The District of North Vancouver
INFORMATION REPORT TO COUNCIL

May 7, 2018
File: 08.3060.20/037.17

AUTHOR: Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner

SUBJECT: PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING: TRAVELODGE REZONING

REASON FOR REPORT:

The purpose of this report is to inform Council of an upcoming Public Information Meeting.

SUMMARY:

The Marvel Group are holding the required facilitated Public Information for rezoning the Travelodge site located at 2050 Marine Drive. The staff report on the detailed application will include a summary of the input received.

An Early Input Opportunity for Council will be held in the coming weeks.

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING DETAILS:

Date: May 23, 2018
Time: 6:30-8:00pm (Doors open at 6:30 and presentation is at 7:00pm.)
Location: Grouse Inn, 1633 Capilano Road

SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA:

The application includes 4 commercial properties currently occupied by the Travelodge Hotel, the Pho Japolo Restaurant, Denny’s Restaurant and the parking lot for the Earl’s restaurant (the restaurant itself is located on a neighbouring lot in West Vancouver).

The site is an integral part of the Lions Gate Village core as it proposes to complete the Curling Road park and both vehicle and pedestrian connections in the core area.
The site is currently designated Commercial Residential Mixed Use (CRMU Level Two - 2.5 FSR) in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The Lower Capilano Marine Village Centre Implementation Plan envisions the site for residential use with a tower and additional low rise and townhouse buildings.

Surrounding properties include the Grouse Inn development site to the east, the LARCO project and Belle Isle projects to the north and DARWIN's West Vancouver application to the west.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The proposed rezoning site includes a 29 storey residential tower, two residential low rise buildings (4-6 storeys) and a mix of family oriented townhouse units (2-3 storeys). One of the low rise apartment buildings is a purpose built affordable rental building with approximately 34 affordable units (or approximately 10% of the project’s gross floor area/unit count).

The proposal also includes the design and construction of a new public park located on Curling Road. This project’s land dedication for park will add to the park dedication from the Grouse Inn site and create a new park that includes an adventure playground as well as a green space for passive recreation. The park will connect the greenway trail (provided by LARCO) to the new bus stop plaza (provided by the Grouse Inn).

![Artist's rendering, view from the south with Marine Drive in the foreground, the project includes a 29 storey tower and a 4 storey affordable rental building next to Marine Drive and a 6 storey building and public park next to Curling Road as well as land dedication for roads and pedestrian improvements.](image-url)
The proposed site plan includes road dedication for widening Curling Road and Marine Drive, extending Glenaire Drive and connecting to the new east west road that services the properties along Marine Drive. In addition, land is being provided for the new public park and for new north-south pedestrian connections to Marine Drive.

FORMAT OF MEETING:

An independent facilitator will oversee the scheduled Public Information Meeting. Public input and a summary of the facilitated public information meeting will be forwarded to Council in the staff report at Council’s consideration of the detailed application. A copy of the meeting notification package is attached.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION:

1. The Notification Flyer for the Public Information Meeting has been sent to a larger than typical notification area (400m instead of 100m) and has also been translated into Farsi recognizing that more than half the residents of Lions Gate have Farsi as their mother tongue;
2. Two notification signs have been erected onsite (facing Marine Drive and Curling Road); and
3. A newspaper advertisement has been placed in two editions of the North Shore News.

Tamsin Guppy
Development Planner

*Attachment: Notification Flyer*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWED WITH:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Community Dev.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Operations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Fire Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk’s Office</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ NS Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ RCMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ NVRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Museum &amp; Arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING REPORT

To: Tamsin Guppy, Planner, District of North Vancouver E: guppyt@dnv.org
    Samantha Potter, Projects Manager, Brook Pooni Assoc., E: spotter@brookpooni.com

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

Re: Public Information Meeting Summary for Marvel Group Travelodge Project

Date: May 24, 2018

Event Date: Wednesday, May 23, 2018
Time: 6:00 PM – 8:30 PM
Location: Grouse Inn, 1633 Capilano Road, North Vancouver

Attendees: Fifty-two (52) members of the public signed in to the meeting

Comment Forms: Twenty (20) comments forms were received at the meeting

Notification

PIM Notification Flyers
• 1,017 notification flyers were mailed on May 9, 2018. In addition, 50 notification packages were hand delivered to homes on McGuire and Garden Avenue (highlighted area purple in Canada Post map in Appendix), and 20 packages to Woodcroft.

Site Signs
• A PIM site sign was erected on May 10, 2018 notifying the community of the meeting

Newspaper Advertisement
• A quarter page colour ad ran in the North Shore news on May 16 and 18, 2018

Attendees: 52 members of the public attended the meeting, In addition, the following project team members, and District of North Vancouver staff were in attendance.

District of North Vancouver
Tamsin Guppy, Planner, District of North Vancouver

Project Consultants
Community Engagement: Samantha Potter, Sophie Perndl, Kara Matheson, Brook Pooni Associates
Development Management: Barry Savage, Three Shores Development
Architecture & Urban Design: Andrew Browne, Stuart Jones, Farnaz Abed, IBI
Landscape Architecture: David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture
Transportation Engineers: Mladen Pecanac, IBI

Facilitator
Catherine Rockandel, Rockandel & Associates
PRESENTATION SUMMARY

The Official Community Plan (OCP) designates this site as Commercial Residential Mixed Use 2 (CRMU2). The application as submitted proposes approximately:

- 208 owned (condominium) units in a 29-storey tower with adjacent townhouses
- 56 owned (condominium) units in a six-storey building with adjacent townhouses
- 35 affordable rental apartments in a four-storey building
- Two floors of underground parking and a new public park are proposed.

To support public engagement in the meeting a sign language interpreter was provided and presentation boards handouts were translated into Farsi.

**Key Themes**

Twenty (20) comment forms were received at the meeting, of which fourteen (14) individuals expressed support for the proposal and six (6) did not indicate support but provided comments. There was no (0) individuals that indicated they were opposed to the development.

The key themes heard in the facilitated Q&A were also reflected in the comment sheets. Some individuals mentioned more than one theme in their comments.

- Twelve (12) comment forms focused on mixed housing and affordability issues including consideration of more market rental and senior housing
- Seven (7) comment forms focused on traffic issues in the area including some comments related to bus movements that impact traffic congestion
- Two (2) comment forms about parking in the local area including suggestions for changing parking orientation on Curling Road
- Two (2) comments forms focused on the Marine Drive interface with development including sidewalks and open space improvements.

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

**Q1**  I am confused because on the map I see Marine Drive at the bottom and Curling Road and Lions Gate Crescent in between. Isn’t Lions Gate Crescent the new road that is extending into Hope and is there going to be a traffic light there? What about the buses that were expected to be coming in there?

**A1**  (Tamsin Guppy) The Lions Gate Village Centre Plan was done in conjunction with the neighbourhood back in 2013 and it tries to show how the core area in Lions Gate will build out as individual applications come in. Town Centre plans are just a vision for how that redevelopment might work. As you get the different parts of the jigsaw, they actually tie in together. The site we are talking about today includes the Travel Lodge Hotel, the Denny’s restaurant, the Pho restaurant and the Earls parking lot. The actual Earls restaurant is in the West Vancouver municipality and is being developed by somebody else. Any buildings that are on Marine Drive frontage can’t have their lobby entrances there because of the HOV lane and the fact you can’t stop in a bus lane. We then needed to think of another way of providing access to those buildings and that is why you have an internal road. It also means you can have a very pedestrian friendly street. This site is
between Marine Drive and Curling Road and it has a road that connects to Glenaire and also connects to a new road that is currently a service road being used for truck deliveries. Curling will ultimately connect onto McGuire but that will only happen if and when the Comfort Inn and Best Western choose to redevelop.

Q2  Are they going to provide some stops or depots for the buses? I would like to understand how that works.

A2  (Tamsin Guppy) There is an existing bus stop on the south side of the Grouse Inn and Grouse Inn’s application includes a widening of this bus stop and the development of a new public plaza. That application has been approved and they are going through the building permit process right now. They will probably start construction later this year or early next year. The application we are discussing tonight is right next door so we didn’t need or ask for another bus stop. We will be getting better pedestrian connections. People coming from Woodcroft will be able to come straight down Glenaire and down a public path. For those, in the future that will be living in the Belle Isle developments or in the Larco project there will be a greenway trail that comes down. We are working on the landscape plan so that there will be a nice connection through the park and down the eastern side to bring you to Marine Drive as quickly as possible.

C3  I am concerned about the parking and traffic. If you have extra lanes as a perimeter to the development you have open space that could be used for vertical parking. All the parking on top is parallel. If you turn them 90 degrees and add another lane for backing up into the lane before Curling Road you could go from 12-15 feet of parking to 35 feet of parking. It is still open space but it would be double the parking. You should also think about the future and the possibility of wanting to widen that road. If you make that extra lane right now with vertical parking that would become possible. If you get future developers to do this as well maybe eventually an additional lane could be added to Marine Drive. The traffic is already bad and it is just going to get worse when the village project is completed.

A3  It comes down to extra street parking. Currently there is street parking along Curling Road and along the Crescent. Parking was placed according to city plans so we have been forced to place them where they decided they were to be. We agree there are other opportunities to increase the street parking but it comes down to the District approved parking locations.

Q4  Will you provide housing for people with disabilities and those who are homeless? I see you will offer 35 discounted units but what does that mean? Is that intended for those people or other kinds of people?

A4  The discounted or subsidized rental is proposed to be provided at CMHC Level 2. That is a 35% discount from average rents for any given unit. This is based on average rents for purpose built rental.

The District has a policy for enhanced accessibility requirements and adaptable unit requirements. The project will meet all of those requirements.
I am happy to see that there is more densification and more multi-family densification happening on the North Shore. It gives some of us that grew up on the North Shore a chance to move back. Yes, densification brings more traffic issues but hopefully we will have some good resolutions for that. Overall, I am happy and impressed to see some diversity in housing stock because that has always been lacking on the North Shore.

I want to applaud the District for working with the proponent to ensure that purpose built rental is included in this project and the fact that this is affordable purpose built rental. On the North Shore we have a nearly zero vacancy rate and this is persistently continuing. We need to build more purpose built rental here on the North Shore and in the District. The reality is that we need to get away from cars and the future is less cars and not more of them. Because of this, I wouldn’t get too hung up on the parking.

I take the bus and the bus trip from that bus stop to downtown takes about 20 minutes.

I know densification is happening all over the world but my concern at the moment is the fact that you are increasing densification by stealth and we are now going up to 29 stories. Can you please tell me where I can see a 29 storey apartment building in North Van district at this time?

Seylynn by Second Narrows Bridge has several towers between 24 and 32 stories. In terms of density, this project isn’t any denser than it was when it was shorter. We just squeezed it because we have a bigger park and more roads and now an affordable housing building. The market condo part remains at the same square footage it is just in a different shape.

When I phoned the District, the person on the front counter was not aware of any 29 stories or higher buildings so you might want to make sure that your people at the District know. My concern is that we will have a forest of towers. The woman at City Hall was very helpful in explaining density to me. We hear at these meetings that there is going to be lots of parks for children but where are these children going to go to school?

This area is within the Capilano and Norgate Elementary School catchments and both schools have space in them. At the current time Capilano elementary also has the IB program in it to keep the number of students up to be able to keep the doors open. Schools are funded by the number of students not by the school itself and that is why some schools were closed in the past.

It is my understanding that Capilano Elementary is full but that there are spaces at Norgate. I would think the majority of children would have to go to Norgate.

We live in the Woodcroft building and I had a problem finding a school near this area so it is a huge problem for parents. Lions Gate Bridge is already so busy and I don’t understand how the District can approve having more tall buildings, I just feel it is going to be a disaster. If Lions Gate Bridge was bigger there would be no problem but three lanes and so many people traveling to downtown is going to be a huge problem.
C12  I think this is a huge opportunity for millennials and people who are looking to be part of community and invest in the community where they can give into the community. If you look between the borders there is not really anything that we feel we could be a part of. I think this is an addition to the community and it is just going to bring benefit to the community.

C13  There is a valid concern about traffic and public transportation. I think there is lack of communication between the City and the residents of the Lower Mainland in general and the municipalities all together. We can’t just increase the traffic to a point where people are forced to get rid of their cars and use public transportation. I know it is extremely hard to get funding for public transport but we are not creative at all. There are all kinds of things that could be done with Lions Gate Bridge, there could also be more Sea Buses. It seems tax payers don’t want to pay more for public transport because they don’t understand why they have to. There seems to be a lack information and communication.

A13  Translink is currently planning the B Line along Marine Drive and is due to open September 2019. The B Line goes across the North Shore and you would have to transfer to go downtown. There is also a plan to increase the Sea Buses.

C14  The transportation plan is to have Curling cross over to McGuire where there will be lights on Marine Drive to bypass Capilano and Marine. The problem is the motels withdrew their applications so there is no Curling crossing Capilano at this time. The timing for this project is wrong. You are going to put these towers in with nowhere to go. You won’t get out of Curling because Curling will not cross until the hotels put their applications in.

A14  (Tamsin Guppy) As a municipality, one of the things we are obligated to consider is how we house our own residents. We have many wonderful single-family homes but they are expensive and not always great for seniors. We need to look at what our housing options are and that includes more apartments to compliment the single-family homes. We could put those anywhere but we tried to focus on town centres where there are services and buses so that some of those people wouldn’t have to buy a second car and could sometimes possibly catch the bus. Right now, the adjacent bus stop has a bus every two minutes during rush hour which is better than anywhere else on the North Shore. That is why we focus development in places like this. The long-term vision is that we provide other ways out. Glenaire is already open so you can drive up to Fullerton and across. We are currently working with the owner of the other property, with the hopes of opening up a piece to create this link in the shorter term. We are still trying to play through when this could happen. This application being discussed today is still at its early stages and hasn’t even started the Council process. We are at least four or five years out so we do have some time to achieve some other linkages.

C15  You didn’t let the people know where the buses will ultimately be going on McGuire. Currently buses coming off the Lions Gate Bridge go up Capilano Road and the ones coming down go down Garden. They are all to go on McGuire once the hotels put in their applications.
A15  (Tamsin Guppy) In the implementation plan, that is what we explored with Translink. We are currently having more workshops with Translink to see if we might be able to have the buses on Capilano Road. In the short term, we can still continue to use Garden Avenue.

C16  In the OCP, the tower was supposed to be tapering down so it was supposed to be 19 stories not 29. The public was presented with an OCP that they approved in 2011 at 19 stories. I still think it needs to be lowered.

Q17  I didn’t get an answer to my question and am still wondering why we can’t have a setback along Marine Drive for all new development? It would leave 20 feet for a bus stop. It is for public transportation not parking. Then when the bus stops the traffic can flow by.

A17  (Tamsin Guppy) The developer is prepared to give up land for roads and road improvements. You are right that we need more land to make our roads work better. We ask developers when they go through rezoning to give up land for that purpose. 29% of this site is already being proposed for roads.

C18  They are giving more land to the north side and they want to make it green. Why don’t they give it to Marine Drive so when the bus parks, traffic can flow on the bridge?

A18  (Tamsin Guppy) We have people that want to ride safely on Curling so we want enough land that we can have a shared bike lane on Curling Road. We agree that better traffic flow is needed and are working hard on a variety of measures to make that happen over time.

Q19  Will you make crossing at Capilano and Marine safer for pedestrians? Maybe with a ramp or overpass?

A19  (Tamsin Guppy) The implementation plan of 2013 was a best guess but as each application comes in, we work harder to improve. We listen to comments and try to adjust. What we have now for the Grouse Inn is land dedication that they have given up to get a whole extra lane. We have tried to address the design of this crossing and there is a ramp to get across and it will be a fully accessible intersection. Every new intersection we do will have ramps down. We are also looking at tactile strips for those people with visual disabilities. We work with organizations like the Rick Hansen Foundation to try to improve our public realm and make our communities as inclusive as possible. We find that people feel safer with wider and safer sidewalks with shops’ looking onto them instead of using a pedestrian overpass that is closed in, especially at night.

(Traffic Engineer) Another option is to increase the traffic light times for pedestrians to cross as well.

C20  We have serious problems right now with traffic jams on Capilano and Marine Drive. To me, a simple solution would be to allow cars coming south on Capilano to turn first and then allow the green lights to turn from north going south, that way they wouldn’t create a traffic jam. That is the problem now and then when you start to use Curling for moving all the development vehicles and work, it is going to be a huge problem. There is not adequate space for the vehicles, you need an extra lane which you don’t have.
A20  I believe the District is planning on having a south bound left turn lane in the future that would allow better operation of the signal. The signal timings can be tweaked to improve the operation.

C21  That is something that should be done right now.

C22  The concept of overhead walkways were in the first iteration that came out for the Village. The District removed the overhead walkways because they didn’t want to pay for them. Everything here is being paid for by the developers and the District didn’t want to put in any more money and put in the walkways.

C23  Every time I come to these meetings I hear you talk about shops at street level. I have been very disappointed with the development of the shops along Marine Drive. There are essentially no shops along Marine Drive. If we are talking about the future, many people are already using online shopping so we won’t be using shops. There will be no need and there will be no lights of shops shining on Capilano Road as there aren’t already on Marine Drive. It is a dead area and you aren’t going to be able to generate stores, they are going to disappear. I think it might be good if by the time we get to the next iteration you can think of a different way of describing what is going to happen here.

Q24  Have you thought about helping the NDP with the process of lowering the price of housing for first time buyers? Have you thought about doing anything besides the 35% rental? That is much lower than what I had in mind. I thought they were going to build up a huge complex of rental apartments in this area. If you are going to do this, maybe 50-60% of them should have to be rental to help with the housing problem.

A24  In terms of the market units, we don’t’ know what price we will be offering them at. We don’t know what programs we are going to offer. We have at least 18 months of a City process to go through so it is far too early to decide on that. With regards to the rental, the buildings that are under construction right now, the Larco buildings, they are 100% rental.

C25  I am interested in hearing about any plans moving forward that the City may have in regards to helping first time home buyers
Please Join Us

The Marvel Group is hosting a Public Information Meeting for our proposal in Lions Gate Village. Located at 2050-2070 Marine Drive, the proposal is for one 26-storey tower, one 6-storey and one 2-storey building which includes 22 ground oriented townhomes, office and amenity space.

**DETAILS**

- **Date:** Saturday, May 27, 2017
- **Time:** 10:30 - 1:00 pm (drop-in)
- **Location:** Grouse Inn Meeting Room
  1633 Capilano Rd
  North Vancouver
- **Online:** Information boards will be available online on May 27 at http://www.brookpooni.com/resources/

**MEETING LOCATION: GROUSE INN**

*Please note: this information package is being distributed to residents within approximately 400 metres of the proposed development site, in accordance with District of North Vancouver policy.*
The Public Information Meeting will:
- outline key elements of the proposal (such as housing options and public realm improvements),
- present building designs (including building illustrations), and
- provide an opportunity to ask questions of the consultant team.

DESIGN CONCEPT

SITE MAP

QUESTIONS?

Tamsin Guppy
Planner, District of North Vancouver
t: 604-990-2360
e: guppyt@dnv.org

Samantha Potter
Projects Manager, Brook Pooni Associates
t: 604-731-9053
e: spotter@brookpooni.com
APPENDIX: Farsi Notification (page 3)
APPENDIX: Canada Post and Hand Delivery Distribution Area
Public Information Meeting #2

A redevelopment is proposed for the properties located at 2050-2070 Marine Drive and 2000 Curling Road (the Travelodge site) to allow a 29-storey residential tower, a 6-storey residential building, and a 4-storey purpose-built subsidized rental building. Please join us at our second Public Information Meeting to review the updated proposal and share your thoughts.

Marvel Group is proposing to rezone the properties into a Comprehensive Development Zone to permit approximately 236 market residential units, 26 townhomes, and 35 purpose-built subsidized rental units. This revised proposal responds to public feedback and includes an increase in the tower height to allow for a larger public park and rental housing.

Public Information Meeting Details

Date: Wednesday, May 23, 2018
Time: 6:30 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. Presentation at 7:00 p.m.
Location: Grouse Inn Meeting Room (1633 Capilano Rd, North Vancouver)

Information packages are being distributed to residents within approximately 400 meters of the proposed development site. If you would like more information please contact Sophie Perndl at Brook Pooni Associates at 604-731-9053 or Tamsin Guppy at the District of North Vancouver at 604-990-2391.

Please note: this is not a Public Hearing. DNV Council will receive a report from staff on issues raised at the meeting and will formally consider the proposal at a later date.
APPENDIX: Site Signage
Developer’s Public Information Meeting #2

Revised Proposal:
A 29-storey residential tower, a 6-storey residential building, a 4-storey purpose-built subsidized rental building, and an expanded public park. Included would be a range of residential units including townhomes and rental housing.

May 23, 2018 6:30pm – 8:00pm (presentation at 7:00pm)
Grouse Inn Meeting Room
1633 Capilano Rd

Applicant Contact:
604-731-9053 x 114

This meeting is required by the District of North Vancouver as part of the regulatory process.
Dear Mayor & Council,

I note from the 2018 Campaign Sources of Financing database available that the following donations took place to Building Bridges Elector Organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRIBUTOR_NAME</th>
<th>Developer/Realtor?</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>DIRECTOR_1</th>
<th>DIRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAHIM FAKHARI</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>9/24/18</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARA FAKHARI</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>9/26/18</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has reported to me that these two individuals are involved in the tonight’s application organization – Marvel Group.

According to LinkedIn – Rahim Fakhari is Marvel Group’s CEO.
According to Zoominfo – Sara Fakhari is listed as Marvel’s Vice-President.

Nothwithstanding the fluid nature of Campaign Finances and Conflicts of Interest in British Columbia, will the Councillor who represents Building Bridges do the honourable thing, and recuse themselves from the debate and vote?

Sincerely,

Peter Teevan
## DNV Development Under the Current OCP - Housing Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>OIC</th>
<th>OIC</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Under</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>By</th>
<th>Consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe Home</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Housing</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Housing</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Care &amp; Disability Care</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Rental</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership - Co-op</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership - Co-Housing</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Income Ownership</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Additions</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Care &amp; Disability Care</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek House</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Studio</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnished Room/Rentals</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Apartments</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family/Detached</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS                         | 5,873| 5,873| 1,254 | 619 | 305 | 562 | 283 | 5,873 | - | 727 | - | 727 | 0.3% | 1,079 | 447 | 1,176 | 44 | 6,910 | 60.2% | 1,465 | 8,385 | 503 |

Last Data Refresh: Mid May 24, 22

April 22: HDO shows 5,997

Show Data as of: 5/10/22

Start of OCP: 1/01/21
## DNV Development Under the Current OCP - Housing Continuum

| Category | Unapproved | Under Construction | Approved | Development Permit Approved | TOTAL | Rezoning Pending | Pending | Public Hearing Pending | Pending | 1st Reading Pending | Pending | Before Council | Approved | Percent Built | Council | Final Read | Anticipated | Total in Process | In Process | Estimated Remaining | OCP Units Anticipated | Remaining OCP New Units | Rejected by Council |
|----------|------------|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|---------------------|--------|---------------|----------|--------------|--------|-------------|---------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Safe House | IN | 26 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Emergency Housing | IN | 27 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Senior Care & Disability Care | IN | 23 | - | - | - | 40 | 60 | - | - | - | - | - | 0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Transitional Housing | IN | 18 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Single-Family Detached | IN | 941 | 70 | 148 | 10 | 210 | 94 | 594 | - | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64% | 34/44 | 6 | 69 | 73 | 71.3% | 267 | 1,000 | 2,658 | 82 | - | - |
| Ownership - Co-op | IN | 143 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ownership - Co-Housing | IN | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Affordable Home Ownership | IN | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Apartments above Shops | IN | 20 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Senior Care & Disability Care | IN | 228 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Church Houses | IN | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Secondary Suites | OUT | 400 | 90 | 90 | 18 | 180 | 90 | 510 | - | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| For Lease & Rentals | IN | 1,259 | 789 | 42 | 156 | 17 | 3,157 | - | 217 | - | 217 | 664/100 | 64 | 500 | - | 2,458 | 105.8% | (1,042) | 1,600 | 2,458 | 89 | - | - |
| Studio Apartments | IN | 1,271 | 2,244 | 641 | 179 | 55 | 3,292 | - | 216 | - | 216 | 664/100 | 64 | 500 | - | 2,458 | 105.8% | (1,042) | 1,600 | 2,458 | 71.4% | - | - |
| High-Rise Apartments | IN | 3,105 | 350 | 38 | 366 | 15 | 706 | - | 133 | - | 133 | 44 | 44 | 44% | 34/44 | 34 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 95.4% | 1,859 | 5,180 | 3,261 |
| Dual-Use, Townhouses, etc. | IN | 78 | 10 | - | 3 | 3 | 73 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Row Houses | IN | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Single-Family Detached | OUT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **TOTALS** | 5,313 | 3,254 | 869 | 306 | 283 | 130 | 5,400 | - | 717 | - | 717 | 874 | 874 | 874% | 874 | 874 | 874 | 874 | 874 | 874 | 874 | 874 | 874 | 874 | 874 | 5,231 |

Last Data Refresh: Week of May 04, 22

Gross Unit Numbers, not net new.

April 22 POC shows, 5,297

Show Data as of: 5/9/22

Start of OCP: 7/1/11

5/9/22 3:54 PM
What ought to "drive" a proposal from the "right side" of the Continuum to the "left"?

In my opinion:

**Community Benefit(s):**

- How much more housing do we need?
- Does the proposal offer enough of what we need?
- How does it impact the neighbourhood?
- Does it use infrastructure that is better used & served by other proposals?
- What other factors are present or possible?

### DNV Development Under the Current OCP - Housing Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2021 Units</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Under Construction</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>2nd IFF Approved</th>
<th>Public Funding</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Total Before Council</th>
<th>Unsold</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Public Anticipated</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Remaining Estimated</th>
<th>OCP Units</th>
<th>Unaudited</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe House</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Housing</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Care &amp; Disability Care</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Rental</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Home Ownership</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments above Shops</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Care &amp; Disability Care</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Homes</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Suites</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Built Rentals</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares Apartments</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplexes, Triplexes, etc.</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Houses</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwellers</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>9,772</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8,928</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>13,643</td>
<td>20,035</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
Last Data Refresh: Wed May-04, 22
April 22 POS shows 3,209
Show Data as of: 5/04/22
Start of OCP: 5/04/11
The District has updated its Street and Traffic Bylaw (Bylaw 7125), which regulates traffic and boulevards within the municipality. The new Bylaw took effect January 1, 2005. This brochure offers general guidelines on what you can and cannot do with regards to construction, planting and rubbish and snow removal on the boulevard and laneway. For details, visit www.districtof...  

CONSTRUCTION AND PLANTING

What you can do without a permit...

On the Boulevard:

Repair and replace an existing driveway, walkway or retaining wall, as long as:
- It’s from a previous permit.
- You haven’t increased with the width or height.
- It doesn’t conflict with a utility or other structure.
- It’s not a safety concern.
- If you place bark mulch, gravel, rock or similar material, ensure it’s less that 10 centimetres deep, doesn’t change the grade, and is kept away from the road.

On the Boulevard and Laneway:

Plant a bush, shrub, grass, or groundcover as long as:
- It’s less than 0.9 metres high when fully grown in its natural state.
- It’s at least 1.5 metres from the roadway edge or sidewalk when fully grown in its natural state.
- It doesn’t affect pedestrian access, visibility or traffic safety.
- It doesn’t interfere with a public utility service to the highway.
- The planting is indigenous to B.C.’s Southern Coast, if it is on a steep slope or near a body of water.

What you need a permit for...

On the Boulevard and Laneway:

You’ll need a permit or District approval to do the following:
- Construct a fence, planter box, retaining wall, ornamental lighting or benches.
- Install any impermeable hard surface (other than replacing an existing driveway).
- Install anything altering the natural grade.
- Put up signage.
- Plant a bush, shrub, ornamental plant, or ground cover that’s likely to be taller than 0.9 metres.
- Plant a tree or hedge
- Build a new driveway, walkway or stairs

To obtain a Highway Construction and Planting Permit:

You need to apply in writing to the District Transportation Section. Your application should include a description and detailed plan of the proposed construction or planting (this should include construction or maintenance details). Fees will be applied once the application is accepted. If you are applying for a Building Permit, this approval will be processed at the same time.
TEMPORARY USE OF THE ROADWAY-
Highway Use Permits
You cannot perform any work or activity on the
roadway unless it's associated with normal roadway
usage. This includes anything that interferes with
traffic or damages the roadway, unless authorized
through a Highway Use Permit. These permits are
issued for temporarily placing fixtures or other item,
such as a waste disposal bin, barricades, traffic lane
 closures, and signs on the road or boulevard during
construction. The Permit can also be used for special
events, such as block parties, parades, processions or
movie filming. A fee will be applied once the
application is accepted for processing.

CARE OF THE BOULEVARD
• No one may damage any tree, shrub, plant, bush,
hedge, ornamental planting, fence or lighting on
a boulevard.
• No one may cut down or prune any tree on a
boulevard without District permission.
• Any rubbish obstructing the sidewalk should be
immediately removed.
• For vegetation growing around power, cable or
telephone wires, call your local utility company
for advice.
• No one may park their vehicle, trailer or boat on
the boulevard.

VISIBILITY
A sight line hazard is anything that impedes a
person's ability to see traffic or pedestrians. Here's what you can do to ensure safety:
• Keep vegetation clear of walkways.
• Cut back foliage and vegetation to provide a
clear view of stop signs, street name and traffic
signs.
• If you own or live on a corner property be aware
of the sight line visibility for pedestrians and
motorists – our Transportation Section can assist
you.

WHO CAN I CALL FOR MORE
INFORMATION?

DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
355 West Queens Road
North Vancouver, BC
V7N 4N5

Main Line 604-990-2311
Transportation Section 604-990-2450
Fax 604-987-7185
Website www.dnv.org
Email eng@dnv.org

IF YOU SEE A PROBLEM...
If you notice a boulevard in need of maintenance
for visibility or safety reasons, please call our
Transportation Section at 604-990-2450. We’ll
document the call and visit the site to address the
problem.
SKETCH PLAN OF SURVEY MARKERS SET ON
- LOT 1, PLAN 14868 AND
- LOT A, PLAN 5664142,
BOTH OF BK 15, DL 764, CP 1, NWD.

SCALE 1:100

BROTHER OF BROTHERS
INTEGRATED SURVEYORS LTD.
To Whom it May Concern:

Please find attached a letter in support of the development proposal at 2050-2070 Marine Drive and an Unaddressed Lot.

Thanks,
Emily

---

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.
Re: Support for 2050-2070 Marine Drive and an Unaddressed Lot

Dear Mayor Little and Council:

My name is Emily Vinet, [REMOVED]. I would like to express my full support for IBI Group’s proposal to redevelop the existing underutilized lands at 2050-2070 Marine Drive with new housing and commercial space.

I grew up in the District of North Van and was lucky enough to have been able to purchase a home and start my family here. We live in our home now, but for 3 years while it was being developed, my parents were kind enough to let my husband and I stay with them (in North Van) as there was no rental here that allowed us to meet our saving goals to complete our home purchase.

While I consider myself extremely lucky in this regard, I know this is the exception to the rule. Many friends who I grew up with in North Van have been priced out of living close to their families in North Van and have had to move to Vancouver Island, Squamish, Port Moody and Port Coquitlam to start their own family.

Given my recent experiences, I can attest to the need for more housing choices in North Van.

Not enough has been built or approved in North Van over the last couple of years, which makes it more expensive for people to live here. Without projects like this one being built, I’m concerned that North Van will feel the effects of this current housing crisis intensify -- young couples and families will continue to move further away, bringing with them contributions to the local economy and community that are needed for the long-term sustainability of this city that I love and call home.

I believe that this project has a lot to offer the community, with its variety of housing options suitable to a range of needs and income levels. Further, the desirable location within walking distance to transit, commercial space, recreation, green space, trails, and schools, support a healthy and sustainable community.

I hope that Council will approve this project. I truly think this development will be a welcome addition to Lions Gate Village.

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard by Council.

Emily Vinet
North Vancouver
Dear Council

I wish to submit my full support and encouragement to accept the rezoning application for the lands of 2050-2070 Marine Drive, North Vancouver on June 7th hearing. I have full confidence in the developer creating beautiful public spaces as well as considerate and aesthetically appealing buildings with excellent functionality. I feel that this development is perfectly in keeping with what has been approved thus far - for other developers and will only add to the growth and expansion of our community. This is a very important gateway to North Vancouver and is long overdue to be re-imagined and I strongly encourage approval for this application to move forward. I have lived and worked on the North Shore and think this is an excellent area for higher density with excellent and easy access to nature trails, public transport and shops and services are all quite walkable making it a desired area for growth.

Thank you for your consideration.

Monique Davidson
Good day,

My name is Shiva Golpira and I am a long-term resident of the North Shore. I have spent a big portion of my life here; my parents and my sister still reside in the North Shore.

I’ve always wanted to continue living in the area; I know and love the community. However, due to lack of sufficient condominium supply, I had no choice but to move to Vancouver, even though my office is also located in the City of North Vancouver.

Living in houses is not for everyone and I think we need a diverse supply of housing in the North Shore. Therefore, I support this project and I hope that you do too.

Sincerely,
Shiva Golpira
Dear Mayor and the council,

I have been a resident of the North shore since 1985. Since then the prices of real estate has gone up astronomically and it is becoming almost prohibitive for starters to buy residence in our areas. So we desperately need some affordable lodgings in North shore. It seems obvious that the above development is a very beneficial one for our region and I highly recommend it. I hope that your office and the respected committee may approve this project very quickly and facilitate its execution soonest possible. I am sure you appreciate how useful is this project and will support its approval.

Yours truly,

Casey K. Lotfali

Sent from my iPhone
Good day,

My name is Sepehr Hojati and I am a long-term resident of the North Shore. I have spent a big portion of my life here; however, I have always wanted to start my own family in North Vancouver, however, with insufficient number of condominium complexes in the area, and high prices for single family homes, I have been unable to pursue that dream. I believe that our community can benefit from projects similar to what this 2050 - 2070 Marine Drive is proposing. I would like to see our community grow and invite young families to the area.

Sincerely,
Sepehr Hojjaty
Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

SURLEY Council are not even considering the height and density proposed for this development on the Travelodge Site.

No consideration has been given to the road infrastructure to support it - which is non-existent. Also, no affordable housing, or any amenities or benefits at all for our neighbourhood.

I find these proposals extremely stressful, and am very angry at this monstrosity being put forward.

Sincerely,

Val Moller
I'm pleased to see the City are in process to approve this project. Not only will completion of this project increase the availability of rental units and beautification of this part of the city, it also causes more available unit for our younger generation that can not afford a single house in this part of the town. The diverse number of rental units and ownerships plus townhouses, also makes this project quite attractive.

As a neighbouring resident I hope and wish this project goes forward.

Fred Golshan
The below is provided for information.

From: tomdavidoff
Sent: June 06, 2022 10:27 PM
To: Infoweb <infoweb@dnv.org>; Michael Geller
Subject: Travelodge Capilano/Marine Rezoning application going to Public Hearing Tomorrow

Dear DNV: please pass along this message regarding tomorrow night's hearing

Dear Vancouver City Council

I am writing to support the proposed redevelopment of 2050-2070 Marine Drive, a site I have passed many times commuting to UBC from Redonda Drive when I lived in the District and en route to Grouse Mountain. The site has of course always stood out as massively underdeveloped.

You are of course familiar with the need for more homes in our region in order to handle the crisis of housing affordability that affects people at income levels that will only grow over time.

I have no doubt that Michael's design is as sensitive to the local context as feasible and will fit in well with the community plan. So you will get badly needed, well-designed, contextually appropriate homes.

Regards,

Tom Davidoff
Hello,

I am writing in support of the proposed rezoning at 2050-2070 Marine Drive, North Vancouver.

This project will provide much needed housing diversity to a chronically undersupplied market. Council cites "traffic and congestion" as being a major reason against this project due to the density of the proposed towers and additional residents it will bring. I recently moved into the Belle Isle development behind the Travelodge site and have enjoyed taking fast public transit along Marine Drive to get into downtown everyday. My daily commute has been cut in half since I moved from East Vancouver to North Vancouver, as access to rapid transit was a significant factor in my decision to move here. This area enjoys tremendous access to rapid busses and e-bike sharing programs and I believe new residents will utilize public transit/bikes in a similar fashion as I have and not have a material effect on traffic. Building density and keeping people out of cars, as this project will do, minimizes ecological footprints of cities and is the most environmentally friendly approach to housing. It is not poor climate policy.

Furthermore, this project will complement the adjacent Sentinel and Park West projects and complete a beautiful, modern corridor along Marine Drive. For those driving into North Vancouver from the Lions Gate Bridge, it will truly be a welcome sight and bring new life into the area. The proposed heights of the buildings are in-line with its existing neighbours and will be a welcome addition to the Lions Gate Village.

Thank you,

J
Was sent directly to me.

JG

Good morning James,

Please see attached for a Letter of Support regarding the 2050-2070 Marine Dr Rezoning application that is heading to Public Hearing tonight in the District of North Vancouver. If you wouldn't mind, please confirm receipt of this letter.

Thank you and have a great day,

Garde MacDonald

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.
Real Estate Intelligent

LETTER OF SUPPORT
JUNE 7, 2022

LETTER OF SUPPORT

2050-2070 MARINE DR, NORTH VANCOUVER

CAMERON MCNEILL | SHAYNA MACQUISTEN
June 7, 2022

Attention: Kevin Zhang, Development Planner
District of North Vancouver
North Vancouver, British Columbia

Re: 2050-2070 Marine Dr, North Vancouver Rezoning Application

To the District of North Vancouver:

MLA Canada, one of Western Canada’s leaders in multifamily real estate Advisory, Sales, and Marketing, is writing this letter to show our consideration and support for the rezoning application and development planned at 2050-2070 Marine Dr in North Vancouver.

The project as proposed provides a significant benefit to the local community by incorporating a variety of housing options that appeal to a wide audience of prospective purchasers and renters alike. Specifically, 62% of the proposed units are considered family-friendly (2-bed or larger) and 35.7% will be market and/or non-market rental units, both of which are a significantly higher proportion compared to other highrise developments in North Vancouver and surrounding municipalities. Additionally, the developer’s commitment to 48 local-first units signals a strong commitment to North Vancouver residents and providing a fair chance at newly constructed housing supply.

The location of the site just east of the Lions Gate Bridge offramp on the north side of Marine Dr, makes it ideal for commuters working in downtown Vancouver, West Vancouver, or further east into Burnaby and/or Coquitlam. Additionally, the site is encircled by two existing highrise development projects: Park West at Lions Gate by Keltic Canada Developments as well as The Sentinel by Denna Homes, both of which have added a sense of community and identity to the localized area. Furthermore, these two projects provide existing precedent for the building and overall development form proposed at 2050-2070 Marine Dr. With the proposed additions of a neighborhood park, green roofs, and overall building placement that minimizes noise with the creation of an inner courtyard, Marvel’s proposal moves the Lions Gate Village area closer to becoming a complete community that houses, employs, and offers relevant services to residents.

As cited over the past two years by mainstream media, development industry professionals, and all levels of government, housing supply and its impact on affordability remains top of mind. The 2050-2070 Marine Dr proposal adequately addresses these concerns by not only adding a variety of housing options that appeal to a variety of income levels, but also by incorporating rent-to-own units that bridge the gap for first-time and entry-level aspiring homebuyers. We are in full support of this rezoning application.

We hope this letter of support is helpful and if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our team directly.

Regards,

Shayna Macquisten
Chief Revenue Officer, Partner
MLA Canada
Good day,

My name is Ali Basij and I am a long-term resident of the North Shore. I have spent a big portion of my life here; [REDACTED]

As a Millennial leaving and currently working in the North Shore, I like to see our community thrive and be more inclusive to all ages.

I believe this project can benefit a variety of demographics not just as a place to live, but a place to spend quality time with loved ones and network.

I believe that our community can benefit from projects similar to what 2050 - 2070 Marine Drive is proposing.

Sincerely,
Ali Basij
Dear Mayor and Council:

I am not a resident of the District of North Vancouver, nor do I have any direct property or financial interest in this application. What I do have, however, is a keen and abiding professional interest in seeing that our various municipalities continue to evolve in positive ways that benefit the most people, both those who live here now and those not yet here. This includes the “missing middle”, a key aspect underlying the District’s Official Community Plan.

By way of background, I was the DNV Senior Urban Designer from c. 2009-2013 and, as such, was deeply and directly involved in the development of the OCP and three of the four town centre plans – Lynn Valley, Lower Lynn, and Lions Gate. During this time I was also directly involved in reviewing development applications and the preparation of implementation programs for these centres.

As for the current application before you, I am in full support of this submission. The significant direct and indirect benefits to the full realization of the vision for Lions Gate are worth noting:

- Road dedication to complete the new road;
- Park dedication to complete the local park:
- 41 non-market rental homes built to Passive House standards;
77 market rental homes;

212 market homes for ownership;

Less quantitatively but no less important, the proposed development helps to reinforce the look, feel, and function of a true town centre, one that is in turn supported by the RapidBus service and, eventually, the regional transit improvements being proposed by TransLink.

In closing, I strongly urge Your Worship and Councillors to support this keystone development that will bring all the elements together to fulfill the vision of a transit-oriented and complete community.

Thank you,

Frank Ducote, FCIP/RPP

All this with a density of 2.75FSR that is, by regional standards, is very low.

If approved, redevelopment of this property will complete a new public park and road system serving the village. It will also add 330 new homes including 41 non-market rentals, 77 market rentals & 212 condominiums. The non-market building is being constructed to Passive House Standards and the balance of the development is meeting or exceeding DNV’s stringent environmental standards.

The condominiums will include rent-to-own and locals-first programs. The overall FSR is only 2.75 and to address traffic concerns, the number of parking spaces has been dramatically reduced to less than one per unit since the development is on the RapidBus route with a stop outside the door.

Sent from Mail for Windows
Dear Honourable Mayor Little and Council,

I'm writing this letter as a supporter of this project.

As a developer, I find this project to be a key component of the new town center, especially with the contribution of a 22,000 sqft public park. It is also very beneficial for the town center to see the completion of the new network of roads, pedestrian and bike pathways.

It is always a challenge to find ways to make homes more affordable and reachable for all members of community. Travelodge project developer has done a great job introducing an impressive combination of programs for this project, including special programs that benefit the local North Shore residents.

Regards,
Abo Taheri

Dr. Abo Taheri
President & Managing Partner
W: www.denna.ca
Tuesday, June 7, 2022

Dear Mayor & Council,

RE: DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL TRAVELODGE SITE – 2050-2070 MARINE DRIVE.

Your Worship & Council,

I took special note of the testimony/appeals of the Strata Owners at 2030 Marine Drive – a property that is braced on either side by Park West and tonight’s proposed development.

Having attended the site myself to meet with Ms. Ebrahimi to see for myself what the issues are – my concerns increased as there seem to be multiple intersecting dynamics affecting that property and its owners and tenants.

My summation of the issues here is this, to the best of my understanding:
• Because of the inability to egress to the east from 2030 Marine Drive an easement was granted guaranteeing access and egress through the Proposed Developments’ property to Curling Road to the North.
• The proposed designation of a public roadway as part of the development proposal would seem to make moot that easement.

HOWEVER,

Given that earlier tonight I recommended to you that the roadways being built within this development should be retained as private rather than public roadways.

Given that it seems the driveways within Park West’s property cannot be dedicated as public roadways because I am told they travers below-grade parking structures.

Given the evidence of multiple transgressions and inattention to maintaining safe, legal access and egress to 2030 Marine Drive, already on the part of Park West (as testified by a surveyor) and this fact:

In tonight’s staff report under the sections of both Construction Management Plan and Legal Framework, I could find no mention of the easement rights of 2030 Marine Drive.

So how can anyone reasonably expect the District to monitor this issue and to ensure safe access to and from that property?

I write to you to say that I am concerned about this. I think that the District is either a party to this dynamic or at least should not exacerbate the challenges by pressing ahead with a development plan and approval until these issues have been satisfied by either mutual consent agreement or by legal decision.
If you agree with my recommendation to retain the 2050-2070 roadways as Private Drives then I deduce that an easement right-of-use ought to persist.

To press on, in spite of the challenges, would seem to me, to be somewhat reckless and inconsiderate.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

North Vancouver, BC
Tuesday, June 7, 2022

Dear Mayor & Council,

RE: DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL TRAVELODGE SITE – 2050-2070 MARINE DRIVE.

Your Worship & Council,

I wish to direct your attention to the attached article “Canadian Cities Have Seen Up To 90% of New Real Estate Supply Scooped By Investors” as I believe it is germane to tonight’s Public Hearing and to our OCP.

Much has been said and will be said, surely, tonight about how increased housing supply is somehow a good thing and benefit to our community. But we saw the following from our recent Census Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population 2016</th>
<th>Population 2021</th>
<th>Growth %</th>
<th>Private Dwellings</th>
<th>Private Dwellings Occupied</th>
<th>Empty Units</th>
<th>Residents per Occupied Unit</th>
<th>100% Occupancy Population Growth %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver District</td>
<td>85,049</td>
<td>88,168</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>31,179</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>92,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver City</td>
<td>52,986</td>
<td>58,120</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>29,021</td>
<td>27,263</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>61,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver (City &amp; District)</td>
<td>138,037</td>
<td>146,288</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>60,200</td>
<td>59,263</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>154,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver District</td>
<td>42,473</td>
<td>44,127</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>18,795</td>
<td>17,690</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>46,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrard Inlet 3, Indian reserve (TSW)</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission 1, Indian reserve (Mosquito Creek)</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour Creek 2, Indian reserve</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-16.6%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capilano 5, Indian reserve</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>2,893</td>
<td>-22.1%</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total North Shore</td>
<td>106,791</td>
<td>106,267</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>84,863</td>
<td>80,355</td>
<td>4,508</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>207,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 4,500 empty units across the North Shore – almost 1,500 of them inside our District.

Who are we building for?

Tonight, here we contemplate adding a further 212 Strata Units (plus 118 market and sub-market rental units) to our supply – I confess to being concerned about who we think needs these units?

If we are “sitting on” 1,479 empty units, then what do we need with more of them?

An obvious solution would be to make them all rentals – and affordable ones – but I don’t think the Provincial and Federal Tax Laws allow that kind of development to happen.

But it occurs to me that here and now we have a unique opportunity to discern who we have been building for and whether we need more strata units.

You, as a legislated Government Body have access to the Land Titles role. In addition, we are about to refresh our voters list in anticipation of the 2022 Local General Election.

It occurs to me that if we were to take the list of all units produced in DNV under the current OCP, those that have occupancy permits…. And we were to compare the name(s) on Title to the names registered
on the Voters List, we could easily tell whether or not the units we have been building are for citizens who use them as their primary residence.

So, I ask that question: **Can you please undertake to tell us what percentage of newly built and occupied DNV units are occupied by their owners as primary residences?** I don’t believe there is an easier time to figure that out.

If the ratio is low – then new supply is of little value to the general public in the DNV. If it is high, then you can expect more public support for new housing supply.

And it is a key question with relation to this development proposal here – in that this development will be one of the tallest buildings in our District (if approved) and it proposes to breach our OCP covenant of 2.5 FSR for this zone. If we are not building homes for our own residents, then how could you possibly hope to justify breaching our OCP?

I hope and look for an answer to this question.

_Sincerely_,

[Signature]

Pete Teevan

North Vancouver, BC
Canadian Cities Have Seen Up To 90% of New Real Estate Supply Scooped By Investors

Canadian real estate is being scooped up by investors with excessively cheap credit. Ownership data for residential real estate across four regions show a significant share owned by investors in 2020. What’s most impressive is how fast this trend must have accelerated. Cities have seen up to 90% of recently completed homes go to investors, much higher than normal.

About Today’s Data
Today we're looking at the share of housing owned by investors across Canada. When we say investors, we mean “non-owner-occupied” housing. Statistics Canada (Stat Can) defines this as a home that’s “vacant, rented out to others, or used as a secondary property.” Since we’re only looking at cities, no one’s shack in the woods is likely to be included. Only data for Ontario, British Columbia (BC), and Atlantic Canada is available.

Canadian Cities Have Seen Up To 92% of New Supply Go To Investors
Let’s start with some general observations, shall we? About 1 in 5 (21.0%) homes in the median city across the four regions are investor-owned. When isolating new construction (built after 2016), that number rises to 1 in 3 (33.7%) bought by investors. Their ownership of new housing is over-represented. It’s running about 60% faster than the general market share.

The share of investor-owned housing is more intense in some regions than others. For example, Bay Roberts, Newfoundland, has the highest percentage of investor-owned housing. They own 49.9% of the total stock and 92.1% of recently completed construction. For a city where unemployment is 65% above the national average, it’s not a great setup.

Toronto Has Seen Investors Buy 39% of Recently

https://betterdwelling.com/canadian-cities-have-seen-up-to-90-of-new-real-estate-supply-scooped-by-investors/?fbclid=IwAR1kaYthIbYBfaarruZVhiS...
Canadian Cities Have Seen Up To 90% of New Real Estate Supply Scooped By Investors - Better Dwelling

Investor-ownership soar. Investors owned 20.4% of the housing stock in 2020, just shy of 1 in 5 homes. Including recently completed homes (after 2016), investors owned 39.1% of the new supply. They’re buying at more than double the usual rate. It’s a bigger issue than Teranet transfer data showing investors are city’s largest buyer segment.

Vancouver Has Seen 44% Of Its New Supply Go To Investors

Vancouver real estate shows a similar trend, but a higher share of investors. Investors owned nearly 1 in 4 (23.5%) of total housing supply in 2020. For recent builds, that share jumps to nearly half (44.0%) of the supply. It’s easy to see how Toronto and Vancouver home prices are so distorted. There’s a lot less friction for home prices when you’re passing the costs on to someone else.

Ontario Has Seen Investors Buy 1 in 3 New Homes

Zooming out, investors own an even higher share of Ontario real estate than Toronto has seen. Investors owned 21.6% of total housing stock in 2020 and 34.7% of homes built after 2016. Once again, 1 in 5 homes in Ontario are investor-owned, but they managed to scoop 1 in 3 new homes. Investor owners are a disproportionately large share of new homeownership.

Small towns in Ontario lead when it comes to investor owned housing stock. Wasaga Beach (32.3% of homes), Collingwood (31.4%), and Hawkesbury (30.5%) managed to top the list for the greatest share. New construction ownership for the first two cities is consistent with historical trends. Hawkesbury is an outlier, with 60% of its recent construction going to investors.

Ontario Residential Real Estate Owned By Investors

The share of Ontario’s non-owner occupied housing stock by city, and grouped by the date the home was completed. New construction or homes completed after 2016, while total is the total housing stock.
Unfortunately, this data set doesn't go back to 2015, but it would be interesting to see if the non-resident tax influenced this issue.

**BC Residential Real Estate Owned By Investors**

The share of BC's non-owner occupied housing stock by city, and grouped by the date the home was completed. New construction or homes completed after 2016, while total is the total housing stock.
Atlantic Canada Residential Real Estate Owned By Investors

The share of Atlantic Canada's non-owner occupied housing stock, by city, and grouped by the date the home was completed. New construction are homes completed after 2016, while total is the total housing stock.

Sources: Statistics Canada; Better Dwelling.

Not a lot of cities across the Atlantic provinces, so let's go over the big cities and how new supply is faring. In Halifax, nearly 1 in 5 (18.4%) homes are owned by investors, with investors owning 37.1% of recent completions. Moncton goes from 13.5% of total housing stock to 37.1% of recent home completions. St. John's real estate skew a little higher for total supply at 23.5% investor-owned, but "just" 28.0% of recent completions with investor ownership.
Why investors are purchasing can be an issue, though. The Bank of Canada (BoC) recently highlighted real estate investors as a risk to the economy. They believe investors are driving up home prices based strictly on the expectation home prices will always rise. When this occurs, the market can become more vulnerable to an economic shock. It's especially problematic if the investors are older and closer to retirement.

During periods of abrupt economic shock, investors can also amplify turmoil. Investors tend to flee the ship during a downturn, unlike an end-user who rides out most negative shocks. It's a lesson that should have been one of the most important from the US housing bubble. Even high-income investors with solid credit scores turn into a more significant risk than poor homeowners.

GET BETTER DWELLING IN YOUR INBOX.

Or, you know... wait for your bank’s economist to repeat the insights next week. Whatevs.

your email

SIGN UP

Stephen Punwasi
Co-Founder and chief data nerd at Better Dwelling. Named a top influencer in finance and risk by Thomson-Reuters.
The non-market rental units

Public Input
2050-2070 Marine Drive
(Travelodge Site)
Peter Teevan
June 2022
Which are the non-market units?:

There are 41 non market rental units which are segregated alone in Building B – proposed.

This must mean that the non-market rental rates are assigned to “the door” and not the “tenant”.

I consider this ill-advised.
Are these non-market units actually "affordable"?

- I have advocated for a two-fold test for "affordability":
  - 1) Rents geared to income (i.e. 30% of gross household income for non-dependants for housing costs (all in)) -- FAIL
  - 2) Rents not above 30% of gross household income for non-dependants for housing costs (all in) which are 30% or less of the median Metro Vancouver Income.
This "eligibility requirement" is self-defeating

(k) "Eligibility Requirements" means:

(i) aggregate annual household gross income that is less than or equal to 333% of the annual rent for the size of the Affordable Rental Unit proposed to be rented (which rent, for greater certainty, may not be greater than the Maximum Rate for the unit), where said aggregate income is established by way of true copies of the previous year's income tax returns for each household member or individual who will reside in the Affordable Rental Unit provided, however, a person will be deemed not to meet the Eligibility Requirements if the Owner has reasonable grounds to believe that such person is not in need of subsidized housing (e.g. seniors with a substantial assets or students with financial support from parents) even if such person would otherwise meet the criteria set out above; and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non Market Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Unit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Vancouver Median Income (Annual - 2016 Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Income to Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Income per Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent % of Maximum Income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So what happens when your income goes up?

- Does your rent factor adjust with it, so your rent is geared to income?

(f) contains a provision that, if the tenant ceases to qualify for the Affordable Rental Unit because he or she no longer meets the Eligibility Requirements, the Society may end the tenancy agreement by giving the tenant a clear six months' notice to end the tenancy in accordance with section 49.1 of the Residential Tenancy Act (or successor legislation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non Market Units</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>1 Bed</th>
<th>2 Bed</th>
<th>3 Bed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of Unit</td>
<td>$43,956.00</td>
<td>$47,952.00</td>
<td>$60,939.00</td>
<td>$68,931.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Income per Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent % of Maximum Income</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># People in Household</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum income /Hr FT</td>
<td>$21.13</td>
<td>$23.05</td>
<td>$14.65</td>
<td>$16.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are these rents truly affordable?

• While the rent factors appear to be within Metro Vancouver Median Income guidelines we must consider the following:
  • 1) The eligibility requirements restrict the tenants to rent is already 30% of household income or you get evicted.
  • 2) There are additional charges for:
    • Storage Locker
    • Bicycle Storage
    • Parking Stall
Wouldn’t it be better to?

- Not segregate the non-market and market rental units?
- Have a certain quota of non-market units which are tied to the tenant, not the “door”?
- Eligibility for the non-market units is by tenure, with priority given to DNV residents first (prior voters list), then to DNV workers, then others?
- As household income evolves just adjust the rent so that the unit rent factor, storage locker, bike locker, plus 1 parking stall rate totals 30% maximum of the household income? As income grows so too does the rent factor – up to the prevailing market rental rates?
My scorecard for this non-market proposal?

- Fail.
  - Self-defeating eligibility requirements.
  - Not affordable when you add amenities.
  - Eviction rather than rent adjustment policy.
When is a “Gift” not a Gift?

Public Input
2050-2070 Marine Drive
(Travelodge Site)
Peter Teevan
June 2022
What this proposal includes:

The project will contribute the following housing amenities, off-site works, land, DCC's, and CAC's:

- 77 market rental units;
- 41 non-market rental units;
- Off-site works currently estimated at approximately $2,673,000;
- Land dedications totalling approximately 4,629 m² (49,828 sq. ft.) including a 4.1 m (13.5 ft.) wide dedication along Marine Drive;
- Construction of a new neighbourhood park;
- DCCs estimated at $4,072,000; and
- CAC of $3.4 million.
The lot plan...
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Can you spot the park?
Can you spot the park?
Maybe you can see it this way?

It would be interesting to see afternoon shadow studies as well....
What about the "public" roadways?

Who do these roads serve other than the private properties here?
Are these amenities public? Or private?

- They serve only private lands.
- There are no “customers” going to businesses here.
- The area of these lands has been used to build the tower higher by 15 storeys.
  - These areas drive 118,403 sq ft of Tower Condominium Units. ($236.8 Million worth)
  - 15.5 Floors of the Tower can be attributed to these areas’ FSR.
- The park looks to be in constant shadow from either this development or Park West.
- To take the value (FSR) from the land and then claim it is a community amenity looks to me like “double-dipping”.
Are these amenities assets? Or liabilities?

- If title to these areas is transferred to CDN then...
  - Who must replace the assets over the long-term?
  - Who must incur liability over them?
  - Who must pay for lighting, landscaping, maintenance?
  - Who pays for snow removal?

- Let me ask you this -- when I had my home rebuilt -- and I left the back yard open, and I put a driveway in, but I used the area for those things in my FSR calculation to build my maximum square footage -- are you guys sending the parks department out to shovel my driveway and cut my lawn?
- If not, then why would you here? Where is the PUBLIC benefit?
Before you consider moving forward...

- Both Council and the public should be fully informed about the present value and/or annual projected costs to maintain these "amenities" for public use.
And what about storm water?

- DNV has the Integrated Stormwater Management Plan (ISMP).
- Features include limits on hardscaping and requirements for bioswales and riparian areas.
- It strikes me that if you are a private property owner who wants to hardscape most of everything, and you either don’t want to or can’t fit ISMP mechanisms into your plan, then just do the hardscaping, transfer title to the District and take credit for having “donated” a Community Amenity.
- Bonus: you get to declare all the stormwater as “DNV runoff”.
When is a “gift” not a gift?

- When it has no public benefit.
- When it has all the value extracted up to the maximum.
- When it forms a liability not an asset.
- When you use it to work around other regulations.
My advice...

- Decline the “gift”.
- Let them build and maintain their own driveway.
- Let them cut their own lawn.
- Let them shovel their own snow.
- Ask the Woodcroft and Lionsgate Community Associations:
  - Will your residents use these amenities?
Floor Space Ratio (FSR) Analysis

Public Input
2050-2070 Marine Drive
(Travelodge Site)

Peter Teevan
June 2022
Here are the FSR Calculations
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# FSR Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Area M2</th>
<th>Quoted FSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050 Marine Drive</td>
<td>LOT 1 OF LOT 1 BLOCK 15 DISTRICT LOT 764 PLAN 14885</td>
<td>2,602.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070 Marine Drive</td>
<td>LOT 3 BLOCK 15 DISTRICT LOT 764 PLAN 10846</td>
<td>909.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060 Marine Drive</td>
<td>LOT 2 BLOCK 15 DISTRICT LOT 764 PLAN 10846</td>
<td>3,582.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Address</td>
<td>LOT 1 BLOCK 15 DISTRICT LOT 764 PLAN 10846</td>
<td>3,458.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;North Parcel&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,342.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;South Parcel&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,533.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Exempted Floor Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,552.60</td>
<td>28,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FSR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Couple Things about this...

- This is OVER the OCP limit designated for the area at 2.5
- We can see from the calculations that the Floor Space proposed USES the area of the “City Park” and roadways to add more floors to the tower.
- From staff, the area of the “City Park” is .14 ha or 15,069 Sq. Ft.
- From staff, the area of the Roadways is .26 ha or 27,986 Sq. Ft.
- At 2.75 FSR this “drives” 46,055 times 2.75 = 118,401 Sq. Ft of building.
What is the value of "Altitude"?

- What are the market values of Square Footage on floors 1-6?
- What about on floors 7-12?
- 13-18?
- What about floors 18-24?
- And what about floors 24+?
  - For the purposes of discussion I am picking $2,000/Sq Ft.
It should be noted...

- That the proposal IS:
- 1 Building of 4 storeys.
- 1 Building of 9 storeys.
- 1 Tower of 27 storeys.
  - Is this THE HIGHEST in the DNV to date?

- That the proposal is NOT:
- 3 buildings of equal height.
- Therefore the FSR is skewed to the Tower to drive the highest market value per square foot.
What about the FSR of the roadways and park?

- The park is .14 ha or 15,069 Sq Ft.
- The roadways are .26 ha or 27,986 Sq Ft.
- Total Space is .4 ha or 43,055 Sq Ft.
- At 2.75 FSR this means an extra 118,403 Sq Feet on the Tower!
Here is the FSR from your park and your roadways:

\[0.40 \text{ ha} = 43,055 \text{ Sq ft} \times 2.75 = 118,403 \text{ Sq Feet of Tower @7600 SF per floor that is 15.57 Floors.}\]

If they sell for $2,000/Sq Foot then those roads and park generate an additional $236.8 Million in Prime Real Estate.
What about our OCP?

Question:
OCP Intended use: Commercial Residential MIXED use.

Where is the commercial?

Doesn't mixed use usually mean that the main floor, or ground + mezzanine are commercial with residential above?

We are losing 2 full service restaurants and getting?
1 x 500 Sq Ft Coffee Shop?

I thought you wanted to build "complete communities"?
Where is the grocery store?
The bakery?
The hair salon? The Pub?
What would I prefer to see?

- Commercial on the Ground and Mezzanine of the Tower Building.
- Reduce overall FSR to 2.5
  - This would 'shave' 3.5-4 storeys off the Tower taking it to 23 storeys.
- Have the developer retain & maintain the roadways as private driveways.
  - More on this later.
- Have the developer retain & maintain the “city park” as private land.
  - More on this later.
Follow the money?

Public input
2050-2070 Marine Drive
(Travelodge Site)
Peter Teevan
June 2022
Who own(s) this/these site(s)?

2050-2070 Marine Drive (Travelodge site)

©1 Group has applied to develop 77 market rental apartments and 158 owned apartments in a 27-storey tower with adjacent townhouses, 54 owned apartments in a nine-storey building with adjacent townhouses, and 41 non-market rental apartments in a four-storey building. A total of 373 parking spaces is proposed. (application details)

2050-2070 Marine Drive (Travelodge site)

SUMMARY
Marvel Developments (Lions Gate Village) Ltd. has applied on behalf of the owners of 2050 - 2070 Marine Drive and an unaddressed lot to redevelop the existing commercial and hotel buildings.

Schedule A to Bylaw 8574

SECTION 219 COVENANT and RENT CHARGE HOUSING AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT dated for reference: 201...

BETWEEN:

MARVEL DEVELOPMENTS (LIONS GATE VILLAGE) LTD. (Incorporation No. BC0984524) a corporation incorporated under the laws of the Province of British Columbia with an office at

("Marvel")

WHEREAS

A...
The mandate of the Office of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner is to **promote public confidence in elected public officials** as they conduct public business.
History/Intent of Conflict of Interest Laws in BC

British Columbia

B.C. government introduces campaign finance reform to municipal politics

Changes will go into effect Oct. 31 but money previously raised can be used for next year's elections.

Municipal Affairs and Housing Minister Selina Robinson announced the legislation Monday, saying it would affect all local elections for mayor, council, school board and B.C.'s electoral areas.

"It's been a wild west in political fundraising here, and people want change. Deep pockets shouldn't decide elections — people should," Robinson told reporters.

UBCM president Wendy Booth said Monday the new legislation will bring fairness to municipal politics.

"We think these changes will level the playing field for candidates," she told reporters.
We saw a change in tactics from 2014 to 2018

2014 – Total $20,012.50
2018 – Total $42,889.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRIBUTOR_NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>ACCT_NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALISSA LOPEZ</td>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>PAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEEN LORI</td>
<td>1/1/19</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>BACK, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAUDIA MORAN</td>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>BACK, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID MCGARRY</td>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENETIS BAJD</td>
<td>1/4/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIMME TAJIBAN</td>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASON WATSON</td>
<td>2/1/19</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSICA JONES</td>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN BROWNSCU</td>
<td>1/14/19</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN MCGRANN</td>
<td>2/7/19</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARA SMITH</td>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIA BRUCE</td>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATT WATKINS</td>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WHITE</td>
<td>2/12/19</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESOLO JONAH</td>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CLASS 1 CONTRIBUTIONS OF LESS THAN $100</td>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$4,850</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRISH MARRION</td>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTOR_NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>ACCT_NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>PAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/19</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>BACK, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>BACK, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/19</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/19</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/19</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$4,850</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTOR_NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>ACCT_NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>PAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/19</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>BACK, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>BACK, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/19</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/19</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/19</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$4,850</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTOR_NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>ACCT_NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>PAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/19</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>BACK, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>BACK, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/19</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/19</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/19</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/19</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$4,850</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/19</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>BAC, IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is a conflict of interest(s)?

- It is not about YOUR state of mind...
- It’s is about OUR confidence that your interests are not in conflict with those of the people.
- Members hopefully will recuse themselves not because they feel conflicted.. But rather to ensure that the public has confidence that you recognize the appearance problems. Recusal clears that up.
So how can we trust in this case?

- We don’t know all the owner(s).
- We can’t follow the money.
- We do see SOME money – and these “deep pockets” were not supposed to affect elections.
- What else can we see?
What we can see:

MARVEL FOOD CORPORATION is a Non-distributing corporation with 50 or fewer shareholders corporation type, which located at 1000 - 925 WEST GEORGIA STREET VANCOUVER BC V6C 3L2 Canada. It was registered on 2014-01-24, the corporation's bc is 833145373 and corporation number is 7333848.

These are 2 directors of this company. This corporation record status is Active. Marvel Food Corporation has been running for 8 years, 4 months and 50 days since it was incorporated.

Director details (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAHIM FAHKARI</td>
<td>850 FARMLEIGH ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEST VANCOUVER BC V7S 12H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARA FAHKARI</td>
<td>1003 - 1004 RAYSHORE DRIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VANCOUVER BC V6H 3HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.canadacompanyregistry.com/companies/marvel-food-corporation/
But what about

- What we cannot see?
  - Who else are involved in these properties and the venture?

- In know that I speak in alignment with a number of wise community advocates who believe that recusal in this case should have already happened. It can start now.
Questions:

- Will staff please disclose who are the current registered owners of shares, interests, etc in all the proposal properties and also the nature of their relationship to IBI Group and Marvel Developments/Group?
To Mayor and Council,
I am submitting my attached comments in support of the development proposal for 2050-2070 Marine Drive to be discussed at the public hearing tonight on June 7, 2022. Please include my comments with the materials at the public hearing.
Thankyou.

Take care and stay healthy.
Best regards,
Barry
Barry Fenton

This email is intended for the addressee only and is confidential. If this message has been misdirected please respect our privacy by deleting this message without copying or forwarding it and contact this writer. Thankyou.
Good evening Mayor and Council,

My name is Barry Fenton and I am a member of [redacted] a resident of DNV.

I am writing to Council members with my support for this project.

The applicant has worked with staff since November 2020 to revise their proposal to reduce the tower height, increase the number of non-market rental units and increase the number of market rental units.

The redevelopment will create a variety of housing options with a total of 330 residential units: • 212 market strata units (8 are rent to own), • 77 market rental units, and • 41 non-market rental units. The project proposes that 36% (118 units) of the residential units are rental in tenure (13% as non-market rental units and 23% as market rental units). As noted, the project includes 41 non-market rental units, with rents ranging from 18% to 30% below the median 2021 rents for the District. The applicant is targeting rents for the non-market units to be affordable to "Low-to-Moderate Income Households".

The project contributes to several objectives of the OCP action by providing a range of housing options within the heart of the Lions Gate Village Centre. It also delivers key public amenities such as a new road, a new neighbourhood park, and new pedestrian connections. The project will provide a new road that will be an important connecting feature within the Lions Gate Village Centre. This project will also deliver the Curling Road Park planned south of Curling Road.

It is worth noting that the 4-storey non-market rental building is proposed to achieve "Passive House" certification.

The applicant is voluntarily proposing a locals-first program. Under this program, it is proposed that a minimum of 48 strata units are marketed to "locals-first". Also proposed are 21 strata units that will contain lock-off suites.

I am fully supportive of the much-needed housing options proposed in this project as the site is well-served by frequent transit along both Marine Drive and Capilano Road, and is located in the heart of the Lions Gate Village Centre. This location provides opportunities to reduce transportation demands and facilitate alternative modes of transportation.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my input to this public hearing and I encourage Council members to vote in favour of this proposal.

Barry Fenton
Good Afternoon Gordon and Council members,

I am writing on behalf of development request for the Travel Lodge site.

As a long time realtor on the North Shore as well as a 22 year resident of the North Shore, I am an advocate for more housing and infrastructure on the North Shore.

The Denny’s site, along with the rest of Lion’s Gate Village, is a big asset to the North Shore. Not only is this close proximity to downtown, our own beloved ParkRoyal, Ambleside, hiking trails, biking trails, and 3 ski hills. This is where density should be. It has been developed for many many years already. It is time for an upgrade which DNV & DWV have done an excellent job designing.

As we all know there is limited housing available to downsizers and first home buyers. It is extremely important to maintain our existing residents that have lived on the North Shore, raised their families, and contributed to the property taxes that have helped create our infrastructure. It’s equally important to keep our children, first home buyers, close to each other. That is what community is all about.

Developing downsizer product as well as first home buyer product in essential in maintaining our community.

The Travel lodge site is scheduled for community amenities to tie into the existing Park West as well as Capilano Residences. It is important to complete the OCP and amenities as promised to the resident’s of Lions Gate Village.

Further, this particular site is scheduled for rentals. The vacancy rate overall in the lower mainland is still extremely low. Having additional rentals in the community helps bring in people that do not and can not own.

I hope this site gets approved based on the OCP at Lion’s Gate Village that has been in design for years now.
Thank you for your time,

Coleen Weir
Hello, I would like to extend my support for this application. I drive by the site frequently and am appalled how the neighbours have created this beautiful façade for the city while keeping this section right in the middle as it is. I like that the project is appealing to all people.

If you need more info from me then please reply to this email or call my on my cell at [redacted].

Mike

MG
Dear Mayor and Council,

I know that questions from the Public don’t automatically get answered by staff so I submit these questions here hoping that one or more of you may see merit in posing a similar question for the benefit of clarity and transparency to the Public:

1) please detail who the current owners of each of the four lots in question are and if possible list directors of any companies involved.
2) what are typical market rates for condominiums per square foot as they vary in height (low storeys through to high storeys) eg. what is an average price per sq ft of a floor 1-6 condo vs an average price per square ft on a floor 20+ of a condo tower. I am assuming they market prices rise as the floor level increases.
3) can we determine the percentage of new built units in DNV or even Lions Gate Village which are occupied as primary residences? This could be determined by comparing the land title registry to the local government electoral voters list to be completed later this year.
4) please quantify the financial costs to DNV taxpayers to take on the dedicated roadways and “city park” (as labelled on the drawings)
5) please engage with the Lower Capilano and Woodcroft Community Associations to determine whether they see any public benefit to the designated roadways and “city park”?

Thank you,

Peter Teevan

Sent from my iPhone... Pardon the typos! :)

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.
Oh also please add this question:

Before closing the Public Hearing please disclose what the extra charges will be for the non market and market rentals for:
1) storage locker
2) bicycle storage locker
3) vehicle parking stall(s)

In my opinion we cannot determine the affordability of these units without knowing these costs.

Thank you,

Peter Teevan

Sent from my iPhone... Pardon the typos! :)

---

> On Jun 7, 2022, at 19:14, Peter Teevan wrote:
> >
> > Dear Mayor and Council,
> > >
> > I know that questions from the Public don’t automatically get answered by staff so I submit these questions here hoping that one or more of you may see merit in posing a similar question for the benefit of clarity and transparency to the Public:
> > >
> > 1) please detail who the current owners of each of the four lots in question are and if possible list directors of any companies involved.
> > 2) what are typical market rates for condominiums per square foot as they vary in height (low storeys through to high storeys) eg. what is an average price per sq ft of a floor 1-6 condo vs an average price per square ft on a floor 20+ of a condo tower. I am assuming they market prices rise as the floor level increases.
> > 3) can we determine the percentage of new built units in DNV or even Lions Gate Village which are occupied as primary residences? This could be determined by comparing the land title registry to the local government electoral voters list to be completed later this year.
> > 4) please quantify the financial costs to DNV taxpayers to take on the dedicated roadways and “city park” (as labelled on the drawings)
> > 5) please engage with the Lower Capilano and Woodcroft Community Associations to determine whether they see any public benefit to the designated roadways and “city park”?
> > >
> > Thank you,
> > >
> > Peter Teevan
> > >
> > Sent from my iPhone... Pardon the typos! :)
Dear esteemed community members,

I am writing to you today on behalf of some of the residents in order to bring into attention a few already existing, and potential characteristics of the neighbourhood in question that we believe would need to be considered in today's hearing.

The intersection of Capilano and Marine Drive is the main connection between the city of Vancouver and the highway. For this reason, even before any of the many newly erected buildings in this neighbourhood are occupied, there is a huge congestion problem at the intersection, especially during rush hour; effectively making the city of Vancouver unreachable in a timely manner at these times. This also causes a traffic overflow to the highway and the IronWorkers Memorial Bridge, for those that need to make the trip to the city of Vancouver.

Furthermore this entire neighbourhood practically has no natural area or park land that is accessible to the residence (except one hard to reach narrow path) leaving most residents having to use the rugby fields for their outing or walking their dogs. This, plus the lack of coast access makes this side of the district of north Vancouver stand out in a negative way from the rest of greater Vancouver which has accessible natural areas as one of their distinguishing hallmarks.

As far as city planning is concerned, it is easily visible in some of the greatest cities in the world, including other neighbourhoods of Vancouver, that the changing times have caused the development opportunities to instead of being used for high rises and high density areas to give way to developments of lower density low rise structures, with a focus around community development, and sustainability oriented city planning and construction. It seems to us that it would be ideal to follow suit, or even excel at taking such an approach if presented with development opportunities. These approaches (such as the new proposed development area on w 4th, Vancouver) have proven to be much more desirable by residents that come to choose the larger Vancouver area and especially north Vancouver as their home. It not only maintains the district's integrity, but increases the values and benefits that our place of living can bring.

Last but not least, we would like to point out that the intersection borders with an indigenous reservation area. We believe it is agreeable by all of us that it is our responsibility as a community, who have found our home on these unceded lands, to make sure our developments not only do not infringe on the fabric of their community, but to also embody and protect many of the values that they uphold, such as respect for their land and nature and moderation in growth and solely monetary profit based development.

We trust that our officials are not swayed by any lobbying efforts to forgo their responsibilities.
to their highly esteemed office, as they are not required to do so by law. And we hope they will be able to instead tell a story to their children and grandchildren that when it was their time to serve their community, they uphold the dignity and responsibility of making sure our district continues to remain and improve as one of the most distinguished places to live on earth. We wish you the best of luck on your efforts towards that.

Thank you for your time

Sincerely
Hello,

We were not able to make it to the public hearing today. But would like to have some comments on the current situation.

We are originally from downtown, crosstown area. The homeless and drug situation got significantly bad after Covid. To the point where we did not feel safe for our young children to go out.

Finally made the big plunge to move to this new area in north Vancouver hoping to find some peace and for our children to grow up in a safe neighborhood. It was a big stretch for us to afford our new home but we did it because its necessary.

We were told that the travelodge would become a green space starting in 2023 and that was what sold us on buying into this area. Now seeing this news about the bc housing renting it to the homeless until 2023 and could be until 2025 is disappointing to say the least. Just 2 weeks into moving here someone came into our front patio gates and try to steal our plant and patio chair in the middle of the night. My husband chased after him and followed him to the travelodge parking lot where the thief finally gave up and ditched our belongings.

To witness that was horrific and we had to sign up to a security company to have security alarms set up all over our home. This was nothing that we had ever imagined would happen moving to this neighborhood.

We hope that the green space/park will still happen and we look forward to the new developments, which can’t happen any sooner.

Faye Liem

Sent from my iPhone
From: Hazen Colbert
Sent: June 07, 2022 6:54 PM
To: mike@mikelittle.ca; lisamuri@shaw.ca; BETTY FORBES <bettyforbes.nv@gmail.com>; mathew@mathewbond.com; Jordan Back <jordan@jordanback.net>; David Stuart <StuartD@dnv.org>; Dan Milburn <milburnd@dnv.org>; Eric Godot Andersen <stuartd@dnv.org>; Lyle Craver <LyleCraver@dnv.org>
Subject: [REDIRECTED]Public Input for 2050 - 2070 Marine Drive Tuesday June 7, 2022 at 6:51PM

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.

PUBLIC INPUT for 2050-2070 Marine Drive,

I signed up to speak to the matter and DID NOT receive confirmation I could speak. As of 6:53PM I cannot access the meeting albeit that may change.

The highlighted portion below indicates a covenant is required in the bylaws for the road and park to be completed ASAP and NOT when the developer gets around to requesting a development permit in 2025 as per the NSN article I sent you.

Ms. Simkin, please confirm that all of council, Mr. Milburn and Mr. Kevin Zhang have received this input.

Sincerely,

Hazen S. Colbert
Thanks for your note and acceptance of my clarifications.

We very much want to proceed now, having been before this council on 3 different occasions. It is essential that the road system and park on the Travelodge property be completed as soon as possible to serve the adjacent properties & entire Lions Gate Village community.

Thanks again for your interest. Cheers

Michael Geller FCIP, RPP, MLAI, Ret. Architect
President, The Geller Group
Adjunct Professor SFU Centre for Sustainable Development and School of Resource & Environmental Management

On Sat., May 14, 2022, 13:30 Hazen Colbert, <hazen.colbert@gv.org> wrote:

Mr. Geller,

Thank you for responding.

You comments are good and appreciated. I think the community would benefit you restating them at the Public Hearing.

Based on the comments I am sure others and perhaps you would consider assembling 2030 Marine Drive into the Marvel plans and building that site up to 27 storeys. CD Comprehensive 10 would provide considerable uplift over CD9 Commercial

I understand that Ms. Tina Ebrahimi reached out to Councillor Bond (who you have advised is not your friend) to discuss related matters.

One might be curious if DNV Planning and Council might hold off the Public Hearing until after the municipal election so all options might be considered.

For full disclosure, I have no interest in 2030 Marine Drive and know nothing more about the Ebrahimi family than I know about the Fakhari family.

Sincerely,

Hazen S. Colbert
Hazen Colbert, you are missing two very important considerations.

The first is that the Floor Space Ratio of the Broadway and Birch development that I opposed was 10.52 in a 3 FSR zone.

The market housing within the Travelodge project is 2.5 FSR. The OCP allows 2.5 FSR. (The additional 0.25 FSR is for below market rental housing.)

The second relates to height. The buildings along Broadway & Birch are generally a maximum of 12 storeys as per zoning. The buildings immediately to the south are 3 & 4 storeys.

The buildings near the Travelodge development are 23 and 26 storeys. Architecturally, a 27 storey building fits in.

I hope this information helps you appreciate why I can strongly support the Travelodge development while remaining opposed to the Broadway & Birch development, (which I might add was approved by Vancouver Council.)

I will be pleased to discuss this further with you if you wish.

Michael Geller FCIP, RPP, MLAI, Ret. Architect
President, The Geller Group
Adjunct Professor SFU Centre for Sustainable Development and School of Resource & Environmental Management

On Sat., May 14, 2022, 11:57 Hazen Colbert, wrote:

Mayor and Council,

On Monday, May 9, 2022 Mr. Michael Geller spoke in favour, as proponent, of the 27
storey building along Marine Drive.

There is a problem.

On May 13, 2022 Councillor Mathew Bond, who voted in favour of the bylaws, retweeted Gellers tweet of that date OPPOSING buildings of 28 storeys.

Here is the tweet.

https://twitter.com/michaelgeller/status/1525140390449274881?cxt=HBwWgoCj1djGsaqpAAAA&cn=ZmxleGljbGVfcmVjcw%3D%3D&refsrc=email

Michael Geller on Twitter

“While I hesitate to reopen old wounds, I wrote this following Council's approval of the Broadway & Birch tower at over 10 FSR (floor space ratio). Many of us feared it would set a direction for

twitter.com

Here is the original article:


Michael Geller (planner/architect): Why I oppose latest 28 storey 10.52 FSR proposal for Broadway & Birch

Reprinted below with permission of
Michael Geller, a well-known planner and architect in Vancouver. We don’t often publicly hear comments from professional architects and planners whether cityhallwatch.wordpress.com

I also note that the FSR for the Marel development pierces the FSR ceiling in our OCP.

How can Council even remotely consider Geller’s input credible if in the same week he both supports AND opposes what is, in all material ways, the identical height? If 28 storeys is too much along a Skytrain line, how can it be fine adjacent to a bridge built in 1949?

I note the Geller and Bond are close personal friends, and Bond is featured on Geller's blog.

http://gellersworldtravel.blogspot.com/2017/05/

Some of the same people who supported the bylaw crucified our good Prime Minister for traveling to a friend’s travel destination as a conflict of interest but thought nothing of Bond, who is featured on Geller’s travel blog, voting in favour of the bylaw.

In the name of the sweet baby Jesus, what is happening here?

Sincerely,

Hazen S. Colbert