A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

1. **Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission held July 13th, 2011**

   It was regularly moved and seconded JJ/PM

   THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission held July 13th, 2011 be adopted.

   Unanimously Carried

2. **Business Arising**

   None.

3. **Staff Update**

   **1250 Lonsdale Avenue:** The Public Hearing was on July 25th; there were many favourable comments on the design. There was a question on the provision of child
play space in tall buildings. Of the 20 speakers, none were opposed and no residents from the Grande spoke.

Harbourside OCP Amendment: At the July 18th Council meeting Council passed a motion directing staff to establish a task force to review material produced to date with respect to the proposed OCP amendment.

140-150 West 15th: The Public Hearing was on July 25th. There were 20 speakers: four opposed and 16 in support. The project was given second and third reading. Questions were raised about the oversupply of parking and staff were directed to report on a reduction of 10 stalls and the addition of one more VRS unit.

Space Needs and Operating Costs for a New North Vancouver Museum: This report was reviewed at the July 18th Council meeting. Council endorsed the recommended size of approximately 20,000 to 23,000 sq. ft. but did not support including the museum in the 1308 Lonsdale Avenue development due to concerns on density bonussing and the fact that the developer is only including space for a 10,000 sq. ft. museum. There are several potential locations including at the waterfront.

129-141 West 2nd Street (The Bishop): A report on this project was reviewed at the July 18th Council meeting. Some Council members felt that the parking should be reduced. The project will go to Public Hearing on September 19th.

213-217 West 1st Street: This OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application which will include rental housing, community service office space with a density bonus and an OCP height increase was reviewed by Council on July 18th.

Councillor Heywood joined the meeting at 6:15 pm

Civic Amenity Fund: The Civic Amenity Reserve Fund Bylaw had its introduction and first three Readings at the July 18th Council meeting. Funds for density bonussing will be held in this fund and will be expended at Council's direction.
Action: SS to circulate the report.

Brad Phillips joined the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

Location of Staircases and Elevators: Council passed a motion at the July 18th meeting to direct staff to investigate zoning tools to encourage developers to install staircase access adjacent to all elevator locations to encourage residents to use the stairs.

City Support for Market Rental Housing: At the July 25th Council meeting staff were directed to investigate the implications of establishing a reduced schedule of fees and charges specifically for the support of market and non-market rental housing projects to be constructed in the City of North Vancouver, and also to report on other opportunities for municipal support for market rental housing construction.

Harry Jerome Centre: A motion to put replacement vs renovation of the rec facility as a referendum question for the election November was defeated narrowly.

1860 Lonsdale Avenue: This had final adoption on July 25th.
4. **OCP 2021 – CityShaping Workshop**

S. Smith gave an overview of progress on outreach to the community. The City is seven weeks into the process. There has been a positive response to the website which contains a growing amount of information with pictures from events.

Two new discussion papers and briefs on population and housing are being produced.

The two co-hosted events on “Growing a More Sustainable Economy” and “Social Inclusion and Cultural Diversity” were successful. Staff are working on a joint workshop for the fall with Vancouver Coastal Health, The District of North Vancouver and West Vancouver on the connection between health and community planning.

Staff have attended five of seven large events in the community e.g. Party at the Pier, Caribbean Days, and the Family Automall days.

They will have a presence at the Civic Plaza Craft Fair on August 13th and at the Concert in the Square on the 20th.

The summer students are now carrying out ipad surveys in key locations e.g. at the library during story time, at playgrounds such as Mahon Park, and are hoping to be allowed into the seabus waiting area. Some locations are more challenging to engage people.

A member of APC suggested that the form be attached to the homeowner grant form next year.

The question was asked about visiting less dense, more residential areas. Staff will not be going door to door but are targeting a variety of large events and smaller groups to get input from a variety of people.

A paper copy of the survey is now being offered and is very popular.

A member asked about non residents who do not work in the City, are they completing the survey? No, They are directed to the discussion forum.

450 surveys have been completed to-date with 900 views or hits. The online survey will close on August 31st.

Of the people who have viewed the discussion forum 6.5 % have participated. We have between 44-330 views of each question and 57 comments posted to-date.

Staff are now looking for opportunities to target different groups, specific events.

It was suggested that school PAC meetings in September would be a good way to connect with large groups of parents or the first day of school when parents are waiting for their children. Could forms be sent home with pupils? Perhaps the Assistant Superintendent could be asked to send out the forms to all the school principals?
Action: S.Smith will talk to Mary Tasi.

S. Smith distributed the two draft questions on housing and public safety which will added to the online CityShaping discussion forum and asked for feedback. Discussion ensued.

Do we want to keep the aging buildings or really just ensure we keep the capacity (number of units)? It is a lot less impact on the environment to renovate an older building rather than building a new building.

There was a discussion on affordable housing. There is a need to lobby the provincial and federal governments to provide tax incentives for builders and developers. Should the City even be asking the question if they cannot do much about it? It was noted the City is making efforts in this area and has affordable housing policies.

The comment was made that rezoning allows for the gentrification of areas and pushes out the rental housing. Is there a mechanism that could be used to protect the stock? If you want a complete community, there needs to be affordable housing.

A question was asked about how density bonus is exchanged for community amenities and choosing between a community centre and affordable housing? Staff: Both amenities are listed in the OCP as eligible for density bonus but are not weighted. That decision is up to Council.

A member asked if there was a way of creating a fund to put some density bonus into a fund e.g. to help students. Discussion ensued. One member asked how would it be decided who would get the housing? These are long term decisions and there are also major infrastructure upgrades that are required at Harry Jerome Recreation Centre, North Shore Neighbourhood House and to the sewage system.

It was noted that the City has struggled for many years on how to deal with affordable housing.

Comments were also made about creating a more vibrant nightlife like Yaletown with good restaurants, or attracting more creative workers, so that the City is not a bedroom community.

The group then moved on to discussing the boards on economic development and giving their input.

Social Inclusion may be discussed at the September meeting.

The meeting reconvened in the conference room and continued.

5. **General Discussion**

It was noted that population trends have changed. For the first time in eight years BC has had a net outflow of people moving to other provinces. The province is No. 3 in Canada in attracting immigrants, with about 15% coming to BC.
An APC member raised the issue of amenity contributions. There was discussion on what is appropriate to be asking of a project in terms of its amenity contribution, especially large developments. What is the process by which such agreements are created? There should be a standardized form. People need to clearly understand how the decision is arrived at. The discussion of density bonussing and the process in which they are decided should be very clear.

It was noted that there are two challenges: how do you value the bonus, and how do you create it? It is not charity. Amenities that make the most sense have the most synergy with the project.

The comment was made that APC should have a workshop or a monthly meeting on it, using projects as examples.

Staff noted that the Director, Community Development did come to a previous meeting to clarify the process. A request was made for a talk about the specifics and how staff approaches density bonussing and how the developer approaches it. Staff advised the City is not looking for the APC to create a pro forma.

Action: S. Smith to follow up.

6. Other

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission will be held on Wednesday, September 14th, 2011.

Chair