
From: Robyn Hay
Sent: November 03, 2021 11:45 AM
To: Robyn Hay
Subject: FW: Riverside Site - Metro Vancouver Housing Project

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: October 29, 2021 12:15 PM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>
Subject: Riverside Site - Metro Vancouver Housing Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DNV. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor & Council,

I don't think I will have time to comment before you this coming Monday on Agenda Item 8.2 – I will probably feel more need to comment on 8.5...

And with the assumption that you would proceed to Public Hearing anyway, I will still have time to comment on this proposal.

But at this time I will share with you some of the public statements/comments I have made on the subject so you can digest them into your own thoughts on the proposal.

Now, I already sent this to you before:

Dear Mayor and Council,

At your last meeting I came before you to recommend that you vote to express your interest in partnering with Metro Vancouver Housing on a project and I suggested that you pick any other site than “site 1”.

One of the arguments I presented was that site 1 is, according to your own (“your” meaning the District’s own) information, part of Maplewood Park.

Here is the explanation of the site from the staff report:

This staff report material makes two claims:

- 1) That the OCP Designates these property lots as RES-6. I am sorry to point out to you, but that does not appear to be exact. Here is the image for those lots from the OCP Land Use Map. One of the lots (the most eastern one – is designated as Residential Level 6, and the other 3 are designated commercial/residential level 2.
- 2) While the OCP Landuse Map (which does not reflect current zoning) does show the properties as next to the park, your more accurate resources show these lots as a part of the park.

This is from the DNV parks website: <https://www.dnv.org/recreatio.../find-all-district-parks-map>

Here is the information from your own GeoWEB portal: <http://www.geoweb.dnv.org/properties/...>

Here is the zoning (current) for lots 1-4:

Each lot is the same zoning.

Now, I am aware that both staff and members of Council have made comments that there is some “eye of the needle” legal argument that this is not a park. I am writing to suggest to you that, here, just shy of 12 months from the next Local Election, that threading that needle will be difficult and for no reasons other than:

- 1) Your own parks department says these lots are Park.
- 2) Your own Geoweb map says these lots are Park.

3) The current zoning of these properties are Park.

4) Your own bylaws call for a District Referendum to be held before un-dedicating park space (which could be held concurrent with the election)

5) Your website does not appear to offer ANY other information other than that these lots are, in fact, PARK.

So how is the public supposed to figure this out?

So your options, insofar as I can see them are:

1) Choose another (preferably brownfield) site.

2) Hold said referendum in October 2022 (would probably deter MVH from accepting our “bid”)

3) Attempt (yet again) to use the AAP (how did that hold with the public the last time it was used?)

I wish you luck in threading that needle. Personally, if it were me, I would choose another site.

The last thing I want to point out is this: ingress/egress to this potential site (site 1) can only be accomplished (without breaching the brand-new separated bike lanes on Riverside) by cutting down even more trees and building an alley-way to the east. This will mean more costs, more re-zonings – and the question is – do you intend to run that “alley” all the way to align with Forrester? Or would you re-dedicate and re-zone other DNV-owned lots for this alley-way?

Note – the costs to the taxpayer to build this alley-way and to provide services to these lots would be substantial – but there would be ZERO costs to provide access and servicing to the St. Denis property or to soon-to-be-available Firehall #2’s old site. Also, both sites are closer to the still-in-SD44-use Lynnmour School.

Best Regards,

Here are some subsequent comments:

well the key word here is “designated” - I have already had feedback from members of Council that these lots are not “Designated Park” as that involves some special process of Council at some point in the past.

But who can find out about that process? It’s not on DNV.org. My message to Council will be:

If it looks like a duck. And quacks like a duck.

Guess what? IT’S A PARK!

I haven’t been shy in saying that I have no faith in Metro Vancouver as an organization to manage much of anything. Personally, I absolutely support creating affordable homes inside town centres - but I don’t really trust Metro to be the ones to deliver it. I would have more confidence to have DNV partner with BC Housing and a partner than to give control to Metro Vancouver.

I admit that is my bias, based on how I see them mis-manage so many other aspects of their portfolio.

But I can learn - do you know of Metro Vancouver housing projects that have been well managed from concept to occupancy?

Staff did not even explain in the public meeting what Metro’s contribution would be - and even after I asked in the meeting, no one followed up to explain. I expect that will come out in the public meeting.

Soooo... I have commented that this site is “Park” and some have tried to explain to me “it’s not a REAL PARK”, or something to that effect.....

Lol... you can’t make this up....the FIRST LINES of the staff report for Monday’s meeting:

RECOMMENDATION

THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1414 (Bylaw 8538)" to rezone the subject site from Park, Recreation and Open Space to Comprehensive Zone 139 (CD139) be given FIRST reading;”

If I had a mic, I would drop it.

Note: why is this important? Because we have a process that to rezone (Un-dedicate) parkland requires a district-wide referendum.

People have explained to me “no, that referendum is required only for (legally) dedicated park space” but when your own website has ZERO information on what that means, how can the public know the difference?

But here is the great opportunity! Without too much delay (12 months) we can have that required District Wide Referendum on un-dedicating this as parkland during the October 2022 Local General Election. That would “cleanse” this tainted status and process, wouldn’t it? If the PEOPLE vote to use this parkland as affordable housing, then there would be zero controversy. Then my only concerns would be”

- 1) the plan for Maplewood Park/The Spirit Trail going forward.
- 2) the reliability of Metro Vancouver to be the partner on this.
- 3) retaining title to the land by granting leasehold only.
- 4) the costs to provide ingress/egress and utilities to this site versus the other options.

My preference: build MORE affordable housing units on the soon-to-be-abandoned Firehall#2 site on Mountain Highway in Lynn Creek.

Thank you... Feel free to talk amongst yourselves.... TOPIC: When is a duck actually a park?

Discuss .

“Riverside Site” Rezoning Application

Virtual Public Information Meeting Summary Report

Event Date: November 5- 15

Website: DNV.org/public-meeting

[REDACTED]

I am supportive of this project. I would like to understand how traffic and sidewalks along Riverside, particularly at the intersection of Old Dollarton and Riverside, will be managed and updated. As currently configured, the intersection is not pedestrian-focused, and I feel that it will need to be updated to accommodate the increased foot traffic from this site. I am also curious to understand if the additional district-owned properties that were studied as potential candidates for this development in the area will also be developed soon. It seems like a great opportunity to add needed housing for modest incomes in the neighborhood. Good work on a well-intentioned project!

hayr

Staff response: Thank you for your comments. Should the project advance, it is anticipated that upgrading and widening on the Riverside Drive road frontage of the site will be undertaken to accommodate a bike lane, sidewalk, and boulevard improvements as a separate District capital project. The format of the road would reflect the objectives in the Maplewood Village Centre Implementation Plan and Design Guidelines, including opportunities to improve pedestrian safety and comfort and details of the road design would need to be resolved through a future development permit process. With regard to the use of other District sites for housing, Council directed staff to prepare development scenarios on several District-owned sites that could be considered for affordable housing. District staff anticipate returning to Council with an update in the next few months.

[REDACTED]

This sounds like a great project. In terms of the height/density, I would suggest go for the maximum. This is an important social housing project. The Maplewood Area Plan states that heights will be increasing in adjacent areas to the same or larger. Six stories on a busy road of Riverside Drive seems sensible. I wouldn't advise less stories because of some feeling that it's too high, as I believe Mayor Mike Little was quoted in the North Shore News as saying. I'm not sure if this is the position or not, but it's an illustration of focusing on some vague idea of being that might lead to fewer social housing units rather than on maximizing such units. It's a great neighbourhood for density being so close to Northwoods village. However, traffic, especially now along Old Dollarton is a huge issue. Continued improvements to the road and transit system are needed. This social housing and Tsleil-Waututh Nation developments should be supported while other projects in the area should be carefully considered given gridlock at some times of the day. In terms of the site, it's a good one as its not pristine nature and appears to have been used for something before. Overall, I strongly support 90 social housing units on this site.

hayr

Staff response: Thank you for your comments.

[REDACTED]

How many parking lots are anticipated for this development? and What's your proposed plan for the access road connection? Is it going to connect the Old Dollarton Road or Riverside Drive?

hayr

Staff comment: Thank you for your comments. The proposed CD139 zone requires a minimum of 0.50 residential spaces per studio or one-bedroom unit, 0.65 residential spaces per two-bedroom unit, 1.10 residential spaces per three or more bedroom unit, 0.10 visitor spaces per unit, and 1 space per 40 m2 of gross floor area for social gathering use. As this is a District-led rezoning application there is no developer applicant or housing partner at this time. Should the project advance, many of the details such as unit numbers and unit mix would be resolved through the Development Permit process and secured in the required lease agreement with a housing provider. It is anticipated that redevelopment would entail a six-storey apartment building with one level of underground parking. This form of development could accommodate approximately 60-90 rental units. Vehicle access to the site would be provided via a new north-south lane from Old Dollarton Road, located near the east side of the property, as envisioned in the Maplewood Plan.

Hi there, I am deeply concerned about this development as this will remove a vast swathe of forestry. Urban development is responsible for an increasing rate of urban deforestation, and, given the current climate and mental health crisis, it is crucial that we preserve that which remains. Developers in the area have removed and plan to remove large amounts of trees that are older than this city that sequester an incomparable amount of carbon compared to the seedlings used as replacement, and the loss of natural beauty in the area is detrimental to human mental and physical health. There are an increasing number of scientific studies and articles that speak to the importance of preserving natural landscapes and features, especially in urban environments, as increased rates of depression, anxiety, respiratory diseases and similar conditions have been linked to lack of exposure to wilderness and concentration of buildings, in particular high-rises, and vehicles. I am also concerned about how you define "affordable", as too often this is used as a marketing technique and is not in fact "affordable" for the vast amount of people who work minimum wage or close to. People who have lived here their whole lives are now having difficulty finding a place to live. Rent prices are increasing congruently with development, and inversely, mental health and protections of wildlife, forestry, and natural resources are decreasing. I feel that policy change regarding how much companies can charge for rent would be more affective at securing "affordable" housing. There has been a massive influx of people to the area and a great decrease in forestry in the last few years, and this has put a great deal of strain on the wildlife in the area. Birds and other animals are becoming more pressed for access to food and shelter due to habitat loss. We have even had bears in the area and on our Riverside Drive property. We must respect those in our community who are non-human, and understand that we have a duty to protect them, most especially in this time of crisis. This box on the map currently supports hundreds of thousands of lives. Do we have the right to destroy these homes for a few tens of human beings? On the opposite side of Riverside Drive, there is a massive amount of ancient trees that were once protected by this city when the previous owners asked to remove them. Thankfully, they were denied. However, now, with a much wealthier company coming forward, this city has agreed to allow almost a hundred old and beautiful trees to be killed and removed during development. I am deeply concerned about this unhealthy behaviour when it comes to destruction of local wilderness and wildlife, and I question the incentives behind these projects. I ask the District of North Vancouver to please reconsider how it is managing urban deforestation, and to initiate an inquiry into the accumulative effects of localised deforestation, where each individual property owner has the right to remove every tree on the land and replace it with a few seedlings, if that. This is not sustainable, and given the climate and mental health crisis we currently face, it is integral that we take preservation of the natural world seriously. I thank you for your time, and I look forward to a response so we can discuss these highly important issues further.

hayr

Staff response: Thank you for your comments. The site is located outside the environmentally sensitive area identified in the Maplewood Lands Environmental and Hydrogeological Assessment Report. Environmentally Sensitive features include wetlands, riparian areas, steep slopes, and mature forest (ecosystem at risk). Here is a link to report for your reference -

<https://www.dnv.org/sites/default/files/edocs/maplewoods-environment-report.pdf>. The site is located in Environmental/Hazard Development Permit Areas (DPAs) for Protection from Creek Hazard, Protection of the Natural Environment, and Streamside Protection. Any future development of this site would be reviewed against and be required to comply with the applicable development permit guidelines at the development permit stage. It is also noted that tree replacement would be required as part of the site redevelopment. Three replacement native trees would be required for every large diameter or protected tree removed. Rents would be established through the lease agreement with a future non-profit housing provider at levels that are appropriate for low to moderate income households in the District with before-tax incomes ranging from \$30,001 to \$85,170.

Hi there, Just want to know if the development being considered is modular in form or not? Any details regarding the final development form would be appreciated. Thanks

hayr

Staff response: Thank you for your comments. As this is a District-led rezoning application there is no developer applicant or housing partner at this time. Should the project advance, many of the details such as building design and siting would be resolved through the Development Permit process and secured in the required lease agreement with a housing provider. The proposed CD139 zoning does not preclude the potential for modular construction.

Thanks for the reply. Could you please confirm that there will be no Public Hearing session for this application? IE, this forum is the only opportunity to provide comment, as subsequent design will be based on the DP process and will therefore not be subject to public comments - is this correct? I am opposed to a modular housing form at this location, that's my only comment, thanks.

hayr

Staff response: Thank you for your comments. Following the closure of this virtual Public Information Meeting, a Public Hearing will be held for the proposed rezoning bylaw. The Public Hearing is currently tentatively scheduled for November 23rd. The date of the hearing will be confirmed within the next week. If the site is rezoned, a Form and Character Development Permit would subsequently be required which would consider things such as building setbacks, relationship to the street, overall design, materials etc. There would be another Public Information Meeting as part of the Development Permit process. The Development Permit would then be forwarded to Council for consideration. The public would have an opportunity to provide additional input at the Public Information Meeting on the Development Permit, as well as at the Council Meeting at the time of Council's consideration of the project.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [DNV Input](#)
Subject: Riverside Drive Rezoning
Date: November 22, 2021 6:08:43 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DNV. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Council,

On this National Housing Day 2021, in advance of the November 23 public hearing, I write you in support and with encouragement of the rezoning of your land on Riverside Drive, solely for the purpose and consideration of a not-for-profit supportive housing project.

Subsidized social housing for low to moderate income households is a critical missing piece from our housing continuum, at least in quantities that would begin to make a difference in our community. It is not enough to say that you have "already" approved projects at Sanford, Delbrook and 16th Street. Nor is there time to say "there must be a better location than here?" There is no time to waste. We must forge forward in decisions that solidify partnerships that will reflect housing as a cornerstone and foundational human right in communities and increase available social housing inventory.

This rezoning opens the door to a MetroVan Housing project application for our municipality. The housing model used in MV projects helps build up inventory for households most in need, and for households at risk of displacement through demovictions at the many remaining older purpose built rental properties. Furthermore, MV has long established successful projects that build and unite the tenants of their buildings into tight-knit and supportive communities which are so very needed in a world full of division, vitriol and hatred. MetroVan (and other supportive housing) provides SECURE rental for families, without fear of eviction for landlord purposes.

Three years ago I sat at a fireside chat in Lynn Valley Library with Mayor Walton and asked him why it was that CNV had four MetroVan housing projects and DNV had none. He hemmed and hawwed and said that ultimately the land DNV owned where a project could be accommodated was a bit off the beaten path and not really near transit or other amenities. As Maplewood begins to see a town centre take shape, we can see that the site suggested for rezoning is not too far from amenities at all. Most importantly, we can gain social housing units WITHOUT displacing residents from homes. For me, that will always gain a nod.

Council, rezone this property and take one more baby step towards this key partnership project and towards social equity for ALL citizens of our fair city.

Thanks for your consideration,

Kelly Bond

From: [REDACTED]
To: [DNV Input](#)
Subject: Riverside site social housing, support bylaw amendment 8538
Date: November 22, 2021 9:35:39 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DNV. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear DNV

I write in support of the bylaw amendment 8538 to permit the proposed

Riverside site social housing.

Kindly be advised that my husband Themba E. Tana and I have lived and owned our house [REDACTED] for over 33 years .

I feel that this amendment will contribute to a more diverse and vibrant community and quality of life for all of us who live in the DNV.

By way of background, kindly note that I have been variously a member, vice chair and Chair of the BC Environmental Appeal Board from 1992- March 2000; whilst working as a practising lawyer helping injured workers with their workers' compensation claims since 1980 .

Thank you for your consideration of our support. If you require further information, kindly feel free to contact me at the above email.

From: [Janice Dungate](#)
To: [DNV Input](#)
Subject: Written submission Public Hearing Nov 23 21 - Unaddressed Lands E Riverside, N of Old Dollatro, S of Maplewood Park
Date: November 23, 2021 5:39:04 PM
Attachments: [Written Submission from Janice Dungate NVD Public Hearing Nov 23 21.docx](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DNV. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Municipal Clerk, District of North Vancouver

Attached, please find my written submission for the Public Hearing as outlined above being held tonight (Nov 23 21 at 7 pm).

Please advise if you have received this submission. Thank you.

Janice Dungate



Written Submission from Janice Dungate, [REDACTED]

Public Hearing – November 23 2021 – Unaddressed Lands East of Riverside Drive, North of Old Dollarton Road and South of Maplewood Park: PID:013-881-931, 013-881-922, 013-881-914 AND 013-881-906

I have **no objection** to zoning bylaw amendments for this property regarding the **use for affordable homes**. This is needed east of the Seymour and I support the use of district land for this purpose.

What I **object to** is the following:


1. Discussions of **six storeys**; and the potential density that this would bring to this area. There are no six storey buildings now and the most recent developments have been four storey or less.
The character of Maplewood is lower heights and if this site is approved for six storey buildings then all the ones waiting to come next will also be asking for a six storey building. Four storey or less is what is most appropriate and considering the six storey building at 600 West Queens – Delbrook Lands was not approved – then this should be a consideration for this property as well.
2. **Access to this property** to/from Riverside Drive is not a good idea – have you been sitting on Riverside Drive waiting to turn east onto Mt. Seymour Parkway?? It is often backed up to this parcel of land – this needs to be considered as a secondary access not a primary access.
3. **Riverside Drive** is also narrow and does not have sidewalks on both sides of the street. If people living on this parcel of land walk to/from shopping at Stong's or Canadian Superstore for groceries and the pharmacy, how will they walk safely on the west side of Riverside? You may say cross at Riverside and Mt. Seymour Parkway, but again this is narrow and where is the infrastructure for buses and pedestrians **to access this parcel of land safely**.
4. Parcels of land in Maplewood are being considered for development – where is the **VISION** for this area – where is the partnering with Tsleil-Waututh and Darwin for the Maplewood North Lands? How can we continue to REACT rather than **PLAN** – now is the time – don't rush because of a grant deadline – ensure that this is the right decision for the whole area not just 1 parcel of land. It took many months and even years to decide the outcome for Delbrook Lands – give the same thought and consideration for this parcel of land to be part of a great development of land, land use and to start growth of a vibrant community that has suffered over the year with neglect.
5. **Bicycle access** is also limited due to safe access to this parcel of land – Riverside is too narrow for dedicated bicycle lanes along the full length – think of the infrastructure and build into any re-development a viable pedestrian and bicycle route for this parcel of land and for other areas of Maplewood before it is too late. Help us get out of our cars by doing the right thing in development!
6. This is currently a **greenbelt** and with the potential loss of more greenbelt in this area and to the east – the setback should be well defined and the greenbelt needs to be maintained as much as possible so that the native animals to this area have a corridor of safety and a place to live, eat and breed.

Respectfully submitted: November 23, 2021 – 5:35 pm

From: [Cristina schwegler](#)
To: [DNV Input](#)
Subject: Zoning bylaw amendments...riverside dr
Date: November 23, 2021 8:00:28 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DNV. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

 I am all for affordable housing but to take park space away to make that happen does NOT make sense.. for many reasons!

Please find another location!

Sent from my iPad

From: [Genevieve Lanz](#)
To: [DNV Input](#)
Subject: FW: Tonight's Public Hearing re: Bylaw 8538
Date: November 24, 2021 12:17:04 PM

Forwarded for the record.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: November 23, 2021 8:51 PM
To: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>
Subject: Tonight's Public Hearing re: Bylaw 8538

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DNV. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mayor and Council,

Apologies for this very brief input.

My concern is that if this is to be 'affordable housing', **all costs to be born by either the DNV or the developer/proponent must be considered.** In my opinion, in the haste to fit within Metro Van's timeline, some of the costs related to this particular site are not being recognized.

Katherine Fagerlund

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]