

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.
in the Atrium Meeting Room on Wednesday, July 8th, 2015**

MINUTES

Present: M. Clark
D. Farley
M. Higgins
P. McCann
M. Robinson
B. Watt
Councillor Back

Staff: S. Smith, Planner 2, Community Development
D. Johnson, Planner 2, Community Development
C. Miller, Planner 1, Community Development
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk

Guests: Brent Carlson, Anthem Properties
Rocky Sethi, Anthem Properties
Matthew Hansen, Matthew T. Hansen Architect
Cheryl Bouwmeester, eta landscape architecture

Absent: A. Jamieson
D. Marshall
M. Rahbar
T. Valente
Councillor Bell

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m.

1. Minutes of the Meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission held June 10th, 2015

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission held June 10th, 2015 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously



2. Business Arising

Web links to information on the action items from the June 10th meeting were emailed to members.

Lot 5 guiding principles will be presented to the group in the fall.

There was a discussion on members taking turns to make resolutions; someone being ready to draft a resolution would help the Commission be more effective. Members would be able to request a pass on their turn at any time. Those present were supportive of the idea. The suggestion will be discussed at a future meeting with more members present.

3. Staff Update

S. Smith reviewed relevant planning development, project and policy items from the previous Council meetings,

The open house for the East 3rd Street/Moodyville design guidelines went well with approximately 120 people in attendance.

4. 450 East 5th Street (OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application)

D. Johnson, Planner 2, introduced the application which is a request to amend the OCP and Zoning Bylaw to support a subdivision to create nine single family homes. The OCP amendment is to change the land use designation from "School and Institution" to "Residential Level 1 (Low Density)."

Staff asked for the Commission's input on the OCP Amendment, the Zoning Bylaw amendment, the size and massing of the proposal in relation to the surrounding streetscape, and the site planning.

Rocky Sethi, Anthem Properties, told the Commission members that Anthem Properties were the successful bidder for Ridgeway site in 2013. They were selected by the School District because of their approach to public consultation; the District felt their proposal had the best chance of success.

Matthew Hansen, Matthew T. Hansen Architect, described the proposal:

- Anthem originally looked at higher density for the site, but decided it would not work in the surrounding single family neighbourhood. Smaller lots also did not fit in the neighbourhood. The current proposal is a better fit in the streetscape which is generally made up of 50 foot lots.
- One of the goals of the OCP is to maintain single family neighbourhoods.
- Providing a secondary suite and coach house option creates affordability. Income from the suite will help finance the single home.
- The proposal fits the needs of at least two income levels.
- The proposed design which is a mix of craftsman and prairie styles respects the historical nature of the neighbourhood.
- The secondary suites have separate entrances and natural ventilation and light.

- Each dwelling has a minimum of two covered parking spots with open slab parking for tenant use.
- The design will fit within the RS-1 Zone; no development variances will be required.

Cheryl Bouwmeester, eta landscape architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- The landscaping will be integrated to provide continuity, yet be individual enough to differentiate between the homes.
- All storm water will be treated onsite for slow release.
- The design will provide privacy with hedging.
- Plant material will be native and native-adapted.
- Any additional paving will be permeable.

Questions from the Commission included but were not limited to:

- The garages cannot be turned into coach houses? **A:** The FSR will not permit the development of coach houses because of the size of the homes.
- Are there instances where you cannot provide natural light to the lower suites? **A:** No; the setbacks are wide enough for side yards.
- Have you allowed for drought tolerance in the landscape plan as our summers seem to be getting drier? **A:** Most plants once established will bounce back; all the materials can be drought tolerant as there are moisture levels within a dormant plant. Those considerations will be taken into account.
- Why do you use the wording “repurposing of this brownfield”? **A:** The School District has looked at the building and deemed it not useful for upgrading; there is too much asbestos in the building and too many repairs required.
- Are you planning to seek a green building certification or mirror LEED requirements? **A:** Not at this time.
- Why not? **A:** We are not at that point in the design. The changes to the Building Code are very close to builtgreen. **Staff:** There is provision in the Zoning Bylaw; they have to achieve a specific Energuide rating to have the cellar floor area excluded.
- Re affordability; the houses are pretty large; how will they be priced? **A:** We will not know for one to two years. Single family housing is not as affordable nowadays. There is a spectrum of affordability.
- One of the public meetings was post application; has the public looked at this application? There seems to be quite a few duplexes near this. When were the variations considered relative to the OCP process? **A:** The original public meeting was in September 2013. We presented a few different options. The townhouse option was dismissed by attendees. In December 2013 we had another meeting with detailed options; large lot single family houses were preferred. We then worked with the public on the number of coach houses; we originally had seven and have now reduced it to two. People did not like the idea of offsite parking so we have an abundance of onsite parking.
- What about open public space? The area is park-deficient. **A:** The park-deficient area is south of this area. With regard to the idea of a pocket park on the site, the City would not maintain it, so one of the houses would have to look after it which is not possible. The loss of open space is still a concern in the community. We have worked with the community on it. We will make a contribution to the City

towards park space. I believe the City has some areas where they wish to secure park areas.

- There are two parking spots for the homes with coach houses? **A:** Yes; one for the main and one for the coach house.
- Any discussion having storage under the garages? **A:** No, they will be detached garages on a concrete slab.
- Was there a plan for duplexes and keeping the playing field? **A:** That was one option but it was not selected.

Comments from the Commission included but were not limited to:

- I am satisfied with the proposal. The houses look unique and not cookie cutter.
- There is nothing affordable about a 4,000 sq. ft. house.
- We were renting a basement suite; it helped us to buy a house.
- There is enough space on the site for a brand new school with new playground.
- I support the proposal and encourage energy efficiency measures.
- It is unfortunate you cannot put more houses on the site.
- I have no issues with the application but feel an obligation to present concerns re future school enrolment. The contract was signed a long time ago and I am not convinced that the School District will not need this building in the future. We are anticipating an increase in school enrolment. The Moodyville area which is redeveloping, is a block and half away from this property. There is no option for another school. I would like to see City staff review the proposed population.
- One member who was unable to attend provided a letter and comments in advance articulating concerns around: building character, energy efficiency, too much parking, existing tree removal, affordability and loss of neighbourhood play space.
- I am concerned with the loss of open space whether or not the school space is no longer required. I still feel the City will be looking for open spaces because of the increasing density in this area; but if that is not what the community wants, we have to go with what the community is looking for.
- I like the idea of single family dwellings with some rental space.
- We still have Cloverley School which is not that far: I guess they will rebuild it.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Official Community Plan Amendment and Rezoning Application for 450 East 5th Street and recommends approval, subject to the approval of the following by City staff:

- Further consideration of maximizing access to natural light for lower suites; and
- Achieving energy efficiency measures above and beyond minimum requirements of the Building Code.

The Commission is satisfied that the developer is responding to neighbourhood feedback, and that affordability is supported with the inclusion of secondary suites and coach houses.

The Commission is concerned about the future amount of school space and open park space in the subject area.

**Carried
Five in favour
One opposed**

*There was a short break at 7:10p.m.
The meeting reconvened at 7:15 p.m.*

5. Urban Design and Planning Guidelines Overview

C. Miller, Planner 1, gave a presentation on “Urban Design and Planning Guidelines Overview.

Questions and comments from the Commission included but were not limited to:

- If the guidelines are too specific everyone will design the same; it is the easy way out.
- What about coach houses? **A:** It is all about use and accessory use; they are tied together.

6. Sustainable City Awards

S. Smith outlined the award selection process; nominations will open in September and are open to the public. The group will make their selection in October.

Action: Staff to compile list of recent developments.

Action: Members to think of possible community groups to nominate.

7. Information Items

2015 Community Profile information was emailed to members.

8. Other Business

September has been identified as a possible time to have the Waterfront and Lower Lonsdale tour which is part of the 2015 Workplan.

There will be a housing presentation in September/October. The laneways workshop also remains on the Workplan.

Action: Staff to poll the group re Saturday or Wednesday preference for the tour.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission will be held on Wednesday, August 12th, 2015.



Chair