

**DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**1510 – 1530 Crown Street and 420 – 460 Mountain Highway  
Zoning Bylaw Amendments**

REPORT of the Public Hearing held on Tuesday, December 7, 2021 commencing at 8:45 p.m. 2021 in the Council Chamber of the District Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, British Columbia.

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

**Absent:** Councillor B. Forbes

**Staff:** Mr. M. Hartford, Manager – Development Planning  
Ms. G. Lanz, Deputy Municipal Clerk  
Ms. S. Clarke, Committee Clerk  
Ms. S. Dale, Confidential Council Clerk  
Mr. D. Veres, Senior Development Planner

---

**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 bylaw 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*.

Mayor Little stated that:

- Council will use the established speakers list. At the end of the speakers list, the Chair may call on speakers from the audience;
- Each speaker will have five minutes to address Council for a first time and should begin remarks to Council by stating their name;
- After everyone who wishes to speak has spoken once, speakers will then be allowed one additional five minute presentation;
- 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 bylaw under consideration this evening;
- If a written submission has been provided, there is no need to read it as it will have already been seen by Council. It can be summarized, ensuring that the comments are pertaining to the bylaw under consideration at this hearing;

- All members of the audience are asked to be respectful of one another as diverse opinions are expressed. Council wishes to hear everyone's views in an open and impartial forum;
- Council is here to listen to the public, not to debate the merits of the bylaw;
- Council may ask clarifying questions;
- The Municipal Clerk has a binder containing documents and submissions related to the bylaw, which Council has received and which members of the public are welcome to review, available online at [DNV.org/agenda](http://DNV.org/agenda).
- Everyone at the hearing will be provided an opportunity to speak. If necessary, the hearing will continue 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;
- The Public Hearing is held via Zoom and recorded in accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

## **2. INTRODUCTION OF BYLAW BY CLERK**

Ms. Genevieve Lanz, Deputy Municipal Clerk, introduced the proposed bylaw, stating that Bylaw 8505 proposes to amend the District's Zoning Bylaw by rezoning the subject site from Single-Family Residential 6000 Zone (RS4), Single-Family Residential 4000 Zone (RS5) and General Commercial Zone (C7) to a new Comprehensive Development Zone 136 (CD136). The CD136 Zone addresses permitted and accessory uses and zoning provisions such as density, amenities, setbacks, height, building and site coverage, landscaping, storm water management, flood construction requirements, and parking, loading and servicing requirements.

## **3. PRESENTATION BY STAFF**

Mr. Darren Veres, Senior Development Planner, provided an overview of the proposal elaborating on the introduction by the Deputy Municipal Clerk. Mr. Veres advised that:

- The proposal includes 205 strata units, 170 market rental units, and 45 non-market rental units for a total of 420 residential units;
- The proposal also includes ground-floor commercial space, and a childcare facility in the heart of Lynn Creek Town Centre;
- This project is adjacent to and interrelated with Fairborne's Marie Place project;
- Bylaw 8505 rezones the site from RS4, RS5, and General Commercial Zone C7 to Comprehensive Development 136 Zone;
- The property is located on the north-side of Crown Street and the east-side of Mountain Highway directly adjacent to Fairborne's Marie Place project;
- The site is approximately 2.4 acres and comprises the Dykhof Nurseries commercial site) and five single-family lots;
- The site also includes a 1,664 sq. ft. area of the existing Fire Hall #2 site and an abutting 6,077 sq. ft. road allowance proposed to be purchased from the District of North Vancouver;
- The proposed sale of these lands is subject to Council's approval of Bylaw 8509;
- The OCP designates the site as Commercial Residential Mixed-Use Level 3 (CRMU3) which envisions high density uses with a mix of commercial and residential development at a density of up to approximately 3.5 Floor Space Ratio (FSR);

- Zoning for the site is currently a mix of single-family RS4 and RS5 and Commercial C7 and the site is proposed to be changed to a new Comprehensive Development Zone 136 tailored specifically to this project and the proposed density of 3.5 FSR;
- The project has been reviewed against OCP and addresses the following goals and policies:
  - Concentrates new retail and services in the Town Centres;
  - Encourages and facilitates a wide range of multi-family housing sizes;
  - Focuses a higher proportion of affordable housing in designated growth areas;
  - Contributes to the provision of affordable housing; and,
  - Encourages and facilitates a broad range of housing types including non-market housing;
- The project has been reviewed against the Targeted Official Community Plan Review Action Plan and addresses the following Priority Actions:
  - Priority Action #1: Achieves compact Town and Village Centres;
  - Priority Action #3: Prioritize rental, social, and supportive housing;
  - Priority Action #5: Increases housing diversity and accessibility needs within Town and Village Centres;
  - Priority Action #6: Creates a connected network of walking and cycling routes; and,
  - Priority Action #8: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from buildings and transportation;
- It also addresses the implementation lens for social equity through the inclusion of non-market housing units and accessible housing units;
- The project has also been reviewed against and is consistent with the Lower Lynn Implementation Plan and the Lynn Creek Town Centre Public Realm Guidelines;
- The Plan envisions:
  - A new North-south lane at the east-side of the site which would connect Crown & Hunter Streets;
  - The town centre plaza;
  - A connection from the plaza to Marie Place Park to the east; and,
  - The Green Spine is intended to run north-south along Marie Place and connect with the expanded Marie Place Park;
- The project includes ground-level commercial space which fronts Mountain Highway;
- Atop the podium are two mid-rise buildings, a seven-storey market rental building with 143 market rental units, and an eight-storey mixed market and non-market rental building with twenty-seven market rental units and forty-five non-market rentals units;
- At the south end of the site is a twenty-four storey strata residential building extending along Crown Street and this building contains 201 apartment units and four ground oriented units facing Crown Street;
- Above the commercial podium is a rooftop outdoor amenity area for residents of the two rental buildings;
- At the rear of the property is a new lane to connect Crown Street at the south and Hunter Street at the north;
- Accessed from this lane is a surface parking area and entrances to two underground parking areas;
- A new pedestrian connection is proposed between the commercial podium and the base of the twenty-four storey building to connect the parking courtyard at the rear with Mountain Highway;
- The town centre plaza is at the north end of the site and a smaller plaza facing Mountain Highway further south;

- There are separate residential lobby entrances for the market rental, non-market rental, and strata homes;
- The layout of the ground floor includes a mix of spaces including a 23,000 sq. ft. space designed to accommodate a local grocery store, a 10,000 sq. ft. space intended for a child care provider, and a range of smaller commercial spaces that could be considered for independent retailers;
- The grocery store will be secured in the development covenant for the initial occupancy and a minimum of ten years to ensure this type of retail is given a reasonable opportunity to become established in the town centre;
- An amenity space for residents of the rental buildings is located in the north-east portion of the site to take advantage of the frontage on the future pedestrian connection to the east;
- The project has been reviewed against the District's Residential and Affordable Housing Strategy and the project meets several goals including:
  - Expanding the supply and diversity of housing;
  - Expanding the supply of new rental housing; and,
  - Minimizing impacts to tenants;
- The project consists of market rental units, non-market rental units, and strata units and it provides 215 rental units and it does not displace any residential rental tenants;
- The project consists of 45 non-market units, 170 market rental units, and 205 strata units for a total of 420 units;
- The total of 215 rental units in the project constitutes just over 51% of the total housing units, with strata homes comprising the remainder;
- 53% of the units are in a two or three-bedroom layout, which are considered suitable for families;
- The project proposes forty-five non-market rental units to help address housing challenges for low to moderate income households with pre-tax incomes of between \$30,000 and \$85,000;
- Rents for the proposed non-market units range from:
  - \$1,280 for a one-bedroom unit – considered affordable to a household with an income of just over \$51,000 per year;
  - \$1,664 for a two-bedroom unit – considered affordable to a household with an income of approximately \$66,000 per year; and,
  - \$2,129 for a three-bedroom unit – considered generally affordable to a household with an income of just over \$85,000 per year;
- The non-market units would be considered affordable for households with incomes in the low to moderate income range of \$30,001-\$85,170;
- The housing agreement would secure all of the market and non-market rental units as rental and secure the rental rates and eligibility criteria for the below-market units;
- The parking proposal includes 425 parking stalls for residential purposes, which includes 29 stalls for visitors and 39 stalls for commercial purposes;
- Bicycle parking proposed includes a total of 805 spaces, for a ratio of 1.9 bicycle parking spaces per residential unit, with an additional 56 spaces for the use of commercial employees, patrons, and visitors;
- The project includes a number of features intended to reduce private vehicle travel demand including pedestrian and cycling improvements on Mountain Highway and Crown Street, bicycle parking and maintenance rooms, two car share parking spaces, and an end-of-trip bike facility for commercial tenants and visitors;
- To ensure clarity in the requirements for commercial and visitor parking including child care, an amendment to the CD136 Zone will be proposed to clearly indicate the need

for thirty-nine commercial parking spaces, and twenty-nine visitor parking spaces some of which may be shared with commercial uses;

- The applicant has considered the project phasing to assist in early delivery of the project elements with the greatest public benefit;
- Phase 1 includes the commercial space (with childcare), market-rental housing, and non-market rental housing, underground parking garage, and a new laneway;
- Phase 2 includes the strata condominium building;
- Construction of both phases could occur at the same time but occupation of Phase 1 would occur first;
- The project involved two Public information meetings which were held on July 11, 2018 and November 7, 2018;
- Approximately 206 notices were delivered in the neighbourhood for each event;
- The July 11<sup>th</sup> meeting was attended by approximately fifteen residents and the November 7<sup>th</sup> meeting had attendance of approximately eleven residents;
- Topics of discussion and comments at the meetings included the parking proposed in the project, the mix of uses, construction timeline, the cost of the dwelling units, and local traffic challenges;
- Supportive comments noted the need for a grocery store in the area and an appreciation for the design;
- The proposal would meet Step 3 of the BC Energy Step Code and include a Low Carbon Energy System (LCES) for all of the residential components of the project;
- The applicant is proposing a fossil fuel free mechanical design for these components;
- The commercial component of the project would comply with Step 3 of the BC Energy Step Code in accordance with the District's recent updates to the Construction Bylaw;
- To assist in current and future needs for electric vehicle charging, the revised proposal includes the provision of energized outlets for Level 2 charging in all residential parking spaces;
- To assist in addressing concerns with the use of concrete as a construction material, the applicant has committed to using fly ash concrete in the project which avoids the use of some of the more carbon-intensive components in a typical concrete mix;
- The applicant has committed to the use of green roofs for the two mid-rise buildings;
- This project would provide substantial land dedications for roadways including:
  - The creation of the new 8m wide north-south lane at the east side of the property;
  - Dedications on Crown Street and on Mountain Highway for improved transit service and streetscapes including new bicycle infrastructure and a weather-protected transit stop; and,
  - Plaza space and Pedestrian Mews connecting the plaza to the expanded Marie Place Park;
- The project will contribute the following housing amenities, off-site works, land, Development Cost Charges (DCCs), and Community Amenity Contributions (CACs):
  - 45 non-market rental units and 170 market rental units;
  - Off-site works currently estimated at approximately \$1,969,800;
  - Land dedications totaling approximately 1,552m<sup>2</sup> (16,700 sq. ft.);
  - DCCs on 170 market rental units and 205 strata units estimated at \$3,727,331;
  - CACs of \$2,500,000;
  - Road Sale of \$2,200,000; and,
  - Plaza Area of approximately 4,000 sq. ft.;

- The applicant advises that the sustainability and consultant team will be reviewing the energy transfers closely during the detailed design process to optimize efficiency of design where feasible;
- The applicant advises that the prospective childcare operator would be part of the \$10/day program;
- The applicant advises that every residential suite will have heat recovery ventilator installations for efficient and effective operation of the designed system and to minimize effects of thermal bridging, the applicant will work closely with their sustainability and consultant team to optimize the building envelope design;
- While not envisioned in the commercial space on this site, non-profit and social service type uses would be permitted under the definition of office uses in the CD136 Zone; and,
- This project has been referred to the Squamish Nation following the District's standard notification process and are aware of the public announcement for development on the Squamish Nations lands in the area and will coordinate this project.

#### **4. PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT**

##### **4.1. Ms. Vicki Chou, Vice President, Fairborne Homes:**

- Spoke to the history and context of the proposed development;
- Spoke to the evolution of the project highlighting the following changes:
  - Increased rental housing;
  - Height reduction;
  - Improved sustainability;
  - Transportation demand management strategies; and,
  - Community contributions.

#### **5. REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

##### **5.1. Ms. Lara Winston:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal.

##### **5.2. Mr. Sylvain Celaire:**

- Spoke on behalf of MODO in support of the proposal;
- Noted that the proposed development would allow future residents to join MODO's car sharing program for free; and,
- Commented that the site is in a central location and will help to reduce vehicle dependency.

##### **5.3. Mr. Paul Dean:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Spoke on behalf of CEFA Early Learning; and,
- Commented on the child care and learning space in the proposed development.

##### **5.4. Mr. Don Peters:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal on behalf of the Community Housing Action Committee (CHAC);
- Commented on the need for more affordable housing options;
- Noted that the outdoor space provides a gathering space and sense of community;

- Commented on the close proximity of the development to amenities and transit;
- Commented that the proposed development satisfies the vision of the Official Community Plan and the District's Rental and Affordable Housing Strategy;
- Highlighted that the development will provide accessible units and a proposed childcare; and,
- Opined that more housing supply will provide residents with more affordable housing options.

**5.5. Mr. Peter Salvador:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal; and,
- Commented on the opportunity for the community to have CEFA Early Learning in the area.

**5.6. Mr. Jason Wexler:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Spoke on behalf of Hollyburn Family Services Society;
- Commented on the shortage of safe and secure affordable housing options;
- Opined that the location is attractive with immediate access to parks and transit and amenities such as grocery stores and childcare; and,
- Commented that the proposed development will provide an inclusive community.

**5.7. Ms. Pippa Henrichsen:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Commented that the proposed development will enhance the neighbourhood;
- Commented on the close proximity to childcare and grocery amenities; and,
- Acknowledged that the plaza space is an important component of the proposal.

**5.8. Ms. Alexandra Stevens:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Spoke to the benefit of having a childcare facility within walking distance;
- Commented on the need for available childcare on the North Shore; and,
- Opined that the proposed development will create a well rounded community.

**5.9. Mr. Patrick Stafford-Smith:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Commented that the proposed development is near public transit and employment housing;
- Spoke to the benefits of childcare and park space; and,
- Opined that the proposed development will complete the community.

**5.10. Ms. Josephine Little:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Opined that the project is well-designed;
- Opined that the Lower Lynn area is a good location for high density projects;
- Commented on the close proximity to public transit;
- Spoke to the built-in neighbourhood amenities; and,
- Commented that residents would not need a vehicle to access these amenities.

**5.11. Ms. Charlotte Connor:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Noted that Fairborne Homes were responsive to the District's energy emission goals;
- Commented that the area will be a safe and walkable community;
- Commented that alternative modes of transportation are encouraged;
- Noted the close proximity to amenities;
- Applauded the developer on the emphasis of health and well being; and,
- Noted that the proposal is for a low carbon project.

**5.12. Mr. Barry Fenton:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal on behalf of the Community Housing Action Committee (CHAC);
- Commented that amenities are vital in Town Centres;
- Suggested that higher density in this area will allow for a complete walkable community;
- Acknowledged that the pedestrian core improved;
- Commented that the proposed development will provide a range of housing options;
- Highlighted the benefits of having a grocery store and childcare space in this area;
- Spoke favourably of purpose-built rental units;
- Opined that affordable housing is a focal point of the project; and,
- Acknowledged that the proposal would meet Step 3 of the BC Energy Step Code and include a Low Carbon Energy System.

**5.13. Ms. Judith Brook:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Acknowledged that the proposal would meet Step 3 of the BC Energy Step Code and include a Low Carbon Energy System;
- Recommended the use of heat pumps;
- Suggested exploring low carbon concrete alternatives;
- Requested that conduits be installed to allow for future solar panel connection;
- Stated that childcare is needed in the area;
- Noted that the grocery store is a good addition to the area; and,
- Suggested that the rental buildings should be occupied first.

**5.14. Mr. James Roberts:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Noted that he is a business owner and acknowledged challenges of housing availability on the North Shore;
- Expressed concern with transportation issues;
- Stated that more housing supply where residents can work and live in the same community is important;
- Commented that the proposed development will be a complete and walkable community;
- Opined that there is a good range of housing options that will suit the needs of a variety of people in the community;
- Noted that a grocery store and childcare facility are beneficial; and,



- Spoke to the challenges of residents forced to leave the North Shore.

**5.15. Mr. Peter Teevan:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Questioned the future plans for the Fire Hall #2 site and the plan for the community in its entirety;
- Opined that high density is not always more affordable;
- Opined that the heart of the Lynn Creek Town Centre is a good location for this project;
- Suggested that the CACs should be used to secure units for those with disabilities in order to work and live in the community;
- Commented on the close proximity to a grocery store and transit;
- Opined that the proposed affordable rent seems reasonable and questioned if the amount includes utilities and parking;
- Suggested that the Local's First Program may contradict the District's Residential Relocation and Tenancy Policy; and,
- Expressed concern with the proposed parking ratio.

**5.16. Mr. Corrie Kost:**

- Noted that the affordable housing component is only applicable to 11% of the units and questioned if it is possible to raise this to 20%;
- Questioned how many affordable rental homes would be displaced by this development;
- Questioned under what conditions could the covenant on the affordable units be nullified;
- Questioned if the proposed affordable rent include utilities and parking;
- Questioned how much additional parkland is being provided for the approximately 1000 residents introduced by this development; and,
- Questioned how this project helps meet the goal of affordable rental demand.

**5.17. Resident, 400 Block Mountain Highway:**

- Spoke in support of the proposal;
- Opined that the proposed development will revitalize the community;
- Highlighted the benefits of having a grocery store and amenities, parks, and cycling connections in the area;
- Expressed concern with construction noise and damages to vehicles from construction; and,
- Spoke to the inconvenience of construction for residents already living in the area.

In response to questions from Council, Mr. Hartford and Mr. Veres provided the following answers:

**Are there minimum and maximum sizing on the commercial units?**

The proposed zoning does not set minimum and maximum sizes for the commercial units. The proposal includes a range of commercial unit sizes from the smallest of approximately 1,100 sq. ft. to two larger commercial units of approximately 9,400 sq. ft. and 10,000 sq. ft. The configuration of the building means that it would be unlikely that the units would be consolidated into larger

units. The development covenant for the site will require a general retail layout as shown in the proposal.

**Will strata unit insurance be attainable given that the area is in a flood plain?**

There are buildings completed in the Lynn Creek Town Centre area that have strata unit insurance in place; however, staff have not been given any indication that attaining insurance is any more difficult than buildings in any other locations in the District. There will be a Flood Hazard report required and confirmed as part of the Development Permit process and the Building Permit process and a minimum flood construction level will be set for this proposal.

**What will happen to parkades in the event of flooding and how does the District deal with potentially hundreds of cars contained in a flooded parkade?**

The parkade entrances to this building and any other building in Lynn Creek or any other Flood Hazard area are designed to resist some overland flow that would help the building be resistant to a modest flood. In a catastrophic flood it is possible that the parkade could be inundated with water. The design of the building is such that the mechanical equipment is kept out of the parkade areas to avoid damage for this reason and there would have to be an emergency management approach for this building and any other building in Lynn Creek to ensure that parkades are vacated before that event took place.

**What is the construction build out timing for both the Crown Street and Marie Place projects?**

The applicant advised that a Building Permit will be secured at the earliest possible date and hope to commence construction on both sites by Summer/Fall 2022. The estimate construction time for the Mountain Highway project is approximately 30 months and the construction time for Marie Place is approximately 25 months. For the Mountain Highway project the applicant is committed to providing the 225 rental building first and delivering these rental homes as early as possible.

**In the staff presentation the day care was identified as available for \$10/day daycare. During the public presentations CEFA was identified as a tenant of the project. CEFA is not know as a low cost model, with many spaces around \$60-\$70 per day, will the entire program be low cost, or only a limited number of spaces?**

The applicant has advised that the proposed childcare operator would be part of a \$10/day childcare program that would be a subset of the number of childcare spaces on the site and would be income tested. The number of spaces has not yet been determined as it is in the early stages and qualification for application has not yet been established. The operator is offering a Child Care Fee Reduction Initiative (CCFI) fee cap initiative and will offer any government subsidy programs that the families would qualify for.

**The staff presentation indicated two of three buildings would have green roofs while the applicant's presentation (as well as the renderings in the staff presentation) indicated all buildings would have green roofs. Can staff please confirm that all buildings will have green roofs?**

All three buildings will have green roofs as outlined in the Council report.

**What type of cooling system is proposed?**

The mid-rise residential buildings will not have a cooling system. The high-rise buildings are proposed to be equipped with heat pumps, which would be capable of cooling the units and be electrically powered. The applicant further advised that even with high efficiency baseboard heaters none of the units would overheat and it would meet all building codes and living requirements and that all residents would be comfortable in their units.

**Describe which common property services will be included for non-market tenants such as parking, bike storage, vehicle parking and utilities.**

- Access to amenities spaces in the building and the rooftop areas;
- Estimated car parking rental per stall at a rate of \$100 per month;
- Estimated monthly cost of utilities such as heat and hot water is between \$45 and \$75, depending on unit size and use;
- Estimated monthly cost of water is between \$15 and \$25 per unit;
- There is no storage in the proposed design; and,
- Bike storage has not been determined at this time.

**It appears that the affordable housing component is only applicable to 11% of the units. Is it possible to raise this to a more realistic 20%?**

District staff have discussed a number of options with the applicant and the applicant proposal is for the mix of housing types currently proposed. Staff are happy to encourage applicants to provide more non-market housing. In this case, 11% of the units are proposed at non-market rent in addition to a significant component of the project as market-rentals.

**Under what conditions could the covenant on the affordable units expire?**

The non-market rental units as well as the market rental units in this project are both proposed to be secured through a housing agreement which is accommodated by the two separate housing agreement bylaws. These are secured in perpetuity although it is intended that for the life of the building these non-market units will be secured as well as the market units.

**How much additional parkland (especially Neighbourhood Parkland) is being provided for the approximately 1000 residents introduced by this development?**

There is no specific parkland contribution associated with this project. The project will pay for development cost charges which includes a parkland component which the District can use to buy parkland as it sees fit.

**How does this project help meet the goal of affordable rental demand as stated on page 420 of the “Additional Information.pdf” file?**

This project proposes to provide 45 non-market units at a significant discounted rent as well as 170 market rental units.

**MOVED by Councillor BACK  
SECONDED by Councillor BOND**

THAT the Public Hearing held on December 7, 2021 is authorized to carry on beyond 10:30 p.m.

**CARRIED**

**5.18. Mr. Corrie Kost, SPEAKING A SECOND TIME:**

- Questioned if the windows will be double or triple glazed;
- Suggested that higher priced homes tend to increase the housing stock in the area;
- Commented that existing homes are generally more environmentally friendly than new development; and,
- Commented on the environmental impacts of building materials.

**Can we investigate the issue of coal dust in the area?**

This is the first that the District is aware of any coal dust in the area but are aware that there are some impacts from nearby Port activities. Air quality complaints are generally directed through Metro Vancouver as the regulatory body. Staff can direct the resident appropriately to making a complaint to Metro Vancouver and staff can report back to Council in the future on air quality in the District.

**Will the buyers of these units be made aware that they are adjacent to an industrial area?**

The District does not have a specific policy regarding a nuisance covenant. The mixed-use residential area is expected to be very comfortable in the longer-term future. There is some potential for slight impact from noise in the light-industrial area to the west of Mountain Highway and is a different impact than the heavy-industrial area to the south.

**6. COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

**MOVED by Councillor CURREN  
SECONDED by Councillor HANSON**

THAT the December 7, 2021 Public Hearing be closed;

AND THAT "District of North Vancouver Rezoning Bylaw 1409 (Bylaw 8505)" be returned to Council for further consideration.

**CARRIED**  
(10:36 p.m.)

**CERTIFIED CORRECT:**

  
Confidential Council Clerk