, comfort or convenience of an occupant of the premises.
City of Vancouver

Following an extensive Outdoor Lighting Strategy public process, the City of Vancouver recently amended the Untidy Premises By-law No. 4548.

A By-law to amend Untidy Premises By-law No. 4548 regarding outdoor lighting practices Section 2

An owner or occupier of a parcel of real property shall not cause, permit or allow an outdoor light fixture to be placed or lit in such a way that:

(a) the light fixture casts light directly onto a window or other opening of a residential structure located across a street, or adjacent to, the real property; and

(b) the light unreasonably disturbs the peace, rest, enjoyment, comfort or convenience of the owner or occupier of the neighbouring real property.”

District of West Vancouver

Good Neighbour Bylaw

5.1.4

(f) no Owner may allow an outdoor light to be placed or lit on a parcel of the Owner such that the light source creates a nuisance in any residential zone;

5.3 Exceptions:

5.3.1 The prohibitions in section 5.1 and the requirement in section 5.2 do not apply to the flowing:

(a) Christmas or holiday lights between November 15 and January 15;

Village of Belcarra

Good Neighbour Bylaw

Similar to West Vancouver
Village of Lions Bay
Good Neighbour Bylaw
Similar to West Vancouver

Additional Resources

International Dark-Sky Association  https://www.darksky.org/


Both sites provide public education in the selection of lighting to promote the goal of dark night skies. As noted, some municipalities further restrict the lighting from municipal facilities and new developments in zones directly surrounding an observatory, such as found in Saanich's Zoning Bylaw.
Attachment E: Nuisance Noise

Legislative Authority:

Municipal governments may regulate nuisance caused by noise under Sections 8(3)(h) and 64(b) of the Community Charter.

Municipal governments may regulate the siting of outdoor mechanical equipment through their Zoning Bylaw under Section 8(l) of the Community Charter.

Local governments may not regulate aspects of outdoor mechanical equipment falling under Provincial authority or other regulatory/manufacturing/safety standards. Depending on the equipment, the District relies on regulatory standards and qualified professionals to ensure this equipment is installed in an appropriate, safe manner.

District Residential Noise Complaints:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Complaint</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Pump</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot tub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Municipal Comparisons:

Of the 22 Metro Vancouver municipalities, and the City of Victoria, none were found, except the District, having specific regulation of the listed residential outdoor mechanical equipment in a noise control or regulation bylaw. Some municipalities have general decibel level regulations in these bylaws, which would work to regulate noise levels of outdoor mechanical equipment.

Four municipalities were found to have siting regulations for residential outdoor mechanical equipment in a Zoning Bylaw.

The relevant Zoning Bylaw sections for the City of Coquitlam, City of North Vancouver, City of Pitt Meadows and City of Port Moody are included below as these municipalities were found to have regulation in their Zoning Bylaw to do with the siting of residential outdoor mechanical equipment.

City of Coquitlam

Zoning Bylaw-Current amendment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siting Exceptions</th>
<th>Exception Permitted</th>
<th>Additional Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior heating and cooling equipment and associated venting terminations,</td>
<td>May be sited on any portion of a lot, except as otherwise limited by</td>
<td>For one-family residential, two-family residential, triplex residential, quadruplex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat pumps, Ancillary swimming pool heating and filtering equipment, Emergency</td>
<td>this or another bylaw.</td>
<td>residential and street-oriented village home residential uses, the subject equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generators</td>
<td></td>
<td>must be located a minimum of 1.0 metre from the required interior side lot line setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for the zone the building is located in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venting terminations for central heating and cooling equipment must be located such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that they do not vent into the area of a lot adjacent to an interior side lot line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ancillary swimming pool heating and filtering equipment is restricted to a maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>height of 1.3 metres above grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of North Vancouver

Zoning Bylaw Section 421- Noise Mitigation
(3) recommends exterior and interior design and construction features and practices including, without limitation, the installation of a mechanical heat recovery ventilation system, to mitigate the impact of external and structure borne sound penetration between:
(a) neighbouring industrial, residential, commercial, community, entertainment, traffic, street pedestrian activities and other uses situated on or off the Lands; and
(b) the interior space of all residential dwelling units to be constructed on the Lands.

City of Pitt Meadows

Zoning Bylaw Section 4.15- Mechanical Equipment
Mechanical equipment that produces noise, vibration, smoke, dust, heat, glare, electrical interference, or other offence or nuisance is permitted only in a rear or exterior side yard but not closer than 1.2 m to any lot line.

City of Port Moody

Zoning Bylaw Section 5.2.15- Mechanical Equipment
Mechanical Equipment For all Residential zones, mechanical equipment located outside of a Building, including but not limited to heat pumps, air conditioners, and pool pumps, shall be located in the Rear Yard or directly adjacent to the rear Building face of the principal Structure with a minimum separation of 1.8m from the Interior Side Lot Line.
Attachment F: Landscape Retention and Hard Surfaces

Legislative Authority:

Municipal governments have the ability to regulate open space on residential lots through Zoning Bylaw regulations to do with lot coverage and siting of structures. Further, residential lots may have impermeable area maximums regulated under a municipal Zoning Bylaw.

Municipal governments have limited ability to regulate landscaping on single family residential lots. Screening and Landscaping to mask or separate uses under Section 527 of the Local Government Act may be used to establish minimum screening and landscaping standards for single family homes. However, it is anticipated that outside of a building permit system linked to single family home redevelopment, routine compliance monitoring, and complaint-based enforcement mechanisms would be cost prohibitive for the District and divisive for neighbours.

Municipal governments may use Development Permits under Section 468 to 491 of the Local Government Act to protect the natural environment, protect development from hazards, establish objectives for the form and character of commercial, industrial and multi-family development, promoted energy & water conservation, and promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Legislation does not provide local governments with the authority to require form and character development permits for single family homes. Therefore, development permits provide a very limited opportunity to preserve and protect trees and shrubs that merely provide aesthetic benefits without also being required to achieve some other objective like protecting development from hazardous conditions.

Municipal Comparisons:

Of the 22 surveyed Metro Vancouver municipalities and the City of Victoria, nine had zoning bylaw regulation to do with impermeable or permeable surface area regulations in single family residential lots. The following table represents the largest maximums for impermeable surfaces areas, permeable area requirements and/or front yard landscaping requirements found in single family residential zones of municipal Zoning Bylaws. Note each municipality may consider different materials permeable/impermeable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>% Permeable Required</th>
<th>% Impermeable Maximum</th>
<th>Front Yard Landscaping Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>Back Yard</td>
<td>Entire Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Burnaby</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pitt Meadows</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Port Coquitlam</td>
<td></td>
<td>65-70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Port Moody</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Richmond</td>
<td>50-55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of West Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Anmore</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Bellcar</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The relevant Zoning Bylaw sections for the City of Burnaby and District of West Vancouver are included below as these municipalities share topographical similarities to The District and had regulation related to permeable surfaces/front yard landscaping in their zoning bylaws.

**City of Burnaby**

**Zoning Bylaw Section 6.24 - Impervious Surfaces**

1. This section applies only to Lots in R (Residential) Districts for which an application for a building permit has been made after July 1, 2005 for the construction of a new principal building, whether on new or existing building foundations.

2. Not more than 70 per cent of the total area of a lot to which this section applies shall be covered by impervious materials.

3. In this section "impervious materials" include:
   - (a) buildings and structures;
   - (b) asphalt;
   - (c) concrete;
   - (d) grouted pavers;
   - (e) subject to subsection (f), ungrouted pavers having a surface area on their largest face of more than 0.21 m² (2.25 sq.ft)

   but does not include:
   - (f) ungrouted pavers having a surface area on their largest face of not more than 0.372 m² (4 sq.ft) arranged in a line of single pavers to form a pedestrian walkway with a permeable gap between the pavers;
   - (g) water surfaces of structures designed to retain water, including swimming pools, reflecting pools, and ornamental ponds.

**District of West Vancouver**

**Zoning Bylaw Section 130.15(7) - Site Landscaping**

Impermeable surfaces in front yards must not exceed 50% of the area of the front yard as defined in this Zoning Bylaw, provided that in all cases a pedestrian sidewalk with a maximum width of 1.5 m, a driveway with a maximum width of 4.5 m, and a sufficient area for turning passenger vehicles are permitted in the front yard or the flanking yard on a corner flanking site to provide access by impermeable surface from the abutting street to the principal building on the site.

**Zoning Bylaw Section 110- Definitions**

Impermeable Surface means any consolidated surface such as asphalt or concrete that prevents the absorption of precipitation into the soil, but excludes any area of a lot comprising of exposed bedrock.
The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8472

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

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1404 (Bylaw 8472)".

Amendments

2. District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965 is amended by deleting Section 409(3) and replacing with:

"(3) Retaining walls may be constructed within the required setback area of a lot when the wall or walls do not extend above a line commencing 3.0 feet above the lesser of natural grade and finished grade at the outer face of the outermost wall and subsequent walls do not extend above a line 8.0 feet above the lesser of natural grade and finished grade and projected upward and inward on the lot at an angle of 35° as illustrated by the following diagram:

[Diagram of retaining walls and setbacks]
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Bylaw 8476

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

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1405 (Bylaw 8476)".

Amendments

2. District of North Vancouver Zoning Bylaw 3210, 1965 is amended by deleting the interpretation of "height" in Part 2 and replacing with:

""height" means:

(i) with respect to a building or structure in a single family residential zone the greatest vertical distance measured from the building height base line to the topmost part of the building or structure, except that in the case of an accessory building or structure it shall be the vertical distance measured from the floor level to the highest point of the building or structure except in no case shall the floor level of the structure be more than 4 feet above natural grade at any point."
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Bylaw 8473

A bylaw to amend Nuisance Abatement Bylaw 7325, 2002

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "Nuisance Abatement Bylaw 7325, 2002 Amendment Bylaw 8473, 2020 (Amendment 5)".

Amendments

2. Nuisance Abatement Bylaw 7325, 2002 is amended by deleting:

   a) subsection 6(e)(i) and substituting the following:
      (i) the owner of the property is in possession of a valid building permit in respect of such Building Materials;

   b) subsection 9(a) and substituting the following:
      (a) Christmas or holiday lights between November 15 and January 15, Halloween lights between October 1 and November 7, provided such lighting is turned off by 11:00 p.m. each day and remains off overnight until the following day;

   c) sections 10 through 22 inclusive and substituting the following and re-numbering the remaining sections accordingly:

PART X - OFFENCE AND ENFORCEMENT

Entry

10. Bylaw Enforcement Officers and members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are authorized, in accordance with section 16 of the Community Charter, SBC 2003, c. 26, as amended or replaced, to enter at any reasonable time onto property to inspect and determine whether the regulations of this bylaw are being complied with.

Obstruction

11. A person must not interfere with, delay, obstruct or impede a Bylaw Enforcement Officer or designate or other person lawfully authorized to enforce this bylaw in the performance of duties under this bylaw.
Violations

12. Every person who violates any of the provisions of this bylaw or who suffers or permits any act or thing to be done in contravention of this bylaw or who neglects to do or refrains from doing any act or thing which violates any of the provisions of this bylaw will be liable to the penalties hereby imposed and each day that such violation is permitted to exist will constitute a separate offence.

Penalty

13. Every person who commits an offence contrary to the provisions of this bylaw is liable on summary conviction to a penalty of not more than $50,000.00 in addition to the costs of the prosecution.

Designation of Bylaw

14. This bylaw is designated under section 264 of the Community Charter as a bylaw that may be enforced by means of a ticket in the form prescribed.

Designation of Bylaw Enforcement Officer

15. Bylaw Enforcement Officers, park rangers and members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are designated to enforce this bylaw by means of a ticket under section 264 of the Community Charter.

Ticketing

16. Pursuant to Sections 264(1)(c) and 265(1)(a) of the Community Charter, the table below sets out the designated expressions for offences under this bylaw with the corresponding bylaw section number and fine amount:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGNATED EXPRESSION</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>FINE ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causing a nuisance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit a nuisance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsightly property</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting rubbish to collect</td>
<td>6(a)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depositing rubbish</td>
<td>6(b)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run stationary vehicle</td>
<td>6(c)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor light visible</td>
<td>6(d)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of building materials</td>
<td>6(e)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized vehicle storage</td>
<td>6(f)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of vehicle parts</td>
<td>6(f)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping container stored in residential zone</td>
<td>6(g)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to remove discarded material/rubbish</td>
<td>8(a)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to clear noxious insects</td>
<td>8(c)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to clear brush</td>
<td>8(d)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to shield outdoor light</td>
<td>8(e)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to turn off lighting</td>
<td>9(a)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver

Bylaw 8474

A bylaw to amend Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004

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

Citation

1. This bylaw may be cited as "Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 Amendment Bylaw 8474, 2020 (Amendment 56)".

Amendments

2. Schedule A of the Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw 7458, 2004 is amended by:

   a) deleting the contraventions of the Nuisance Abatement Bylaw 7325, 2002 and substituting the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bylaw Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A1 Penalty Amount ($)</th>
<th>A2 Discounted Penalty: Within 14 days ($)</th>
<th>A3 Late Payment: After 28 days ($)</th>
<th>A4 Compliance Agreement Available</th>
<th>A5 Compliance Agreement Discount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Causing a nuisance</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Permit a nuisance</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unsightly property</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(a)</td>
<td>Permitting rubbish to collect</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(b)</td>
<td>Depositing rubbish</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(c)</td>
<td>Run stationary vehicle</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(d)</td>
<td>Outdoor light visible</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(e)</td>
<td>Accumulation of building materials</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(f)</td>
<td>Unauthorized vehicle storage</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(g)</td>
<td>Accumulation of vehicle parts</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(g)</td>
<td>Shipping container stored in residential zone</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(a)</td>
<td>Fail to remove discarded material/rubbish</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(c)</td>
<td>Fail to clear noxious insects</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(d)</td>
<td>Fail to clear brush</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(e)</td>
<td>Failure to shield outdoor light</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9(a)</td>
<td>Failure to turn off lighting</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Obstruction</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) deleting the contraventions for the Taxicab Regulation Bylaw 7613, 2006 in their entirety.
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Attachment G: Floor space exemptions for basements

Current Approach:

The District regulates single family house floor space basements exemptions through the Zoning Bylaw in the following manner:

410 Floor Space Ratio Exemptions

The following are excluded from floor space ratio calculations:

(1) For single family residential buildings, exclude:

   (a) the floor area contained within that part of buildings and structures having an adjacent exposed perimeter wall of less than 4.0 feet from the floor above to the lesser of natural grade and finished grade as illustrated by the following diagram and formulas:

   \[
   \text{F.S.R.} = \frac{A}{\text{Lot Area}}
   \]

   \[
   A = B + C \left( \frac{p^2}{p^1} \right)
   \]

   \begin{align*}
   A & \quad \text{Total floor area to be included in F.S.R. calculation} \\
   B & \quad \text{Total floor area of all stories wholly above grade} \\
   C & \quad \text{Total floor area of all stories partially below grade} \\
   p^1 & \quad \text{Total perimeter length of a story partially below ground} \\
   p^2 & \quad \text{Length of } p^1 \text{ exposed 4ft or more from floor above}
   \end{align*}

   This means any portion of a basement no more than 4' above the lesser of natural or finished grade is not counted towards floor space. In circumstances where there is a portion of the basement level more than 4' above the lesser of natural or finished grade the calculation is used to exclude only the portion that is no more than 4' above the lesser of natural or finished grade.

Municipal Comparison:

Other municipalities differ in their approaches to including basements in floor space calculations. These approaches range from simply including some or all of the space of a basement, to including certain uses or areas within a basement, to not including basements such as the District currently does for those portions fully under grade.
All three North Shore municipalities limit basement exemptions to the area directly below the storey above.

In 2018, the City of North Vancouver began to exclude basements from gross floor area calculations to encourage more liveable space (i.e. more light) for secondary suites in their one and two-unit residential zones. Previously only cellars (level of a house more than 1.52 metres below average grade as defined by the City) were excluded from gross floor area calculations. This encouraged secondary suites to be located in a cellar which has impacts to liveability.

Other municipalities specify certain uses within a basement which may be excluded, such as the City of Burnaby does when excluding carports in single-family residential zones located within a cellar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Basement Excluded from Floor Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of North Vancouver</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of West Vancouver</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of North Vancouver</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coquitlam</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Burnaby</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Lions Bay</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basements siting varies between municipalities. When a basement counts towards gross floor area this naturally limits the desired size. Site specific constraints, setbacks from natural features, or roadways, etc. may impact the siting of basements.

Note the municipal scan did not consider crawl spaces which typically are not included in floor space or site-specific constraints which would prevent the construction of a basement. Municipalities might exclude other uses from floor space which, if happen to be in a basement, would not could towards FSR such as a mechanical room. Partially above and partially below grade basements may use a calculation to determine what portion of a basement is excluded.
Attachment H: Information on maximum house sizes

Current Approach:

House size in the general single family zones (RS1 to RS5) is regulated by a maximum permitted floor space ratio (FSR) that varies with lot size. Each of the below zones also establishes a maximum principal building (house) size meaning maximum house size is limited to the lesser of the two maximums. The Zoning Bylaw contains several exemptions from floor space, including basements, which would not be counted towards the maximum house size permitted.

The table below identifies the permitted floor space ratio and the maximum principal building size from the District’s Zoning Bylaw for each Residential Single Family zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Family Zone</th>
<th>FLOOR SPACE RATIO (FSR)</th>
<th>Maximum House Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lots ≤ 5,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>Lots &gt; 5,000 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Canyon Heights</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Delbrook</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Edgemont</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Edgemont West</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Highlands</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Kilmer</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Keith Lynn</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Murdo Frazer</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Marlborough Heights</td>
<td>0.35 + 1,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Norgate</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Norwood Queens</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Pemberton Heights</td>
<td>For Lots &lt; or = 5,000</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For lots 5,001 - 11,000</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For lots &gt; 11,999</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Queensdale</td>
<td>The greater of 2,200 sq.ft. or 0.45</td>
<td>5,940 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Sunset Gardens</td>
<td>0.35 + 350 sq.ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Above: In the case of rooms having ceilings greater than 3.66m (12 ft) above the level of the floor area – that area above 12 ft shall be counted as if it were an additional floor level and included in FSR.
Municipal Comparison:

The City of North Vancouver, District of West Vancouver and Village of Lions Bay regulate maximum house size via a ratio based on lot size (also one method the District uses). This ensures the principal dwelling is built to an appropriate scale. Other buildings on a lot would typically also count towards a lot's maximum FSR, for example, a coach house.

Municipalities use a range of other regulations besides maximum FSR which also work to control and shape house size and appearance. For example, maximum height, maximum number of floors, maximum site coverage, limits to retaining walls, setbacks (both of house to lot lines and between structures on the lot), permeable area minimums, etc.

The City of Coquitlam takes a different approach to regulating maximum house size. There is no maximum square footage applied via FSR requirements. Rather, the maximum volume of a building is based on a calculation of perimeter wall area and perimeter wall height for each face of the building. This achieves the desired result of staggered wall faces, and as such, greater building articulation and a reduction in overall massing.

The table below displays other north shore municipalities' minimum lot sizes and FSRs. It only contains those zones which are intended for single-family dwellings. Municipalities have differing minimum lot sizes and thus differing maximum house sizes which would be permitted based on FSR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Size</th>
<th>Maximum GFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of North Vancouver</td>
<td>RS-1: One-Unit Residential 1</td>
<td>N/A (regulated via lot frontage, etc.)</td>
<td>Lessor of 0.3 x lot area + 92.9 m² or 0.5 x area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS-2: One-unit Residential 2</td>
<td>N/A (regulated via lot frontage, etc.)</td>
<td>Lessor of 0.3 x lot area + 92.9 m² or 0.5 x area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of West Vancouver</td>
<td>RS1: Single Family Dwelling Zone 1</td>
<td>8,094 m²</td>
<td>(1) 0.35 of site area maximum, if site area is greater than 677 m²; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 237 m² maximum, if site area is between 474 m² and 677 m²; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 0.5 of site area maximum, if site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS2: Single Family Dwelling Zone 2</td>
<td>1,858 m²</td>
<td>“</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS3: Single Family Dwelling Zone 3</td>
<td>1,115 m²</td>
<td>“</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS4: Single Family Dwelling Zone 4</td>
<td>836 m²</td>
<td>“</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS5: Single Family Dwelling Zone 5</td>
<td>558 m²</td>
<td>“</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Lions Bay RS-1: Residential - Single Detached</td>
<td>8000 m² (density may be averaged to 800 m² with a 700m² minimum parcel area when amenities provided under Community Amenity Contribution Policy)</td>
<td>0.35 FSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The District of West Vancouver has other residential zones which permit single family use but also permit other residential uses (such as cluster housing). These have not been included in this table.
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The District of North Vancouver
REPORT TO COUNCIL

February 9, 2021
File:

AUTHOR: Councillor Jim Hanson

SUBJECT: Indigenous Land Acknowledgements

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT staff report back to Council on options for introducing the protocol of conducting Indigenous land acknowledgements during Council proceedings;

AND THAT in developing an acknowledgement for Council consideration, staff are directed to consult with the appropriate First Nations whose territories would be included in such an acknowledgement.

REASON FOR REPORT:
On December 7, 2020 the District of North Vancouver Council passed motions to join the Coalition of Inclusive Municipalities and to support implementation of the municipal-specific Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada Calls to Action.

Council has also stated that it is committed to working with the Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations to determine what reconciliation means in our community.

These events and directions provide the opportunity for Council to begin discussions on related matters, including exploring options for the introduction of a protocol for conducting Indigenous land acknowledgements during Council proceedings and other significant corporate events.

SUMMARY:
Recognizing traditional territory is now a customary practice in Canada. This practice is done to acknowledge that Indigenous peoples have called this land home since time immemorial, before the arrival of newcomers.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada’s final report included a number of actions specific to and encompassing of local government, with recognizing traditional territory often seen as a first step in demonstrating a willingness to learn the truth about our shared past.
Given Council’s direction, introducing such a protocol during Council proceedings and other significant corporate events is therefore an appropriate next step toward advancing these Calls to Action. However, in order to ensure these actions are meaningful, the development of a territorial acknowledgement should be done in consultation with the First Nation(s) whose territory will be acknowledged.

BACKGROUND:
The following table provides examples of territorial acknowledgements in use by municipalities on the North Shore, as well as municipal agencies. While staff will consult with the appropriate First Nations in development of such an acknowledgement, staff may also reach out to partners and agencies as part of this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Acknowledgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| District of West Vancouver  | 1. West Vancouver is on the traditional and unceded territories of the Coast Salish People, in particular, the Squamish, Tsleil-Waututh and Musqueam First Nations.  
2. We acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Squamish Nation, Tsleil-Waututh Nation and Musqueam Nation. We recognize and respect them as nations in this territory, as well as their historic connection to the lands and waters around us since time immemorial. |
| City of North Vancouver     | …recognize that today’s event is taking place on the unceded and traditional territory of the Squamish, Tsleil-waututh, and Musqueam peoples. The City of North Vancouver. The Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Councils are key government partners for us and I look forward to collaborating more and more with them over the coming years. |
| MONOVA                      | MONOVA respectfully acknowledges that we live and work on the unceded territory of the Squamish (Skwxwú7mesh) and Tsleil-Waututh (səl̓ílwətaʔ) Nations. We are grateful to the Coast Salish people for the opportunity to engage, strengthen and inspire our community on this land. |
| North Shore School District | The North Vancouver School District is situated upon the unceded traditional territory of the Skwxwú7mesh Nation and Tsleil-Waututh Nation. We would like to thank the Coast Salish people and value the opportunity to learn, share and grow on this traditional territory. |
| North Vancouver Chamber     | Written with gratitude on unceded traditional territories of the xwməθkwəy̓əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and Səl̓ílwətaʔ/Selilwitulh (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations. |
| CUPE 389                    | I would like to begin by acknowledging that the land on which CUPE 389 office is headquartered on the unceded territory of the Coast Salish Peoples, including the territories of the |
Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil Waututh Nation. We value the opportunity to learn, live and share educational experiences on this traditional territory.

Family Services of the North Shore

Family Services of the North Shore is located on the unceded and traditional territories of the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw (Squamish), and səl̓ilwətaɁ (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations.

Conclusion:
Recognizing traditional territory is often seen as a first step in demonstrating a willingness to learn the truth about our shared past, and, is therefore an appropriate next step for the DNV to take toward advancing the municipal-specific Calls to Action included in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s final report. However, developing such an acknowledgement must be done in consultation and collaboration with the nations whose territories may be included in the acknowledgement. When an acknowledgement has been crafted in consultation with the respective nations, it may be communicated and shared in a number of ways, and protocols for its use provided to both Council and staff.

Options:
1) That the motions, as presented, be supported.
2) That the motions, as presented, are not supported.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Hanson
Councillor

REVIEWED WITH:

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

REPORT TO COUNCIL

February 10, 2021
File:

AUTHOR: Megan Curren

SUBJECT: DNV Support for Provincial Advocacy for Climate Targets

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT Council support the Help Cities Lead initiative by writing letters to Ministers Heyman (Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy), Osborne (Minister of Municipal Affairs), Ralston (Ministry of Energy, Mines, and Low Carbon Innovation), Eby (Attorney General and Minister Responsible for Housing), and Robinson (Minister of Finance) requesting five policy actions which would empower the District of North Vancouver to help align building policy with Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) science to achieve our climate targets;

AND THAT Council send a letter to Metro Vancouver Regional District asking Metro Vancouver to also support the initiative;

AND THAT Council send a letter to all BC Local Governments asking them to support the initiative.

REASON FOR REPORT:
In the District of North Vancouver, buildings account for 41% of community-wide operating emissions (source: CEEP). The District of North Vancouver is committed to lowering our emissions by a minimum of 45% (over 2007 levels) by 2030. (source: CEEP)

To achieve these targets, we must retrofit existing buildings to reduce overall energy consumption (ie. lighting fixtures, windows/doors, insulation), the energy we use must be fossil-fuel free and renewable (ie. not from fracking or burning trash), and the mechanical systems must be highly efficient (ie. heat pumps).

SUMMARY:
We are in a climate and ecological emergency and we must respond at speed and scale.

The Help Cities Lead (HCL) initiative is an education and awareness campaign working to build support for more focused collaboration between the Province of British Columbia and local governments on climate policy for buildings. It is led by Climate Caucus, Members of the
BC Hydro Community Energy Managers Network, and the Pembina Institute. Help Cities Lead identifies a suite of measures that will enable local governments to take effective action on reducing GHG emissions from new and existing buildings.

Five regulatory measures have been identified where additional authority would be instrumental for municipalities in accelerating climate action:

1. **Regulating GHG emissions for new buildings** – The BC Energy Step Code only regulates energy efficiency in new buildings. Leading local governments would also like the ability to regulate GHG emissions from new buildings.

2. **Mandatory home energy labelling** – In Canada and British Columbia, legislation requires energy labelling for a broad range of consumer products including motor vehicles, furnaces, windows, lightbulbs, and kitchen appliances. However, there are no labelling requirements for the single largest purchase a given Canadian is likely to make – their home.

3. **Property assessed clean energy (PACE) financing** – Programs allow property owners to finance the up-front cost of building energy efficiency upgrades – such as more efficient heating systems, or windows – by paying the costs back over time via a voluntary property tax assessment. The assessment is attached to the property, not an individual; if, and when, the property is sold, the financing carries on with the new owner.

4. **Regulating GHG emissions for existing buildings** – This would include the development of a new regulation that would set greenhouse gas emissions targets from existing buildings.

5. **Mandatory building energy benchmarking and reporting** – Energy benchmarking is the process of collecting and monitoring energy data from a large number of buildings over time so that governments and the private sector can compare the performance of any one participating building against similar properties.

Direction to implement the first three of these measures – enabling local governments to regulate GHG emissions for new buildings, home energy labelling, and PACE financing – were included in the ministerial mandate letters issued in November 2020. We must urge the ministers to expedite implementation of these actions and expand them so that municipalities can achieve science-based climate pollution reduction targets.

**BACKGROUND:**
The Community Energy and Emissions Plan (CEEP) that was adopted unanimously by Council recommends the following actions:

- Switch from fossil-fuel energy towards electricity in all buildings;
- Use (electric) heat pumps to electrify existing fossil gas furnaces and hot water;
- Implement a widespread energy efficiency and fuel switching retrofit program for existing buildings;
- Support and advocate for Provincial building energy benchmarking program;
• Accelerate the development, engagement, education and capacity of building programs for building fuel switching;
• Target net-zero ready and zero fossil fuels in all new buildings in key town and village centres; and,
• Support and encourage the installation of decentralized renewable energy (e.g. solar PV) throughout the District.

Modelling completed by Integral Group suggests the Province’s existing building policies will likely only reduce GHG emissions 16 per cent below 2007 levels by 2030, and reduce them just 21 per cent by 2050. Integral then modelled all five measures and determined they would together reduce GHG emissions 33 per cent by 2030 and 63 percent by 2050. If the Province is to achieve its 2030 and 2050 targets, it will need to take measures over and above the five being requested. (source: Help Cities Lead: Impact Modelling of Five Initiatives to Reduce Building Sector Greenhouse Gas Emissions, December 2020.)

The advocacy recommended in this report would not have any impact to the Financial Plan for 2021. If in the future, legislative changes were made, the District of North Vancouver’s climate action staff would begin exploration of these initiatives to focus on building emission reductions. A complete project plan outlining the costs and benefit, including impacts to the Financial Plan, of each initiative would be brought to Council for consideration.

EXISTING POLICY:
Community Energy Emissions Plan (CEEP)

Conclusion:
Provincial policy should support, rather than prevent, municipalities from aligning policy with current science. This suite of five policy actions in the Help Cities Lead initiative would empower local governments to more effectively reduce building-sector greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and in turn help the province meet its 2030 climate target.

Options:
1. That council support sending letters to the Provincial Ministers, Metro Vancouver Regional District, and BC local governments in support of the five policy actions in the Help Cities Lead initiative.
2. That council not support.

Respectfully submitted,

Megan Curren
Councillor
Attachments:
Attachment 1 – Help Cities Lead by Integral Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>External Agencies:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NVRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum &amp; Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

The Government of British Columbia has set legislated targets to reduce province-wide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 40% from 2007 levels by 2030 and 80% by 2050. Building-sector emissions account for about 11 per cent of British Columbia's total GHG inventory. The sector is the third-highest contributor following road transportation (27.1%) and the oil and gas sector (17.6%). At the local government level, emissions from existing buildings contribute between 40 and 60% of community emissions.\(^i\)\(^ii\)

A number of BC local governments have established ambitious targets of their own to significantly reduce GHG emissions from buildings. However, while the Provincial Government’s success in achieving deep building-sector emissions reductions hinges on the success of local governments to achieve their targets, local governments are significantly constrained in doing so. With the exception of the City of Vancouver, which is regulated under Vancouver Charter, the Local Government Act prohibits local governments from enacting their own building regulation, limiting them to the use of informational campaigns, incentives, and other voluntary measures to encourage emissions reductions from the building sector.

Given the constraints on local government action and the current inability of existing provincial policies to achieve the province’s emissions targets, local governments are asking for additional provincial action. A new suite of policy actions is being promoted by BC’s Help Cities Lead initiative\(^iii\), a coalition of local government representatives and non-governmental organizations who have come together to encourage the Provincial Government to expand the authority of local governments to achieve GHG reductions in their building sector.

Purpose of the Report

This report demonstrates the greenhouse gas savings potential of the suite of five policy actions advanced by Help Cities Lead if adopted province wide. The five key measures encompass:

1. Mandatory home energy labelling;
2. Mandatory building benchmarking and reporting;
3. Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing;
4. GHG requirements for new construction; and
5. GHG requirements for existing buildings.

If enabled, these measures would directly support the goals and actions reduce GHG emissions from buildings of all levels of government as well as utilities. They would also demonstrate the BC Government’s continued leadership and commitment to work with local governments to reduce GHG emissions in the building sector in a meaningful way.

Additional information on each of the five measures can be found on the Help Cities Lead website (helpcitieslead.ca), including six briefing notes: one for each of the actions described above, as well as a sixth that explores the integrated suite of actions altogether.
MODELLING THE IMPACT OF ACTIONS

Integral Group modelled the GHG impacts of each of the five actions individually and as an integrated package to help understand the impact on provincial GHG emissions. Five scenarios were modelled:

- **Scenario 1**: Mandatory energy benchmarking & labelling
- **Scenario 2**: Scenario 1 + PACE financing
- **Scenario 3**: Scenario 2 + GHG requirements for new construction
- **Scenario 4**: Scenario 3 + GHG requirements for existing buildings
- **Scenario 5**: Scenario 4 + voluntary efforts

The percentage of GHG emissions savings assumed for each scenario over the business-as-usual forecast are shown in Table 1. Key modelling inputs used to derive these savings can be found in **APPENDIX A: MODELED SCENARIOS**.

Table 1 GHG savings over 2007 levels for Business-As-Usual Forecast and each of the five modeled scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Business-as-usual</th>
<th>Scenario 1 (S1)</th>
<th>Scenario 2 (S2)</th>
<th>Scenario 3 (S3)</th>
<th>Scenario 4 (S4)</th>
<th>Scenario 5 (S5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory energy benchmarking &amp; labelling</td>
<td>S1 + PACE Financing</td>
<td>S2 + GHG requirements for new construction</td>
<td>S3 + GHG requirements for existing buildings</td>
<td>S4 + additional voluntary efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1** shows the modelled total GHG emissions from 2015 to 2050 for the business-as-usual forecast for buildings in BC, as well as the projected emissions for five different scenarios. Each scenario represents a different combination of initiatives intended to reduce GHG emissions in the building sector. Key modelling inputs used can be found in **APPENDIX B: BUSINESS-AS-USUAL FORECAST**. The assumptions used in both Appendix A and B were taken from several different sources, including published government and non-governmental organization reports and the Provincial Government’s Climate Action Secretariat.

Before interpreting the results, it should be noted that the business-as-usual scenario does not include the Province’s “aspirational” goal to implement a standard by 2035 for all space and water heating equipment sold in BC to have a minimum energy performance standard with a coefficient of performance (COP) that is greater than one. This standard, if enacted, would significantly limit the use of natural gas space and water heating equipment and indeed have a major impact on reducing GHG emissions after 2035. However, its aspirational in nature and the 15-year timeline for implementation translated into too low of a confidence level to include it into the model’s baseline.
Figure 1 - Comparison of GHG emissions for the Business-As-Usual Forecast and each of the six scenarios (2015-2050)
**Results**

The modelled results clearly demonstrate that existing provincial measures to reduce GHG emissions will not achieve the Province’s GHG reduction targets for 2030 and 2050.

Of the five scenarios modelled, Scenario 5 comes the closest to achieving the Provincial Government’s GHG emissions reduction targets.

Like Scenario 4, Scenario 5 uses a combination GHG performance requirements for new and existing buildings, mandatory benchmarking and home energy labelling, and PACE financing. The key difference between these two scenarios is that in Scenario 5, voluntary upgrades that result from benchmarking, labeling and PACE financing are assumed to lead to a 4% annual voluntary uptake of retrofits instead of the 2% uptake that is assumed for Scenarios 2-4. This increase was made to demonstrate the level of additional voluntary effort needed to fully achieve the province’s targets.

**Key lessons from these modelling results include the following:**

1. Mandatory benchmarking and labelling on their own are insufficient to achieve deep GHG savings from the building sector.
2. The simultaneous use of PACE financing and mandatory benchmarking and labelling are likely to lead to more significant GHG savings but will still be inadequate to achieve GHG savings at a level needed to achieve provincial government long-term targets (and likely local government targets as well).
3. All things being equal, GHG performance requirements for new and existing buildings are needed to motivate the building sector to take the steps needed to reduce GHG emissions in a timeline that is consistent with long-term climate change targets.
4. The five policies should be considered as an integrated suite of actions to drive deep GHG emissions reductions from the building sector, rather than standalone measures.
5. Even with the full suite of initiatives adopted, it is likely that additional measures (such as incentives, increases in the carbon tax and other steps to raise the price of fossil fuel, the introduction of a heat pump minimum performance standard, and reductions in the cost of low-carbon fuels such as electricity and RNG) will be needed to achieve the 4% annual uptake of voluntary retrofits that was used in Scenario 5 and bend the emissions curve low enough to achieve the Province’s 2030 and 2050 GHG reduction targets for the building sector.

**Conclusion**

The modelling results above demonstrate how the five policy measures advanced by Help Cities Lead would significantly increase the province’s ability to achieve deep GHG savings from the building sector. Without these kinds of measures, it is very unlikely that the province’s GHG targets for 2030 and 2050 will be met for this sector. However, it is important to recognize that BC is a large, varied province covering six major climate zones with considerable market differences between the heavily populated southwestern and south-central regions and its rural communities. Implementation of
province-wide initiatives to decarbonize buildings therefore can take some time to develop and implement.

Given this context, a first important step to implementing these measures would be for the province to enable and then support local governments to opt-in to using them for their own communities when they are ready to do so. Local governments that choose to adopt them would be able to more effectively derive deep GHG savings from across the entire spectrum of the building sector: new and old; large Part 3 buildings and smaller Part 9 buildings; residential, commercial, and institutional. This will ultimately go a long way to helping these local governments achieve their own long-term GHG reduction targets.

The voluntary adoption of these measures by local governments will also provide the Provincial Government and all local governments in BC with important insights into how to design and implement these kinds of initiatives effectively.

In November 2020, the Mandate Letters issued to five different BC provincial ministers included direction to start to implement some aspect of three of the five measures requested by Help Cities Lead: home energy labeling, PACE financing, and a GHG requirement for new construction. This is a very promising start. The province should be encouraged to develop and implement these measures within the next two years.

As demonstrated by the modelling completed for this report, the remaining two measures requested by Help Cities Lead – benchmarking and GHG requirements for existing buildings - will also need to be established as quickly as possible to put the province and its communities on a path to achieve their long-term GHG reduction targets for the building sector. Nearly two thirds of buildings standing in 2050 will be ones that are already built today and opportunities for deep building retrofits are notoriously rare (about once every 15 to 20 years for most buildings), so adopting these two additional measures aimed at accelerating emissions reductions from the existing building sector is critical.

Time is of the essence for implementing all five of the measures included in this report. The sooner they can be adopted by BC municipalities and eventually province-wide, the sooner the Province will be on a realistic path to achieve its GHG reductions targets in the building sector.
APPENDIX A: MODELED SCENARIOS

Below are the assumed action impacts for each of the five initiatives (see Table 2). Impacts are based on average annual savings per building and annual uptake. Figures were gathered from case studies.

Table 2 Assumed impact for each of the five Help Cities Lead initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Name</th>
<th>Applicable Building Archetypes</th>
<th>Annual Energy Savings</th>
<th>Annual Uptake</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Source for Impact Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking (BM)</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Benchmarking not applicable for Part 9</td>
<td>Not applicable for Part 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking (BM)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Savings are additive up to a set cap of 10% energy savings per building 85% is compliance with reg of eligible buildings Assumes 61% buildings are eligible for Stage 1, 85% with Stage 2 (from case studies).</td>
<td>EnergyStar Average Savings⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking (BM)</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Savings are additive up to a set cap of 10% energy savings per building 85% is compliance with reg of eligible buildings Assumes 58% buildings are eligible for Stage 1, 88% with Stage 2 (from case studies).</td>
<td>EnergyStar Average Savings⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Energy Labelling (HEL)</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Uptake is for % buildings renovated, total labelled will be higher</td>
<td>Pembina Energy Labelling Paper⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Energy Labelling (HEL)</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Energy labelling not applied to Part 3</td>
<td>Not applicable for Part 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Energy Labelling (HEL)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Energy labelling not applied to Part 3</td>
<td>Not applicable for Part 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE - alone</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>PACE without labelling will see uptake similar to Toronto (0.02%).</td>
<td>Existing City of Toronto⁷ PACE program. Increased by 2.5x for BC GHG impact modelling purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Name</td>
<td>Applicable Building Archetypes</td>
<td>Annual Energy Savings</td>
<td>Annual Uptake</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Source for Impact Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE - alone</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>PACE without benchmarking will see uptake similar to Toronto (uptake data is before benchmarking in Ontario)</td>
<td>City of Toronto PACE(^{\text{viii}}) before provincial benchmarking program. Increased by 2x for BC GHG Impact Model purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE - alone</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>Assumes similar to Apartment</td>
<td>City of Toronto for apartments used as a proxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE - with BM/HEL</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Scenarios 2-4: 30%</td>
<td>Scenario 2-4: 2%</td>
<td>PACE with labelling will see jump in projects undertaken. Uptake and retrofit savings adjusted to meet 2030/2050 targets.</td>
<td>Scenario 2-4: Average results from City of Toronto HELP program. Uptake assumed to be double of labelling alone - implied in report that improved financing increases uptake, but no concrete figure provided. Scenario 5: increased to demonstrate additional effort needed to achieve GHG targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE - with BM/HEL</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Scenario 2-4: 19%</td>
<td>Scenario 2-4: 2%</td>
<td>PACE with benchmarking will see increase in uptake.</td>
<td>Scenario 2-4: Average results from City of Toronto Hi-Rise program(^{\text{ix}}). Uptake assumed to be double of labelling alone - implied in report that improved financing increases uptake, but no concrete figure provided. Scenario 5: increased to demonstrate additional effort needed to achieve GHG targets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows the year that each of the impacts listed in Table 5 come into effect for business-as-usual forecast and each of the five scenarios.

Table 3 - Schedule that each initiative was applied in order to achieve 40% GHG reduction by 2030 and 80% by 2050

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>BAU</th>
<th>S1: Benchmark/ Labelling Only</th>
<th>S2: PACE + Benchmark/ Labelling</th>
<th>S3: GHG Regs for New + 3 supporting measures</th>
<th>S4: GHG regs for New &amp; Existing + 3 supporting measures</th>
<th>S5: GHG Targets Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking - % Applicable 1st Stage</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking - % Applicable 2nd Stage</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking - % Applicable 1st Stage</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking - % Applicable 2nd Stage</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking - % Applicable 1st Stage</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking - % Applicable 2nd Stage</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Energy Labelling</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Energy Labelling</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Energy Labelling</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Archetype</td>
<td>BAU</td>
<td>S1: Benchmark/ Labelling Only</td>
<td>S2: PACE + Benchmark/ Labelling</td>
<td>S3: GHGRegs for New + 3 supporting measures</td>
<td>S4: GHGregs for New &amp; Existing + 3 supporting measures</td>
<td>SS: GHG Targets Reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC GHGI - Level 1 (2-year savings lag)</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC GHGI - Level 1 (3-year savings lag)</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC GHGI - Level 1 (3-year savings lag)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC GHGI - Level 2 (2-year savings lag)</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC GHGI - Level 2 (3-year savings lag)</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC GHGI - Level 2 (3-year savings lag)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExB GHGI - Level 1</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExB GHGI - Level 1</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExB GHGI - Level 1</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExB GHGI - Level 2</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExB GHGI - Level 2</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExB GHGI - Level 2</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExB GHGI - Level 3</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Archetype</td>
<td>BAU</td>
<td>S1: Benchmark/ Labelling Only</td>
<td>S2: PACE + Benchmark/ Labelling</td>
<td>S3: GHG Regs for New + 3 supporting measures</td>
<td>S4: GHG regs for New &amp; Existing + 3 supporting measures</td>
<td>SS: GHG Targets Reached&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExB GHGI - Level 3</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExB GHGI - Level 3</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: BUSINESS-AS-USUAL FORECAST

2015 Baseline
Using 2015 as a Baseline year, a baseline energy use breakdown was developed for buildings in British Columbia. Total building area for both residential and commercial buildings was taken from the building area provided by the Climate Action Secretariat for the Clean BC baseline modelling. The residential building area was further split into Small Residential and Apartment based on the 2015 Residential Breakdown for British Columbia given in Table 18 of NRCan's Comprehensive Energy Use Database (CEUD)\textsuperscript{x1}.

NRCan's CEUD was also used to define the energy profile for British Columbia's residential and commercial building area. This was based on the following inputs:

- Split of energy use between Space Heating, Water Heating and Other Electricity (Table 2 Residential, Table 39 Residential, Table 2 Commercial);
- Space Heating Breakdown, count by system and total energy by system (Table 5 Residential, Table 21 Residential, Table 24 Commercial);
- Split of energy use Apartment versus Small Residential (Table 6 Residential); and
- Water Heating System Split (Table 10 Residential, Table 28 Residential, Table 26 Commercial).

**BC Energy Step Code**

Table 4 shows the model's assumptions with regards to the province-wide adoption of the BC Energy Step Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Year Implemented - Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Equipment Replacement**

Each year, a percentage of existing buildings and mechanical equipment is modified for the following reasons:

- Existing buildings are demolished and replaced with new buildings with applicable Energy Step Code energy performance levels.
- Existing space heating and water heating equipment at end of life is upgraded and replaced with more efficient equipment.

Table 5 shows the assumptions used for the rate of modification at different points in time. 2015-2030 rates were provided from the BC Climate Action Secretariat. 2030-2050 rates were calculated to achieve a 100% replacement by 2050. Of the modified area, it was assumed that 20% of this area would be classified as demo and be replaced with new, and 80% would be assigned as equipment modification.

Table 5: Annual Building Area Modified (% of 2015 Baseline Area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2025</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-2030</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030-2050</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 2015 Building Area Modified by 2050</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The annual modified building area was divided between the floor area for different space heating types according to the baseline projections provided by the Climate Action Secretariat for the CleanBC baseline modelling. This provided the split for space heating systems up to 2030. The percent split provided for 2030 is applied to subsequent years up to 2050. The percentage split between space heating systems for residential and commercial buildings from 2015-2015 are shown in Table 6 and
Table 7, respectively.

Table 6: Building Modification Split by Space Heating System - Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Natural Gas</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Electric Resistance</th>
<th>Electric Heat Pump</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2025</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-2030</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Building Modification Split by Space Heating System - Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Natural Gas</th>
<th>Electric Resistance</th>
<th>Electric Heat Pump</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2025</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-2030</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same approach and ratios were used to define new building area, both from net new floor area and demolished and replaced area. However, for new construction oil and wood space heating systems are not included.

**Space and Water Heating Equipment Upgrades**

Table 8 shows the space heating EUI improvements applied to existing buildings modified. Baseline performance was assumed to be equivalent to the 2015 EUI developed using NRCan's CEUD\textsuperscript{xii}. Improvements then are based on the difference between this baseline and the space heating EUI for BC Energy Step Code Step 1 from the supporting dataset established for the BC Energy Step Code Metrics Report\textsuperscript{xiii}.

Table 8 Assumed Improvement to Space Heating Energy Use Intensity after Upgrade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Space Heating System</th>
<th>Improved Percentage of Space Heating EUI at time of replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Elec Res</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Elec HP</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Elec Res</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Elec HP</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Elec Res</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Elec HP</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 shows the forecasted floorspace for each major building types at three points in time 2015, 2030, and 2050. 2015 and projections for 2030 were provided by the BC Climate Action Secretariat. Projections for 2050 are based primarily on projected population growth from BCStats\textsuperscript{xiv}. The split between single family dwelling and apartment was based on NRCan’s CEUD\textsuperscript{xv}.

Table 9  Forecasted total building area (m\textsuperscript{2}) by archetype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SFD</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>219,873,345</td>
<td>60,577,350</td>
<td>102,178,742</td>
<td>382,629,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>260,642,715</td>
<td>72,995,281</td>
<td>141,420,482</td>
<td>475,058,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows the baseline distribution of space heating equipment for each of the three major building types at five-year intervals, starting in 2015. Forecasted business-as-usual heating equipment inputs are based on the assumptions applied to new construction and modified buildings as discussed above.

Table 10  Baseline Area split by space heating system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Elec HP</th>
<th>Elec Res</th>
<th>Natural Gas</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Wood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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