AGENDA FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL,
HELD ELECTRONICALLY FROM CITY HALL,
141 WEST 14TH STREET, NORTH VANCOUVER, BC, ON
MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 2022 AT 5:30 PM

“Live” Broadcast via City Website www.cnv.org/LiveStreaming
Complete Agenda Package available at www.cnv.org/CouncilMeetings

The City of North Vancouver acknowledges that this Council meeting is held on the
traditional territories of the Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations.

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

1. Regular Council Meeting Agenda, January 24, 2022

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2. Regular Council Meeting Minutes, January 17, 2022

PROCLAMATION

International Holocaust Remembrance Day – January 27, 2022

PUBLIC INPUT PERIOD

PUBLIC HEARING – 144 West 21st Street

BYLAW – THIRD READING


REPORT

4. Housing Agreement Update – Rezoning Application: 144 West 21st Street

BYLAW – RESCIND SECOND READING

5. “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments)

BYLAW – AMEND SECOND READING AND SECOND READING, AS AMENDED

6. “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments)
### BYLAW – THIRD READING
7. “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments)

### BYLAW – FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

### REPORT
9. Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw Update

### BYLAW – FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

### REPORT
11. 2022 Development Application Fee Review and Updates to Development Procedures Bylaw and Construction Regulation Bylaw

### BYLAWS – FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS


### NOTICES OF MOTION
14. Transport Canada Standards for Electric Mobility Devices – Councillor Valente

15. City of North Vancouver Multicultural Community Festival – Councillor Girard and Councillor Hu

### COUNCIL INQUIRIES / REPORTS
### NEW ITEMS OF BUSINESS
### NOTICES OF MOTION
### RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION
### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (CLOSED SESSION)
### ADJOURN
CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

1. Regular Council Meeting Agenda, January 24, 2022

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2. Regular Council Meeting Minutes, January 17, 2022

PROCLAMATION

International Holocaust Remembrance Day – January 27, 2022

PUBLIC INPUT PERIOD

The Public Input Period is addressed in sections 12.20 to 12.28 of “Council Procedure Bylaw, 2015, No. 8500.”

The time allotted for each speaker addressing Council during the Public Input Period is 2 minutes, with the number of speakers set at 5 persons. Speakers’ comments will be audio recorded, as well as live-streamed on the City’s website, and will form part of the public record.

As City Hall remains closed to the public, the Regular Council Meetings will be held electronically via Webex. To speak during the Public Input Period of a Regular Council Meeting, pre-registration is required by completing an online form at cnv.org/PublicInputPeriod. Persons can also pre-register by phoning 604-990-4230 and providing contact information. All pre-registration must be submitted no later than 12:00 noon on the day of the meeting.

Once you have pre-registered, you will receive login/call-in instructions via email/phone.

You will be required to login or phone into the Council meeting between 5:00 and 5:15 pm on the day of the meeting. At the meeting, speakers will be asked to state their name and address for the record. If speakers have written materials to accompany their presentation, these materials must be emailed to the Corporate Officer at clerks@cnv.org no later than 12:00 noon on the day of the meeting.

The Public Input Period provides an opportunity for comment only and places the speaker’s concern on record, without the expectation of a response from Council.

Speakers must comply with the General Rules of Conduct set out in section 5.1 of “Council Procedure Bylaw, 2015, No. 8500” and may not speak with respect to items as listed in section 12.25(2).

Speakers are requested not to address matters that refer to items from a concluded Public Hearing/Public Meeting or to Public Hearings, Public Meetings and Committee meetings when those matters are scheduled on the same evening’s agenda, as an opportunity for public input is provided when the particular item comes forward for discussion.

Please address the Mayor as “Your Worship” or “Mayor, followed by his/her surname”. Councillors should be addressed as “Councillor, followed by their surname”.

PUBLIC HEARING – 144 West 21st Street – 5:30 PM

"Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8896" (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745) and “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) would rezone the subject property from a Medium Density Apartment Residential 1 (RM-1) Zone to a Comprehensive Development 745 (CD-745) Zone to permit a 6-storey rental apartment building with 85 units and underground parking.

Third reading of Bylaw Nos. 8896 and 8897 to be considered under Items 3 and 7.

Items 4, 5 and 6 refer.

AGENDA

Staff presentation
Applicant presentation
Representations from the public
Questions from Council
Motion to conclude the Public Hearing

BYLAW – THIRD READING


RECOMMENDATION:

THAT “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8896” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745) be given third reading.

REPORT


Report: Planner 2, January 11, 2022

RECOMMENDATION:

PURSUANT to the report of the Planner 2, dated January 11, 2022, entitled “Housing Agreement Update – Rezoning Application: 144 West 21st Street”:

THAT second reading of “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) be rescinded; Continued…
REPORT – Continued


THAT “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) be amended to include provisions for consistency with policy recommendations for Mid-Market Rental Units;

AND THAT “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) be given second reading, as amended.

Items 5 and 6 refer.

BYLAW – RESCIND SECOND READING

5. “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT second reading of “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) be rescinded.

BYLAW – AMEND SECOND READING AND SECOND READING, AS AMENDED

6. “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT second reading of “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) be amended and given second reading, as amended.

BYLAW – THIRD READING

7. “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) be given third reading.
BYLAW – FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

   (Larry Podhora / Larry Podhora Architecture Inc., 309 Kennard Avenue, CD-748)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8902”
(Larry Podhora / Larry Podhora Architecture Inc., 309 Kennard Avenue, CD-748)
be given first, second and third readings.

No Public Hearing held.

REPORT

9. Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw Update – File: 09-3900-30-0005/1

Report: Planner 1, January 12, 2022

RECOMMENDATION:

PURSUANT to the report of the Planner 1, dated January 12, 2022, entitled
“Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw Update”:

THAT “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8883”
(Additional Coach House Requirements), to amend “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700”
and the “Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines”, be
considered and referred to a Public Hearing;

AND THAT notification be circulated in accordance with the Local Government Act.

Item 10 refers.

BYLAW – FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

(Additional Coach House Requirements)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8883”
(Additional Coach House Requirements) be given first and second readings.
REPORT

11. 2022 Development Application Fee Review and Updates to Development Procedures Bylaw and Construction Regulation Bylaw
   – File: 08-3010-01-0001/2021

   Report: Planner 1, January 12, 2022

RECOMMENDATION:

PURSUANT to the report of the Planner 1, dated January 12, 2022, entitled “2022 Development Application Fee Review and Updates to Development Procedures Bylaw and Construction Regulation Bylaw”:

THAT the following bylaws be considered:

- “Development Procedures Bylaw, 2001, No. 7343, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8906” (2022 Development Application Fee Review);

- “Construction Regulation Bylaw, 2003, No. 7390, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8907” (2022 Development Application Fee Review);

AND THAT staff be directed to advise the development and building communities of the changes to development application fees.

*Items 12 and 13 refer.*

BYLAWS – FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS


RECOMMENDATION:


RECOMMENDATION:

NOTICES OF MOTION

14. Transport Canada Standards for Electric Mobility Devices
   – File: 11-5280-20-0004/1

   Submitted by Councillor Valente

   RECOMMENDATION:

   WHEREAS the City of North Vancouver and Council have a goal of making this municipality “the healthiest small city in the world”;

   WHEREAS the City has prioritized an All Ages and Abilities (AAA) active transportation network of “mobility lanes” providing protection and separation from people walking and motor vehicle traffic for active modes, like bikes and other people-powered and electric assist “micromobility” devices;

   AND WHEREAS a multitude of micromobility devices are increasingly used for daily, practical transportation, as well as for commercial cargo in the City and around the world, and the City is a participant in the Province of BC’s Electric Kick Scooter Pilot project;

   THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Mayor, on behalf of Council, write a letter to Transport Canada requesting that it establish clear and consistent technical specification, testing, labelling and safety standards for the range of available electric assist micromobility devices, including, but not limited to e-cargo bicycles, e-bikes, e-scooters and e-skateboards, and conduct robust consultation with key stakeholders on universal accessibility, active transportation and road safety, given the importance of consumer safety and protection, and to provide clarity for businesses that manufacture, import, distribute, retail and provide insurance products for micromobility.

15. City of North Vancouver Multicultural Community Festival
   – File: 15-8100-01-0001/2022

   Submitted by Councillor Girard and Councillor Hu

   RECOMMENDATION:

   WHEREAS the City of North Vancouver is made up of residents from diverse cultures, multi-ethnic backgrounds and ancestries with distinct languages and traditions that enrich the lives of all residents within the City;

   WHEREAS the 2018-2022 Council Strategic Plan reflects that 38% of the City’s population have emigrated from more than 100 countries;

   Continued…
NOTICES OF MOTION – Continued

15. City of North Vancouver Multicultural Community Festival
   – File: 15-8100-01-0001/2022 – Continued

   WHEREAS the City’s Cultural and Diversity Policy, adopted by Council on June 1, 1998, sets out objectives to promote and reflect a positive and proactive attitude towards community diversity among City employees and representatives, promote inclusion and welcome the participation of community members from various backgrounds in community and civic life;

   WHEREAS multicultural events provide opportunities to: 1) promote awareness and education for residents to learn more about another culture in positive ways; 2) enhance intercultural interactions and breaking down barriers by celebrating the ethnic and cultural diversity of our residents through official celebrations; and, 3) engage residents through volunteerism and participation in the delivery of such events;

   WHEREAS other cities in Canada, which have hosted ‘destination’ multicultural festivals, have demonstrated there to be financial and economic spin-offs through additional tourism dollars spent at local businesses during such festivals;

   AND WHEREAS there are numerous cultural organizations and societies, within Metro Vancouver and beyond, whose mission is to celebrate and preserve cultural traditions through the delivery of performances at such festivals;

   THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT staff be directed to create a Task Force for the purpose of investigating a potential model for a coordinated, annual, multi-day, Multicultural Festival, for the celebration of cultural performances and presentations, offered by cultural organizations and societies, and utilizing a variety of City-wide community spaces and participation from community members;

   AND THAT the Task Force report back to Council on a proposed model, estimated cost implications and the role for the City.

COUNCIL INQUIRIES / REPORTS

NEW ITEMS OF BUSINESS

NOTICES OF MOTION

RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

   THAT Council recess to the Committee of the Whole, Closed Session, pursuant to the Community Charter, Section 90(1)(a) [personal information].

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (CLOSED SESSION)

ADJOURN
PUBLIC HEARING GUIDELINES FOR ELECTRONIC MEETINGS

Public Hearings are included as part of a Regular Council agenda and governed by the provisions of the *Local Government Act*.

A Public Hearing is held to allow the public an opportunity to make representations to Council – in person at the Public Hearing or by written submission – on a proposed amendment to the City’s Official Community Plan and/or Zoning Bylaw. All persons who believe their interest in property is affected by a proposed bylaw(s) are afforded a reasonable opportunity to be heard, voice concerns or present written submissions regarding matters contained within the bylaw(s).

All written submissions and representations made at the Public Hearing form part of the official public record. Minutes of the Public Hearing and a video recording of the proceedings will be posted on the City’s website at cnv.org.

All written submissions must include the person’s name and address. If this information is not provided, it cannot be included as part of the public record. Electronic submissions are preferred, and hand-delivered or mailed submissions will also be accepted. The deadline to submit email submissions is 12:00 noon on the day of the Public Hearing. Due to COVID-19, safety quarantine restrictions have been put in place and the deadline for submissions by mail or delivery to City Hall is 4:00 pm on the Friday prior to the Monday Public Hearing (a minimum of one clear day prior to the Public Hearing).

If persons wish to speak at the Public Hearing, we ask that everyone pre-register to be placed on the speaker’s list. The pre-registration form is available at cnv.org/PublicHearings, or speakers can pre-register by contacting the Corporate Officer’s office. All pre-registrations must be submitted no later than 12:00 noon on the day of the Public Hearing, to allow City staff time to contact all participants and provide them with call-in/online access instructions.

Comments from the public must specifically relate to the proposed bylaw(s). Speakers are asked to avoid repetitive comments and not to divert to other matters.

Speakers will be asked to confirm their name and address for the record and will be provided one, 5-minute opportunity to present their comments. There will be no opportunity to speak a second time. After all persons who have pre-registered have spoken, the Mayor (Chair) will ask if anyone else from the public has new information to provide. Speakers who have not pre-registered will also have an opportunity to provide input at cnv.org/PublicHearings. Call-in details will be displayed on-screen at the Public Hearing (watch web livestream). Once all registered speakers have provided input, the Mayor will call for a recess to allow additional speakers time to phone in.

*Continued…*
Everyone will be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard and no one should feel discouraged or prevented from making their views known. The City asks for everyone’s patience during the electronic Public Hearing.

Procedural rules for the conduct of the Public Hearing are set at the call of the Chair and Council’s main function is to listen to the views of the public regarding the change of land use in the proposed bylaw(s). It is not the function of Council to debate the merits of an application with speakers. Questions from members of the public and Council must be addressed through the Chair.

Once the Public Hearing concludes, no further information or submissions can be considered by Council.

Following adjournment of the Public Hearing, the Regular meeting reconvenes and the Zoning and/or Official Community Plan bylaw amendment(s) are discussed and debated by members of Council, followed by consideration of third reading of the bylaw(s).
The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm.

Mayor Buchanan presented accolades to Council, staff and the public for all positive efforts in the community over the past two years and wished everyone a Happy New Year.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Councillor Back, seconded by Councillor Bell

1. Regular Council Meeting Agenda, January 17, 2022

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Bell, seconded by Councillor Girard

2. Regular Council Meeting Minutes, December 13, 2021

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PROCLAMATION

Mayor Buchanan declared the following proclamation:

Alzheimer’s Awareness Month – January 2022
PUBLIC INPUT PERIOD

- Steven Jones, 728 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, spoke regarding Mosquito Creek Bridge.

PRESENTATION

E-Scooter Pilot Enabling Bylaws – Policy Analyst, Transportation

The Policy Analyst, Transportation provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the “E-Scooter Pilot Enabling Bylaws” and she and the Manager, Transportation Planning, and the North Shore Mobility Options Coordinator responded to questions of Council.

REPORT

3. Proposed Bylaw to Enable E-Scooter Pilot – File: 16-8330-11-0001/1

Report: Policy Analyst, Transportation, and North Shore Mobility Options Coordinator, January 6, 2022

Moved by Councillor Back, seconded by Councillor McIlroy

PURSUANT to the report of the Policy Analyst, Transportation, and the North Shore Mobility Options Coordinator, dated January 6, 2022, entitled “Proposed Bylaw to Enable E-Scooter Pilot”:

THAT “Street and Traffic Bylaw, 1991, No. 6234, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8846” (Electric Kick Scooter Pilot) be considered.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

BYLAW – FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS


Moved by Councillor Back, seconded by Councillor McIlroy

THAT “Street and Traffic Bylaw, 1991, No. 6234, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8846” (Electric Kick Scooter Pilot) be given first and second readings.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Moved by Councillor Back, seconded by Councillor McIlroy

THAT “Street and Traffic Bylaw, 1991, No. 6234, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8846” (Electric Kick Scooter Pilot) be given third reading.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
PRESENTATION

2021 Infrastructure Improvement Highlights – Deputy Director, Engineering, Parks and Environment, Deputy Director, Engineering, Parks and Environment, and Manager, Public Realm Infrastructure

The Deputy Director, Engineering, Parks and Environment and the Manager, Public Realm Infrastructure provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the “2021 Infrastructure Improvement Highlights” and responded to questions of Council.

REPORT

5. Introduction of Rezoning Application: 1712 Lonsdale Avenue (Polygon 229 Development Ltd. / Yamamoto Architecture, CD-749) and Text Amendment: Centennial Theatre, 2300 Lonsdale Avenue, 116 East 23rd Street, and Norseman Park (Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands, CD-165) – File: 08-3400-20-0045/1

Report: Planner 2, January 5, 2022

Moved by Councillor Bell, seconded by Councillor Back

PURSUANT to the report of the Planner 2, dated January 5, 2022, entitled “Introduction of Rezoning Application: 1712 Lonsdale Avenue (Polygon 229 Development Ltd. / Yamamoto Architecture, CD-749) and Text Amendment: Centennial Theatre, 2300 Lonsdale Avenue, 116 East 23rd Street, and Norseman Park (Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands, CD-165)”:

THAT “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8903” (Polygon 229 Development Ltd. / Yamamoto Architecture, 1712 Lonsdale Avenue, CD-749) and Text Amendment to Centennial Theatre, 2300 Lonsdale Avenue, 116 East 23rd Street, and Norseman Park (Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands, CD-165) be considered and referred to a Public Hearing;

THAT notification be circulated in accordance with the Local Government Act;

THAT the community benefits listed in the report section “Density Bonus and Community Benefits” be secured through agreements at the applicant’s expense and to the satisfaction of staff;

THAT the Mayor and the Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the necessary documentation to permit solar shades, which are permanently affixed to the proposed building as an encroachment over City property;

AND THAT the Mayor and the Corporate Officer be authorized to sign any other necessary documentation to give effect to this motion.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
Moved by Councillor Bell, seconded by Councillor Back

THAT the Regular Council agenda of January 17, 2022 be amended by adding Item 6 – "Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8903" and Text Amendment to Centennial Theatre, 2300 Lonsdale Avenue, 116 East 23rd Street, and Norseman Park (Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands, CD-165)."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

BY-LAW – FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

6. "Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8903" (Polygon 229 Development Ltd. / Yamamoto Architecture, 1712 Lonsdale Avenue, CD-749) and Text Amendment to Centennial Theatre, 2300 Lonsdale Avenue, 116 East 23rd Street, and Norseman Park (Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands, CD-165)

Moved by Councillor Bell, seconded by Councillor Back

THAT "Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8903" (Polygon 229 Development Ltd. / Yamamoto Architecture, 1712 Lonsdale Avenue, CD-749) and Text Amendment to Centennial Theatre, 2300 Lonsdale Avenue, 116 East 23rd Street, and Norseman Park (Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands, CD-165) be given first and second readings.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COUNCIL INQUIRIES / REPORTS

Nil.

NEW ITEMS OF BUSINESS

Nil.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Nil.

RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

Moved by Councillor Valente, seconded by Councillor Bell

THAT Council recess to the Committee of the Whole, Closed Session, pursuant to the Community Charter, Section 90(1)(e) [land matter].

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ADJOURN

The meeting recessed at 7:13 pm and did not reconvene. A motion to adjourn was approved in the Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) at 8:39 pm.

"Certified Correct by the Corporate Officer"

CORPORATE OFFICER
Office of the Mayor
CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER
BRITISH COLUMBIA

Proclamation

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

Whereas in 2005, the United Nations General Assembly designated January 27 – the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau – as International Holocaust Remembrance Day;

Whereas on this annual day of commemoration, every member state of the United Nations has an obligation to honour the victims of the Nazi era and to develop educational programs to help prevent future genocides;

Whereas the United Nations resolution that created International Holocaust Remembrance Day rejects denial of the Holocaust and condemns discrimination and violence based on religion or ethnicity;

Whereas Canada offers refuge and new hope to immigrants, refugees and survivors, some of whom have escaped more recent genocides – and it is a place where people learn from each other and share cultures;

Whereas we join the Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre and our Jewish community on an annual day of commemoration to honour the victims of the Nazi era; and

Whereas in 2022 the theme guiding the United Nations Holocaust remembrance and education is “Memory, Dignity and Justice”, which encompasses the concerns of safeguarding the historical record, remembering the victims, and challenging the distortion of history often expressed in contemporary antisemitism;

Now Therefore I, Linda Buchanan, Mayor of the City of North Vancouver, do hereby proclaim January 27, 2022 as International Holocaust Remembrance Day in the City of North Vancouver, the traditional territories of the Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations.

So proclaimed on Monday, January 24, 2022

Mayor Linda Buchanan
THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
To: Mayor Linda Buchanan and Members of Council
From: Emma Chow, Planner 2
Subject: ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT FOR 144 WEST 21ST STREET
(Confide Enterprises / Ankenman Marchand Architects)
Date: November 15, 2021

The following is a suggested recommendation only. Refer to Council Minutes for adopted resolution.

RECOMMENDATION

PURSUANT to the report of the Planner 2, dated November 15, 2021, entitled "Zoning Bylaw Amendment for 144 West 21st Street (Confide Enterprises / Ankenman Marchand Architects)":

THAT "Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8896" (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745) be considered and referred to a Public Hearing;

THAT "Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897" (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st St, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) be considered and referred to a Public Hearing;

THAT notification be circulated in accordance with the Local Government Act;

THAT the community benefits listed in the report section "Density Bonus and Community Benefits" be secured, through agreements at the applicant's expense and to the satisfaction of staff;

AND THAT the Mayor and the Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the necessary documentation to give effect to the motion.
REPORT: Zoning Bylaw Amendment for 144 West 21st Street (Confide Enterprises / Ankenman Marchand Architects)
Date: November 15, 2021

ATTACHMENTS

1. Context Map (CityDocs 2113379)
2. Architectural and Landscape Plans, dated October 2021 (CityDocs 2111160)
3. Public Consultation Summary (CityDocs 1887824)
4. Sustainability Checklist (CityDocs 1791338)
5. "Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8896" (CityDocs 2113703)
6. "Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897" (CityDocs 2115110)

PURPOSE

This report presents, for Council's consideration, details of a rezoning application for 144 West 21st Street to permit a 6-storey rental apartment building consisting of 85 units, nine of which are mid-market units.

BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Daisen Gee Wing, Confide Enterprises Inc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect:</td>
<td>Timothy Ankenman, Ankenman Marchand Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Community Plan Designation:</td>
<td>Residential Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning:</td>
<td>RM-1 (Apartment Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Guidelines:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

Site Context and Surrounding Use

The subject site is located in the Central Lonsdale neighbourhood, on the north side of West 21st St between Chesterfield and Lonsdale avenues. The site fronts on the designated Green Necklace urban greenway route and is within close proximity of the shops, services and public transit of the Lonsdale corridor.

The buildings and uses immediately surrounding the site are described in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>119-159 W 22nd St</td>
<td>5-storey apartment residential</td>
<td>CD-578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>156 W 21st St</td>
<td>3-storey apartment residential</td>
<td>CD-017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>135 W 21st St</td>
<td>3-storey apartment residential</td>
<td>RM-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>128 W 21st St</td>
<td>4-storey apartment residential</td>
<td>CD-368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Context

The site and surrounding area have Official Community Plan (OCP) land use designation of Residential Level 5 for mid-rise apartment development. The intent of this designation is to provide quality multi-family housing with a mix of unit sizes, and a focus on creating attractive and active streets.

Project Description

The site currently contains a 3-storey rental apartment building with 35 units. Built in 1978, the building is in need of a significant maintenance. The site is approximately 53.4 metres (188.27 feet) wide and 36.6 metres (120.03 feet) deep, and slopes down from northeast to southwest by approximately 5 metres (17 feet), which is a significant grade change. The site is located mid-block and not serviced by a lane. The rear of the site faces a public non-vehicular greenway.

The proposal replaces the existing building with a 6-storey rental apartment containing 85 units. The proposed mix of unit types is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-bedroom</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>554-601 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-bedroom</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>736-778 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-bedroom</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>869-908 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine units are proposed as mid-market units that would be secured through a Housing Agreement for the life of the building.

Of the 85 units, 52 are proposed to meet Level 2 of the Adaptable Design guidelines, with the remainder meeting Level 1.

The proposal includes a generous front setback and landscape design to integrate the development frontage with the adjacent Green Necklace infrastructure. A public walkway along the east lot line is proposed to serve as a mid-block pedestrian connection between West 21st Street and the rear greenway.

The top two floors are further setback by approximately 3 metres (10 feet) to help reduce massing and help mitigate impacts on views and shading. About 99 square metres (1,062 square feet) of indoor amenity space is provided on Level 1, as well as a children play area and outdoor gardening plots in the front yard.

Proposed vehicle access and main residential entry are both off West 21st Street. The proposed parking is provided within a level that is mostly below grade, with access located at the southwest of the site allowing it to be at-grade due to the natural slope of the site.

To allow the proposed massing, the proposed bylaw would vary the RM-1 zone FSR, lot coverage, height, setbacks and building width and length requirements.
### Table 3. Summary of Proposed Zoning Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BASE RM-1 ZONE</th>
<th>PROPOSED CD-745 ZONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Principal Uses</td>
<td>Various Residential Uses</td>
<td>Rental Apartment Residential Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Maximum</td>
<td>1.6 FSR</td>
<td>2.6 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage Maximum</td>
<td>50 percent</td>
<td>94 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Maximum</td>
<td>13 metres</td>
<td>19 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>Front/Rear/Exterior Side: 6.096 metres (20 feet)</td>
<td>Front: 8.46 metres (27.7 feet) Rear: 4.18 metres (13.7 feet) Side (east): 3.99 metres (13.0 feet) Side (west): 4.59 metres (15.0 feet) Portions of Cellar above grade: 0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Width &amp; Length</td>
<td>Maximum 30.48 metres (100 feet) above third store</td>
<td>(waived)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING ANALYSIS

**Policy Alignment**

The proposal is consistent with the OCP land use designation and within OCP height and density limits for the site. Located within a block of the Lonsdale commercial corridor, the proposal is in alignment with a number of OCP goals and objectives to have higher density rental housing that is within the Lonsdale Regional City Centre and close to shops, services, public transit and employment opportunities.

The proposed mix of unit types meets key actions of the Housing Action Plan for mid-market rental units and a minimum of 10% three-bedroom units to support families. Also, the proposed 100% secured rental housing of 85 units meets a priority of the Council Strategic Plan to protect and expand rental housing stock.

The proposal exceeds the Zoning Bylaw minimum requirement for 25% of units to meet Level 2 Adaptable Design. The proposal addresses some Active Design Guidelines through provision of indoor and outdoor amenity spaces.

**Building Setbacks**

Setbacks in the proposal are slightly reduced to the rear and east side lot lines, and increased to the front compared to the base RM-1 zone. The enlarged front setback provides space for outdoor amenity, including children play area, and a well-landscaped blending of private/public property line along the Green Necklace.

**Lot Coverage**

Lot coverage is significantly increased in the proposal due to the natural slope of the site, which results in a large portion of the underground parking level to protrude more than 3 feet above grade and be considered part of lot coverage. The proposed amount of lot coverage is acceptable due to the ample proposed landscaping and adequate building setbacks.
Parking
Vehicle and bicycle parking meet the minimum provision required under the Zoning Bylaw.

Infrastructure and Servicing
The proposed pedestrian walkway will require a statutory right-of-way placed on title. Currently, the site contains a covenant and right-of-way for stormwater management of previous development, which are no longer needed. Staff recommend that both covenant and right-of-way be discharged from title.

The proposal will require new utility and communications service connections, stormwater management features, as well as improvements along frontage that meet City standards for road works, streetscaping and the Green Necklace, secured through a Servicing Agreement with the City.

Density Bonus and Community Benefits

The City’s Density Bonus and Community Benefits Policy, in conjunction with the OCP, allows for density bonuses beyond 1.6 FSR in the Residential Level 5 designation, up to a maximum of 2.6 FSR.

The policy provides a number of community benefits options for projects seeking additional density and seeks to ensure the City receives value for additional density granted. However, sites with existing rental housing, such as the subject site, may only seek density bonus through provision of secured rental housing. The community benefit offered by this proposal is an increase of the City’s rental housing stock by 50 units (85 units total), nine of which will be mid-market units, secured for the life of the building through a Housing Agreement with the City.

The value of the density bonus (1.0 FSR = 22,599 square feet) may be estimated at $4,293,810 based on the standard rate for the Lonsdale City Centre ($190/square foot).

In addition to secured rental and mid-market units, staff is seeking Council direction to secure the following items as conditions of this rezoning:

- Statutory right-of-way for mid-block pedestrian connection between West 21st Street and the greenway to the north of site
- Upgrades to greenway north of site as needed
- Streetscape and public realm improvements for Green Necklace along frontage

Legal Agreements

Should Council support this rezoning, the following legal agreements should be prepared prior to final adoption:

- Housing Agreement
- Servicing Agreement
RESIDENTIAL TENANT RELOCATION

Earlier this year, Council amended the *Residential Tenant Displacement Policy* to enhance protection and compensation to long term residential tenants. As this application was submitted in June 2019 prior to the recent policy amendment, the 2015 version of the policy applies.

The existing building contains 35 units in total: 2 studio units, 20 one-bedroom units and 13 two-bedroom units. At time of application submission, 28 of these units were occupied. Half of tenants have lived there for 15 years or more, and 16 tenants have been there for more than 10 years.

The applicant has prepared a Tenant Relocation Plan that exceeds the requirements of the 2015 *Residential Tenant Displacement Policy*, including compensation and relocation assistance. Tenants were first informed of the redevelopment plans in July 2019 with a letter and tenant meeting, followed by an open house in August. The letter and meetings provided tenants information on the compensation package of 3-months' rent plus moving expense compensation of $750 for one-bedroom units and $1000 for two-bedroom units. In addition, the applicant has voluntarily offered additional compensation for long-term tenants at the following rates:

- 1 month's rent additional for tenancies up to 5 years
- 2 months' rent additional for tenancies between 5 and 10 years
- 3 months' rent additional for tenancies between 10 and 20 years
- 4 months' rent additional for tenancies over 20 years

A Relocation Coordinator has been communicating with tenants and providing information on available units in the general rental market, as well as resources for government housing programs. In September 2020, an update was provided by the Relocation Coordinator showing 5 of the 28 tenants had moved out since the rezoning application was submitted. A Tenant Relocation Update was sent to tenants in October 2020 with updated timelines, resources and a Tenant's Needs Survey to help inform relocation efforts.

Under the provincial *Residential Tenancy Act*, final eviction notices cannot be delivered to tenants until a demolition permit has been issued. The notice must provide a minimum of four months prior to the eviction date. Before issuance of the demolition permit, staff will request an update from the Relocation Coordinator regarding the progress of relocating tenants and compensation as outlined in the Tenant Relocation Plan.
ADVISORY BODY INPUT

Advisory Design Panel

The application was reviewed by the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) on July 24, 2019.

The Panel unanimously endorsed the proposal subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Further examination and explanation of the colour palette choices on the elevations;
- Keep the breezeway clear and lit with robust gates on the north from public to private to address CPTED concerns;
- Avoid pedestrian and car interfaces at the driveway;
- Ensure unit planning aspects are reviewed via code, livability or functionality; and
- Ensure a more blended front landscape so there is no distinct property line.

Revised designs were submitted since the ADP meeting that address the above concerns to the satisfaction of City staff.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

A Developer Information Session was held on August 14, 2019 at the Harry Jerome Community Centre. Over 15 people attended and 5 submitted feedback forms.

Overall, feedback supported the 100% rental apartment residential use with a positive response to the proposed landscaping and architecture. Several comments expressed concerns that the proposed height and density were too high for the area and the amount of parking insufficient.

As discussed in previous sections of this report, the proposal meets height and density provisions of the OCP and has a reduced top-level massing to mitigate the appearance of the height. The proposal also meets the City's parking standard for a rental building.

Members of the public will have additional opportunity to speak at the Public Hearing should Council proceed with referral.

SUSTAINABILITY COMMENTS

The proposal addresses the OCP’s Sustainable City Framework through natural systems, physical structure/infrastructure, local economy, human potential, social connections and cultural diversity. The proposed landscaping will be primarily native species using rainwater collection and water efficient irrigation system. Building construction will meet Energy Step Code 3 and provide indirect economic benefits. The following are included in the proposal to promote social interaction, inclusion and community building:
• Amenity spaces for shared office use, gardening, children play area, informal and formal gatherings
• Over 60% of units are proposed to meet Level 2 Adaptable Design
• Fully landscaped frontage to contribute to public realm and user experience

CONCLUSION

This proposal is in alignment with goals and objectives of the OCP and Council Strategic Plan to intensify residential development within the Lonsdale Regional City Centre and increase rental and mid-market units in the City while contributing to important active transportation infrastructure, such as the Green Necklace.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Emma Chow
Planner 2
144 WEST 21ST STREET

RENTAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Issued for Rezoning - April 2019
Responses to PTC - October 28, 2019

STATISTICS:

Legal Description:
Lot A-201 to 206, District Lot 945, Gr. 1, NWO, Plan 17051

Civic Address:
144 West 21st Street, North Vancouver, BC V7M 1N1

Zoning:
Current: R4-1

Proposed Use:
Proposed CD2

Survey Information:
Based on survey information by Bennett Land Surveying Ltd.

Dated: April 10th, 2018

UNIT COUNTS:

Unit Breakdown:

Type: 1 Bedroom 2 Bedroom 3 Bedroom
Percent: 74% 14% 9%
Number: 63 12 3

Total Residential Units:
85

MNR Unit Breakdown:

Type: 1 Bedroom 2 Bedroom

Percent: 31% 69%
Number: 9 56

Total MNR Units:
65

10-10-10:
The project will adhere to City of North Vancouver's 10-10-10 policy as it relates to providing affordable housing. The overall percentages for the unit mix will translate into the 10-10-10 units to promote affordability for all family sizes.

DEVELOPMENT DATA SUMMARY:

Site Area:
2,098.52 m² (22,599 SF)

Permitted FSR:
Per R4-1: allowable FSR 1.6
Per CD: bonus FSR 2.1

Allowable total FSR: 2.6

Proposed FSR:
Per CD: 2.6

Proposed Site Coverage:
Per R4-1: 50% coverage

Proposed Site Coverage:
Per CD: 14% coverage

Height:

Permitted height:
Per R4-1: 3 Storeys max 42.65 m (131 ft)
Per CD: 6 Storeys, 62.54 m (205 ft)

SETBACKS:

Required:
Original zoning as per RW-1 5.23.

Setback: Exteriors - 6.46 m (21.25 ft.): No setback.
Interior: North: 4.59 m (15.06 ft.): - 0.36 m (1.18 ft) from RW-1 5.12.
East: 4.59 m (15.06 ft.): - 0.36 m (1.18 ft) from RW-1 5.12.
West: 4.59 m (15.06 ft.): - 0.36 m (1.18 ft) from RW-1 5.12.

Proposed:
Exterior Front, South: 8.46 m (27.75 ft.): - 0.36 m (1.18 ft) from RW-1 5.12.
Interior, North: 4.59 m (15.06 ft.): - 0.36 m (1.18 ft) from RW-1 5.12.
East: 4.59 m (15.06 ft.): - 0.36 m (1.18 ft) from RW-1 5.12.
West: 4.59 m (15.06 ft.): - 0.36 m (1.18 ft) from RW-1 5.12.

Copyright: Ankenman Marchand Architects. All rights reserved.

Scale: A003
144 WEST 21ST STREET
RENTAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
Issued for Rezoning: April, 2019
Responses to PTC: October 25, 2021

PARKING CALCULATIONS:

REQUIRED:
- Residential (per RT600, section 526 (Figure 8-9)) 0.8 spaces per unit = 81 spaces
- Residential Visitor (per RT600, section 995 (7)) 0.1 spaces per unit = 81 spaces (portion of the required) = 9 spaces
- Residential Disability Parking (per RT600, section 988 (11)) 0.08 spaces per unit x 60 units (portions of the required) = 3 spaces
- Total Parking-Related: 91 spaces

PROPOSED:
- Residential: 43 spaces
- Residential Visitor (per RT600): 8 spaces
- Disability Parking (per RT600): 3 spaces (1 visitor: 2 residents)
- Total Residential proposed: 54 spaces
- Residential-Electrical Vehicle spaces: 9 spaces
- Total parking spaces required: 51 spaces

*All residential parking stalls to have infrastructure required to install electrical charging stations.

BICYCLE PARKING CALCULATIONS:

BICYCLE PARKING REQUIRED:
- Secure Bicycle Parking Spaces:
  - Residential (per RT600, Part 10A 1.5 per unit) based on 66 units = 99 spaces
  - (Residential) Based on 66 units: 0.15 = 99 spaces
  - Total Secure Bicycle spaces required = 128 spaces
- Short-Term Bicycle Parking Spaces:
  - Residential (per RT600, Part 10A 2 per 60 units or part thereof) based on 66 units = 9 spaces
  - Total Short-Term Bicycle spaces required = 9 spaces

BICYCLE PARKING PROPOSED:
- Secure:
  - Residential: 60 horizontal bicycle spaces
  - Total bicycle spaces = 60
- Short-Term:
  - 9 vertical bicycle spaces
  - Total bicycle spaces = 9

Total bicycle spaces proposed (Secure = 129 + Short-Term = 9) = 137 Spaces

Electrical Outlets Proposed for Secure Parking: 68 Electrical Outlets

LOADING CALCULATIONS:

REQUIRED:
- Residential: Not required.

PROPOSED:
- Residential: none

REFUSE SPACE CALCULATIONS:

REQUIRED:
- Residential (The Guidance for Recycling and Garbage Storage Space and Access in Multiple Units Residential, Commercial, Industrial and Institutional Developments) based on 66 units
  - Storage needs = 0.066 m² x 66 units = 4.31 m² (46.45 sq ft)
  - 0.66 m² x 66 units = 4.31 m² (46.45 sq ft)
  - 3 x 3 feet bin: (garbage)
  - 1 x 480, costs (recycling)
  - 3 x 480, costs (mixed paper)
  - 2 x 240, costs (mixed containers recycling)
  - 1 x 240, costs (compostables)

PROPOSED:
- Residential refuse space proposed = 47.6 m² (513 sq ft)

ARCHITECTS
ANKENMAN MARCHAND
144 - West 21st
Vancouver, B.C.
UL 16731
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All Drawings in this set to be used in conjunction with each other. Any errors or discrepancies to be reported to the Architect before commencing work. Contractors are responsible to ensure drawings and specifications are congruent to all the requirements of the appropriate Building Code Authority.
SITE CONTEXT - PHOTOS:
### Project Details

- **Address:** 144 - West 21st St.
- **Opening Area:** Balconies Walls
- **Status:** Rezoning Submission

### Table: Level 2 Wall Area and Opening Area Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Wall Area</th>
<th>Opening Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Wall Area</th>
<th>Opening Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Wall Area</th>
<th>Opening Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes

- All drawings are subject to revision and are considered preliminary. They are intended for the architect's office and are not to be used for construction purposes without further review.
- The walls and openings are designed to meet the requirements of the applicable local building codes and standards.
Summary Report
Developer Information Session Feedback
Re: 144 – West 21st Street

A Developer Information Session was held on August 14th, 2019 from 6:00 pm - 9:00 pm at the Harry Jerome Community Centre located at 123 West 23rd Street, North Vancouver

Meeting Format: 15 presentation boards depicted the proposed plans for the Development on 144-West 21st Street. These boards explained the proposed design, proposed heights, unit types, neighbourhood context, etc. A sign-in station was located at the entry door and exit survey tables were provided to encourage people to complete feedback forms. Attendees were also given the option to take away their feedback forms for further consideration and privacy. Submissions made after November 16, 2016 have also been included in this summary report.

Purpose: To gather comprehensive Community feedback on the preliminary plans and receive suggestions prior to the next stages with the City of North Vancouver.

Outcome: Over 15 people attended the workshop over the course of the evening. 15 attendees filled out the sign in sheet. One third of respondents (5 total) submitted feedback forms either at, or after, attending the meeting. Attendees’ views and comments are captured within this Summary Report. At (and following) the meeting, the project team received several requests from attendees for electronic copies of the presentation material. All such requests were responded to in a timely manner.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Architecture: Overall, the response to the architectural design was positive, though three respondents felt 6 storeys was too high.
- Use: Overall, the response to 100% rental was positive.
- Parking: Overall, respondents felt more parking was needed.
- Tenant Relocation/Retention: Respondents voiced urgency to assist current tenants in finding suitable and affordable housing options during eviction.

This report summarizes the results and includes the final tally of responses received. All additional respondent comments have been included verbatim to avoid bias or interpretation.

The members of the public who either attended the meeting and/or filled in Exit Survey reports are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Miles-Pickup</td>
<td>159 West 22nd St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly A. Blake</td>
<td>206-144 West 21st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yew Hee</td>
<td>402-128 West 21st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janette Razow</td>
<td>408-119 West 22nd St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Issley</td>
<td>408-119 West 22nd St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Clydesdale</td>
<td>135 West 21st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ke</td>
<td>306-159 West 22nd St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda J Rich</td>
<td>404-108 West 21st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Davies</td>
<td>344 West 20th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rica Cabalung</td>
<td>344 West 20th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Krus</td>
<td>144 West 21st St</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are the questions asked on the Exit Survey, with responses following verbatim.

1) Please comment on the proposed 85 new 100% rental residential units.
   - Support. The existing building is old. Rental buildings are needed.
   - Rental units are very much needed in the City of North Vancouver. Consideration MUST be given to the present tenants being displaced & consideration to people who cannot afford $2000.00 per month rent.
   - The area is already quite densified and further rentals combined with the potential Harry Jerome site will over densify the area.
   - Too big & much too high.
   - Main issue is the height of the new proposed building. The height of the new building with block the view of people living from 3rd to top (5th) floor at 119 West 22nd street, tenants facing West. We will lose the City and water view if proposed 6 storey building is built. We recommend building height be limited to 4 storeys. Thank you for your consideration.

2) Please comment on the proposed approximate 50 new underground parking stalls.
   - >50% need to be electric stalls, preferably 100%.
   - Not enough, should be 85.
   - 50 Stalls are not enough when you consider the problems presently existing in our neighbourhood. Most people have considerable problems with this.

3) Please comment on the proposed landscape design fronting West 21st Street.
   - Looks fine. Huge improvement to what is there now.
   - Appears to be good with the existing landscaping in the area. Consider drought resistant hardy plants and trees to minimize the climate change issues we are facing now & in the future.
   - Landscaping too shallow – supposed to be on green necklace. Prefer deeper setback or better privacy.

4) WEST 21st STREET: A 6 storey facade is proposed along the West 21st streetscape with the first 4 storeys being similar in massing and form to the existing building, with 2 storeys above set back significantly from the street to reduce the overall massing and form. Please comment on this design approach:
   - Appears to enhance privacy.
   - Design is fine.
   - Upper stories must be set back much more.
   - 6 storeys is too high and not in line with the existing area. Bonus density should not be granted.

5) REAR LANEWAY CONNECTION: The project includes a breezeway/walkway connecting West 21st Street to the Rear Laneway and walking trails. This will be well lit and is intended to increase public connectivity through the neighbourhood. Please comment on this aspect of the proposal:
   - The existing walkway is well used by people in the neighbourhood, and addition would be appreciated.
   - Good. Great that renters can access the trails.

6) Please comment on the envisioned 'butterfly roof' design (large overhanging roof), which provides solar shading and rain protection.
   - No issues with the design of the building.
- Too high, but overhanging concept ok.

7) Please comment on any other aspect of the project (please feel free to use back of page if necessary):

- Fully support project. However, there should be 85 parking stalls as well as ones for visitors.
- Main concerns are for displaced renters, unreasonable rents for most people, not enough parking spots. Not everyone in North Vancouver can bike to work.
- Too many floors. 3 levels best, + underground parking.
- 6 storeys is too tall. 1.6 FSR is all they should be granted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Systems - Landscape</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Private Trees</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The existing trees within the site cannot be retained due to the location and size of the underground parking, but the project will be retaining the existing street trees along West 21st, and will be adding trees around the site, resulting in a net positive number of planted trees on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Green Roof / Wall</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project will not include green roofs / walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Majority Native Species Landscaping</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will be landscaped with primarily native, native-like and drought resistant plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Habitat Restoration</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Because the project will be using primarily native species, it will provide habitat to local flora and fauna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Community Gardens</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will include urban agriculture plots in the rear yard to be used and accessed by all residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 50% or More Edible Landscaping for Common Space</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project will not include 50% or more edible landscaping, though it will include some native plants with edible fruits or berries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Water Efficient Irrigation System (drip hose, low-flow nozzles)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will coordinate with mechanical teams during next phases to include low-flow and efficient irrigation systems for all landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rainwater Collection</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will provide a rain barrel in proximity to the community gardens, to reduce the amount of potable water required for irrigating garden plots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Reuse of Wastewater</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project will not include wastewater reuse on this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Permeable Paving for Hardscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 40%+ Open Site Space (see Zoning Bylaw Definition)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Structure - High Performance Construction</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Durable Building (modular / deconstructable)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project will not include modular / deconstructable elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Recycled Content</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will include recycled and recyclable materials to the greatest extent possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Majority Use of Environmentally Friendly Materials</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project is primarily of wood-frame construction, and will be local and non-toxic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Certified by a Third Party Green Building Rating System</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project will not certify with a green building rating system, but will follow green built industry standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Structure - Energy Efficiency and Healthy Buildings</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Energy Performance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This project will adhere to the required level of the Energy Step Code, which will ensure it is performing with optimal energy performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Superior Insulation</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Through the energy modeling process required by the Energy Step Code, the project will include the necessary insulation levels to ensure the overall energy performance targets are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Airtightness</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will perform air tightness testing to meet the Energy Step Code requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 High-performance Windows</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will include thermally broken windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 District Energy</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>The project will undergo a review to confirm whether there is an opportunity to connect to the LEC. Should it be deemed viable, the project will respond mechanically through the selection of hydronic mechanical systems which utilize the energy available through the LEC connect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Building Heating System</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Through the energy modeling process required by the Energy Step Code, the project will select a heating system that efficiently heats the building while ensuring the overall energy performance targets are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Heat Recovery Ventilator</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Through the energy modeling process required by the Energy Step Code, the project will assess the need for HRVs in achieving the overall energy performance target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 LED Lighting (whole building)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will include energy efficient lighting throughout all common and private spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Energy-Star Appliances</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Energy-Star Appliances will be used throughout the project to contribute to the project's overall energy performance targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Suite Metering</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Unless otherwise specified by LEC or BC Hydro, the project will not be providing suite-level metering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Water Efficient Fixtures</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>They project will include low-flow fixtures throughout all suites and common areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Greywater Reuse</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project will not address grey water reuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Livability/Human Well Being</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The building has been designed to maximize passive architectural performance and environmental response. This process has produced not only reduction in energy requirements but also high levels of daylighting and views for the occupants along with enhanced natural ventilation utilizing cross ventilation schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure - Transportation</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 End of Trip Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Car-Share Program</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project will not include any car-share programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment: 20% of all residential parking spaces</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will include 20% of purchased residential stalls as electric vehicle charging stalls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment: Adequate space in electrical room for remaining 80% of parking spaces</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>As required, the project will ensure adequate electrical capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Close proximity to frequent Public Transportation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project is located in close proximity to frequent public transportation along Lonsdale Avenue. A short 180m walk brings you to bus stops running both north and south, with 6 distinct bus routes that bring you around North Vancouver, and connect to other transportation hubs such as the Sea Bus station and bus loop exchanges to connect you to the rest of Metro Vancouver. This is extremely beneficial to the rental community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Considerations</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Direct Employment</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This project does not include commercial space, but will include the need to employ a full-time Building Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Commercial Floor Space (net increase, indicate area)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This project does not include commercial space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Neighbourhood Scale Commercial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This project does not include commercial space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Non-Market / Lower-End of Market Commercial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This project does not include commercial space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Commercial Relocation Strategy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This project does not include commercial space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Indirect Economic Benefits</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>During the course of construction, there will be full-time jobs generated during each year of the development. This benefit will also extend to local suppliers of various construction materials, furnishings and fixtures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Potential</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Market Rental Housing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This project will be 100% market rental housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Non-Market / Lower-End of Market Rental Housing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This project will abide by the 10-10-10 requirement. (10% of units in new market rental projects to be rented at 10% below average rents, as indicated by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, for a minimum period of 10 years.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 10%+ Three+ Bedroom Units</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will provide 8, 3-bedroom unit apartments (over 10%) in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Micro-Units ~400 sq.ft.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project does not include micro-units, as it aims to focus on liveability and providing spaces that can accommodate multiple occupants and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Childcare Facilities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project will not include childcare facilities, but will include a children's outdoor playspace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Community Space for Food Preparation, Storage and Processing</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project does not include food preparation or storage facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Green Building Educational / Interpretive Features</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project does not address this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Primary and Secondary Stair Design</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project does not include a feature stair design as to maximize space for creating rental units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Outdoor Circulation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The residential units are not accessed through exterior corridors, but the ground floor units facing the rear yard are able to be access from an outdoor walkway. The project also includes a publicly accessible walkway along the east edge of the site that connects West 21st to the public walking path in the lane at the rear of the building. Outdoor walkability is still a feature in the overall project design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Storage space for residents in storage rooms</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project does not include storage units separate from the closets provided in the residential units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Amenity &amp; Commercial connections</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>To promote social interaction between residents and the commercial users, the project will provide a business room available to for residents to utilize, rather than purchasing a suite with an extra room designated as a workspace. This provides an ideal &quot;work from home&quot; amenity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project goes above the 25% requirement for adaptable units by providing 61% of units meeting Level 2 from the Adaptable Design Guidelines. The outdoor space in the rear yard also includes accessible picnic tables to increase inclusion and resident connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project will not include community cooking facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>To promote social interaction between residents and the commercial users, the project will provide a business room available for residents to utilize, rather than purchasing a suite with an extra room designated as a workspace. This provides an ideal “work from home” amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The provision of community gardens provides residents with ample space for outdoor gardening activities, encouraging residents to get outside, be physically active and grow their own healthy produce. It also includes the children's play area with seating for parents and guardians to gather and overlook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A number of the garden plots will be at heights easily accessible to senior users.Benches and tables around the site will give places for seniors to gather. Tables will include spaces for games like checkers/chess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The project will strictly adhere to the Crime Prevention design guidelines, to reduce any opportunity for crime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cultural Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The business room available to be rented for residents also serves as a formal gathering space. Occupants can gather together for any occasion or celebration. Informal gathering spaces will be incorporated into the landscape design of the plaza, encouraging interaction and activity between residents and visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The landscaping to the south of the building (along West 21st) will be fully landscaped, and will be a significant contribution to the public realm and human experience in the neighbourhood. Also provided is the publicly accessible walkway along the east edge of the site that connects West 21st to the public walking path in 2400 sf of public space and is our proposed public contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The landscaped area to the south of the building will be fully landscaped, designed to incorporate planted areas with seating areas, bringing humans and nature closer together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Development Planning

Introduction

• Proposal:
  – 6-storey rental
  – 85 units
  – 2.6 FSR (1.0 bonus)

• Replacing:
  – 3-storey rental (1978)
  – 35 units
Location

Neighbourhood Context
Policy Context

1.6 base + 1.0 bonus
2.6 FSR

RM-1 Zone 1.6 FSR

Proposal: Overview

• 6-storeys
• 2.6 FSR

85 Total Units
52 Adaptable Units
9 MMR Units

1-Bedroom: 74%
2-Bedroom: 15%
3-Bedroom: 11%

Adaptable Units:
1-Bedroom: 83%
2-Bedroom: 15%
3-Bedroom: 11%

MMR Units:
1-Bedroom: 22%
2-Bedroom: 67%
3-Bedroom: 11%
Proposal: Site Design

• Front and rear:
  – Greenways
  – Seating & landscaping
• East:
  – Mid-block connection
• Amenities:
  – Gardening plots
  – Children play area
  – Indoor amenity space

Proposal: Site Access

- Vehicle Access
- Public Pedestrian
- Mid-Block Connection
Proposal: Landscaping

- 15 trees for removal
- 26 trees proposed
- Public-private integration

Tenant Relocation Plan

- 28 of 35 units tenanted
- 16 tenancies over 10 years
- Tenant Relocation Plan:
  - Relocation Coordinator
  - 3-months + moving allowance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Compensation</th>
<th>Length of Tenancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 month rent</td>
<td>Up to 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months rent</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months rent</td>
<td>10-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 months rent</td>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Analysis

- Consistent with OCP
- Density Bonus: 100% secured rental
- Meets *Housing Action Plan*
- Active Design: indoor/outdoor amenities
- Sustainable Development: landscaping, amenities, Adaptable Design

Zoning Amendment

- CD-745 (RM-1 base):
  - Increase density and height
  - Increase front setback
Conditions of Rezoning

- Housing Agreement
- Servicing Agreement
- Pedestrian Statutory Right-of-Way
- Community Good Neighbour Agreement
- Shoring, Crane Swing, and Staging License Agreement
- Flooding Covenant
- Community Energy Agreement

Updated Housing Agreement

- MMR units:
  - Improve language for eligibility
  - Priority to those living or working within the City
  - Priority for larger units to those with dependents
  - Annual submission of documentation
  - Minimum advertising period
Advisory Bodies

- ADP (July 24, 2019):
  - Endorsed proposal subject to addressing:
    - Colour palette choices
    - Safety concerns on mid-block connection
    - Pedestrian-vehicle conflict at driveway
    - Blend landscaping along frontage

Public Engagement

- Developer Information Session
  - August 14, 2019 @ Harry Jerome Community Centre
  - 15 attendees; 5 written submissions
  - Support:
    - 100% rental apartment use
    - Landscaping and architecture
  - Concerns:
    - Height and density high for area
    - Insufficient parking
Conclusion

• Consistent with policies
• In alignment with City goals:
  – Intensify residential development within Lonsdale Regional City Centre
  – Increase rental and MMR units
  – Contribute to important infrastructure

Thank you.
ANKENMAN MARCHAND ARCHITECTS
Continuing to create architecture that enhances life and the environment.

Public Hearing
January 24th, 2022
Rental Project – 144 West 21st Street, North Vancouver

Overview

Presentation:
- Project Team & Introductions
- Surrounding Context
- Community Visions (OCP Excerpts)
- Community Benefits/Project Overview
- Architecture
- Sustainability
- Summary and Conclusions
Project Team  Who is involved?

BDK Development Corporation

Surrounding Context  (aerial view)

Key information re: Site & Context:

- Site is surrounded by multiple-unit residential buildings
- Short (1/2 block) walking distance to Lonsdale including shops and services, restaurants, transit routes, Gordon Smith Gallery of Canadian Art & immediate access to Upper Levels Highway
- Building fronts onto existing bike lane network along 21st St.
- An extensive greenbelt/Walkway borders the site’s northern border.
- There is a considerable site crossfall from the east side of the property dropping to the west.
Surrounding Context (bike lanes)

Designated Bike Routes:

• As depicted on the map above, there are a multitude of bike routes surrounding the subject site, rationalizing the 128 bike stalls being proposed for the project & providing alternate transportation methodologies.
Applicable Community Visions:

“In 2031, the City of North Vancouver will be a vibrant, diverse and highly livable community that is resilient to climate or other changes, and sustainable in its ability to prosper without sacrifice to future generations”.

“The OCP has a strong focus on ... meeting the needs of the community members locally by creating an attractive, accessible, walkable community that supports the needs of a diverse population and labour force. This includes the provision of quality housing, a balance of amenities, including open space, a variety of transportation options, social services, a strong economy and a healthy environment and community”.

“The City also wants ... continued celebration of arts and culture, an awareness of nature...and the pursuit of high-quality urban design”.

Project Benefits and Overview

COMMUNITY BENEFITS

100% Rental:
- The project, if approved will add 85 rental units to North Vancouver’s much-needed rental stock with a wide variety of unit types.
- This project adheres to the City of North Vancouver’s 10-10-10 Policy as it relates to providing affordable housing. The overall percentages of the unit mixes will translate into the 10-10-10 units to provide affordability for all family sizes.
- The vibrant and unique architecture will greatly improve the current streetscape:

SUSTAINABILITY

Social & Urban Design Sustainability:
- The project proposes urban agriculture, gardens and amenity spaces for the site’s future Residents to gather and socialize.
- The south-facing garden includes outdoor dining and lounge opportunities.
- All residential units have ample, shaded outdoor living spaces – either decks or patios.
- A shared workspace has been included near the building’s entry for all residents to use thereby reducing the dependence of those who would otherwise have to commute to their workplace.

Building Sustainability:
- Significant bike parking is included: a total of 128 stalls including 9 surface stalls for visitors. There is provision for enough charging capacity for all secured bikes to allow E-bike charging stations.
- A total of 10 parking stalls will have the capacity for a Level 2 charging station for EV’s.
Elevations + Materials

Inspired by “the pursuit of high-quality urban design” as noted in the OCP

- A gently sloped, butterfly roof minimizes the appearance of building height and works as a large “bathtub” with a two-tiered drainage system allowing less demand on the municipal stormwater system during peak high-event rains and snow.
- The distinct, unique & colourful juxtaposition of building materials, entry definitions, a 3-dimensional play on the façade materials, and providing each façade with its own definition and personality confirms this will be read as a landmark building.
- The top two floors have been intentionally set back and have been designed as subordinate to the 4-storey massing below.
- Large overhangs allow rain protection from the generous fourth floor patios & shadowing for the top floors.
- High-quality urban design along 21st Street including an iconic entry canopy, planters, plaza etc. all enrich the existing streetscape

Sustainability

Rental Development

In this model, provision of family units and additional Mid-Market rental units which will be rented at very affordable rates.

Affordability

Maintaining affordability is a key driver to the entire project. The development model inherently cuts many typical costs. The number of units and various typologies has been carefully chosen to maintain feasibility and to ensure the proposal is all-inclusive. Having major transit stops in both directions at nearby Lonsdale ensures future residents can avoid the need for, and associated costs of an automobile if desired.

Shared Resources and Community Living

Shared amenity spaces supplement the livability of each home so residents can comfortably live in a smaller space and ensure that there are ample opportunities to create a community within a community. The shared office concept also reduces reliance on the automobile and increases affordability as those who would otherwise be required to rent a second bedroom or den no longer need to!
**Sustainability**

Key to this development is the focus on creating a multi-generational community.

85 units are provided and consist of a wide variety of 1, 2, 2+ den and 3 bedroom homes. All units are single-storey homes providing an accessible choice for seniors or those looking to age-in-place.

A certain number of units will be fully adaptable and additional units will be available for those in need.

---

**Summary and Conclusions:**

- This project is entirely community-based and offers the site’s future residents, a unique and well-considered amenity package along with a unique and appropriate, architecturally striking building that will ensure significant pride throughout the Community.

---

**Questions and Answers?**

Our entire Team wishes to thank both Council and the Community for their consideration this evening!!!!
September 11th, 2019

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W.21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting strongly that the council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully ask for no zoning change on this parcel not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need – this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle, including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake “only what is required by the City of North Vancouver”, implying the 10% community benefit for market housing – it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units - this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 more developments already approved which will increase the density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 33 units (6 townhouses and a 27 unit development). While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for a 87 units.
There is insufficient road infrastructure with nearby intersections not being able to handle the dramatic increase in traffic that will occur if rezoning is permitted. With the west end of 21st street being stop-sign controlled with a pedestrian light, in addition to being a main thoroughfare for children walking to school and the recent development of the Green Pathway – this will cause an unprecedented amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.

The development of the Green Pathway, 21st street is a narrow street that limits traffic flow. The intersection of 21st St. and Chesterfield, one half block from this property, does not function well, and is a high-risk intersection for pedestrians with heavy traffic flow, unclear views for pedestrian crossings and high speed vehicles. The intersection is a walking route for neighbourhood students to Carson Graham Secondary School as well as Wag Creek Park and a local day care. With the addition of over 80+ new units within a five-block span over the coming years, it will increase the already high risk of a car accident involving a pedestrian particularly the youth and children who use this area as a thoroughfare to daycare services and schools.

Rapid neighbourhood growth has put a strain on the community, infrastructure and community members enjoyment. The Central Lonsdale area is experiencing rapid growth as evidenced by the significant number of buildings being built along Lonsdale and both to the immediate east and west. This magnitude of change is impacting density dramatically within the area and this existing development within the neighbourhood must be considered.

If this rezoning is approved and the planned development completed, the neighbourhoods surrounding the property will witness a dramatic increase in traffic in an already heavily congested area, which will lead to more accidents, injuries and fatalities.

The lack of proper engagement with the community should also be cause for concern from Mayor and Council. While the property owner and developer claim to have provided adequate time to inform the community of the upcoming development, mailers arrived in local mailboxes between 1 and 4 days before the proposed community meeting. In addition, the mailer contained both the wrong address and the wrong date for the event. In addition, signage outside of the building was put up less than 2 weeks before the community event.

If this application is to be decided by council, please take this as notice that I would like to have additional information regarding the application and decisions. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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September 16th, 2019

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W.21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well as we own an apartment in Anderson Walk, 139 West 22nd Street. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting strongly that the council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully ask for no zoning change on this parcel not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need – this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle, including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake “only what is required by the City of North Vancouver”, implying the 10% community benefit for market housing – it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units - this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 more developments already approved which will increase the density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 33 units (6 townhouses and a 27 unit development). While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for a 87 units.
There is insufficient road infrastructure with nearby intersections not being able to handle the dramatic increase in traffic that will occur if rezoning is permitted. With the west end of 21st street being stop-sign controlled with a pedestrian light, in addition to being a main thoroughfare for children walking to school and the recent development of the Green Pathway – this will cause an unprecedented amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.

The development of the Green Pathway, 21st street is a narrow street that limits traffic flow. The intersection of 21st St. and Chesterfield, one half block from this property, does not function well, and is a high-risk intersection for pedestrians with heavy traffic flow, unclear views for pedestrian crossings and high speed vehicles. The intersection is a walking route for neighbourhood students to Carson Graham Secondary School as well as Wag Creek Park and a local day care. With the addition of over 80+ new units within a five-block span over the coming years, it will increase the already high risk of a car accident involving a pedestrian particularly the youth and children who use this area as a thoroughfare to daycare services and schools.

Rapid neighbourhood growth has put a strain on the community, infrastructure and community members enjoyment. The Central Lonsdale area is experiencing rapid growth as evidenced by the significant number of buildings being built along Lonsdale and both to the immediate east and west. This magnitude of change is impacting density dramatically within the area and this existing development within the neighbourhood must be considered.

If this rezoning is approved and the planned development completed, the neighbourhoods surrounding the property will witness a dramatic increase in traffic in an already heavily congested area, which will lead to more accidents, injuries and fatalities.

The lack of proper engagement with the community should also be cause for concern from Mayor and Council. While the property owner and developer claim to have provided adequate time to inform the community of the upcoming development, mailers arrived in local mailboxes between 1 and 4 days before the proposed community meeting. In addition, the mailer contained both the wrong address and the wrong date for the event. In addition, signage outside of the building was put up less than 2 weeks before the community event.

If this application is to be decided by council, please take this as notice that I would like to have additional information regarding the application and decisions. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Sincerely,

Gordon & Laura Nelson

3790 Lonsdale Ave

North Vancouver, BC

V7N 3K6
September 11th, 2019

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W.21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting strongly that the council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully ask for no zoning change on this parcel not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need – this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle, including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake “only what is required by the City of North Vancouver”, implying the 10% community benefit for market housing – it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units - this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 more developments already approved which will increase the density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 33 units (6 townhouses and a 27 unit development). While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for a 87 units.
There is insufficient road infrastructure with nearby intersections not being able to handle the dramatic increase in traffic that will occur if rezoning is permitted. With the west end of 21st street being stop-sign controlled with a pedestrian light, in addition to being a main thoroughfare for children walking to school and the recent development of the Green Pathway – this will cause an unprecedented amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.

The development of the Green Pathway, 21st street is a narrow street that limits traffic flow. The intersection of 21st St. and Chesterfield, one half block from this property, does not function well, and is a high-risk intersection for pedestrians with heavy traffic flow, unclear views for pedestrian crossings and high speed vehicles. The intersection is a walking route for neighbourhood students to Carson Graham Secondary School as well as Wag Creek Park and a local day care. With the addition of over 80+ new units within a five-block span over the coming years, it will increase the already high risk of a car accident involving a pedestrian particularly the youth and children who use this area as a thoroughfare to daycare services and schools.

Rapid neighbourhood growth has put a strain on the community, infrastructure and community members enjoyment. The Central Lonsdale area is experiencing rapid growth as evidenced by the significant number of buildings being built along Lonsdale and both to the immediate east and west. This magnitude of change is impacting density dramatically within the area and this existing development within the neighbourhood must be considered.

If this rezoning is approved and the planned development completed, the neighbourhoods surrounding the property will witness a dramatic increase in traffic in an already heavily congested area, which will lead to more accidents, injuries and fatalities.

The lack of proper engagement with the community should also be cause for concern from Mayor and Council. While the property owner and developer claim to have provided adequate time to inform the community of the upcoming development, mailers arrived in local mailboxes between 1 and 4 days before the proposed community meeting. In addition, the mailer contained both the wrong address and the wrong date for the event. In addition, signage outside of the building was put up less than 2 weeks before the community event.

If this application is to be decided by council, please take this as notice that I would like to have additional information regarding the application and decisions. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Sincerely,  

[Signature]

Name  

[Name]

Page 2 of 2
September 11th, 2019

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W. 21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting strongly that the council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully ask for no zoning change on this parcel not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need – this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle, including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake “only what is required by the City of North Vancouver”, implying the 10% community benefit for market housing – it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units - this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 more developments already approved which will increase the density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 33 units (6 townhouses and a 27 unit development). While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for a 87 units.
There is insufficient road infrastructure with nearby intersections not being able to handle the dramatic increase in traffic that will occur if rezoning is permitted. With the west end of 21st street being stop-sign controlled with a pedestrian light, in addition to being a main thoroughfare for children walking to school and the recent development of the Green Pathway – this will cause an unprecedented amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.

The development of the Green Pathway, 21st street is a narrow street that limits traffic flow. The intersection of 21st St. and Chesterfield, one half block from this property, does not function well, and is a high-risk intersection for pedestrians with heavy traffic flow, unclear views for pedestrian crossings and high speed vehicles. The intersection is a walking route for neighbourhood students to Carson Graham Secondary School as well as Wag Creek Park and a local day care. With the addition of over 80+ new units within a five-block span over the coming years, it will increase the already high risk of a car accident involving a pedestrian particularly the youth and children who use this area as a thoroughfare to daycare services and schools.

Rapid neighbourhood growth has put a strain on the community, infrastructure and community members enjoyment. The Central Lonsdale area is experiencing rapid growth as evidenced by the significant number of buildings being built along Lonsdale and both to the immediate east and west. This magnitude of change is impacting density dramatically within the area and this existing development within the neighbourhood must be considered.

If this rezoning is approved and the planned development completed, the neighbourhoods surrounding the property will witness a dramatic increase in traffic in an already heavily congested area, which will lead to more accidents, injuries and fatalities.

The lack of proper engagement with the community should also be cause for concern from Mayor and Council. While the property owner and developer claim to have provided adequate time to inform the community of the upcoming development, mailers arrived in local mailboxes between 1 and 4 days before the proposed community meeting. In addition, the mailer contained both the wrong address and the wrong date for the event. In addition, signage outside of the building was put up less than 2 weeks before the community event.

If this application is to be decided by council, please take this as notice that I would like to have additional information regarding the application and decisions. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Sincerely,

Name Martha Jane Butler
September 11th, 2019

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W.21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting strongly that the council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully ask for no zoning change on this parcel not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need – this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle, including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake “only what is required by the City of North Vancouver”, implying the 10% community benefit for market housing – it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units – this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 more developments already approved which will increase the density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 33 units (6 townhouses and a 27 unit development). While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for a 87 units.

Helen Anderson
323 – 119 22nd St. West
North Vancouver, BC
V7M 0B4

September 11th, 2019

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W.21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting strongly that the council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully ask for no zoning change on this parcel not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need – this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle, including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake “only what is required by the City of North Vancouver”, implying the 10% community benefit for market housing – it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units – this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 more developments already approved which will increase the density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 33 units (6 townhouses and a 27 unit development). While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for a 87 units.
There is insufficient road infrastructure with nearby intersections not being able to handle the dramatic increase in traffic that will occur if rezoning is permitted. With the west end of 21st street being stop-sign controlled with a pedestrian light, in addition to being a main thoroughfare for children walking to school and the recent development of the Green Pathway – this will cause an unprecedented amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.

The development of the Green Pathway, 21st street is a narrow street that limits traffic flow. The intersection of 21st St. and Chesterfield, one half block from this property, does not function well, and is a high-risk intersection for pedestrians with heavy traffic flow, unclear views for pedestrian crossings and high speed vehicles. The intersection is a walking route for neighbourhood students to Carson Graham Secondary School as well as Wag Creek Park and a local day care. With the addition of over 80+ new units within a five-block span over the coming years, it will increase the already high risk of a car accident involving a pedestrian particularly the youth and children who use this area as a thoroughfare to daycare services and schools.

Rapid neighbourhood growth has put a strain on the community, infrastructure and community members enjoyment. The Central Lonsdale area is experiencing rapid growth as evidenced by the significant number of buildings being built along Lonsdale and both to the immediate east and west. This magnitude of change is impacting density dramatically within the area and this existing development within the neighbourhood must be considered.

If this rezoning is approved and the planned development completed, the neighbourhoods surrounding the property will witness a dramatic increase in traffic in an already heavily congested area, which will lead to more accidents, injuries and fatalities.

The lack of proper engagement with the community should also be cause for concern from Mayor and Council. While the property owner and developer claim to have provided adequate time to inform the community of the upcoming development, mailers arrived in local mailboxes between 1 and 4 days before the proposed community meeting. In addition, the mailer contained both the wrong address and the wrong date for the event. In addition, signage outside of the building was put up less than 2 weeks before the community event.

If this application is to be decided by council, please take this as notice that I would like to have additional information regarding the application and decisions. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Sincerely,

Helen Anderson

Helen Anderson
Douglas Anderson  
323 – 119 22nd St. West  
North Vancouver, BC  
V7M 0B4

September 11th, 2019

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W. 21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting strongly that the council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully ask for no zoning change on this parcel not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need — this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake only what is required by the City of North Vancouver”, implying the 10% community benefit for market housing — it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units - this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 more developments already approved which will increase the density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 33 units (6 townhouses and a 27 unit development). While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for a 87 units.
There is insufficient road infrastructure with nearby intersections not being able to handle the dramatic increase in traffic that will occur if rezoning is permitted. With the west end of 21st street being stop-sign controlled with a pedestrian light, in addition to being a main thoroughfare for children walking to school and the recent development of the Green Pathway – this will cause an unprecedented amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.

The development of the Green Pathway, 21st street is a narrow street that limits traffic flow. The intersection of 21st St. and Chesterfield, one half block from this property, does not function well, and is a high-risk intersection for pedestrians with heavy traffic flow, unclear views for pedestrian crossings and high speed vehicles. The intersection is a walking route for neighbourhood students to Carson Graham Secondary School as well as Wag Creek Park and a local day care. With the addition of over 80+ new units within a five-block span over the coming years, it will increase the already high risk of a car accident involving a pedestrian particularly the youth and children who use this area as a thoroughfare to daycare services and schools.

Rapid neighbourhood growth has put a strain on the community, infrastructure and community members enjoyment. The Central Lonsdale area is experiencing rapid growth as evidenced by the significant number of buildings being built along Lonsdale and both to the immediate east and west. This magnitude of change is impacting density dramatically within the area and this existing development within the neighbourhood must be considered.

If this rezoning is approved and the planned development completed, the neighbourhoods surrounding the property will witness a dramatic increase in traffic in an already heavily congested area, which will lead to more accidents, injuries and fatalities.

The lack of proper engagement with the community should also be cause for concern from Mayor and Council. While the property owner and developer claim to have provided adequate time to inform the community of the upcoming development, mailers arrived in local mailboxes between 1 and 4 days before the proposed community meeting. In addition, the mailer contained both the wrong address and the wrong date for the event. In addition, signage outside of the building was put up less than 2 weeks before the community event.

If this application is to be decided by council, please take this as notice that I would like to have additional information regarding the application and decisions. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Sincerely,

D. Anderson

Douglas Anderson
Kelsey Fitzpatrick  
#403 119 W. 22nd St.  
North Vancouver, BC V7M 0B4

September 11th, 2019

Re: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W. 21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I urge you NOT to approve the above rezoning application because the proposed development will increase traffic and public parking demands in our neighborhood and those increases cannot be serviced by existing streets and public parking spaces.

1. **Traffic** - The proposed development includes 50 new units, which translates to potentially 50+ additional cars on our already congested local streets. Please note that W. 22nd St (which I live on, 1 street north of the proposed development) which would be used by residents of W. 21st street, sees regular congestions because it is extremely narrow for its current use. It is a 2-way street with parking on both sides, but because it is narrow it essentially only allows one-way traffic (cars going opposite directions usually have to give way in a pull-out in order to pass each other). As such, an additional 50+ local cars in the neighborhood, will only increase the difficulty of navigating W 22nd St. by a huge magnitude.

2. **Parking** – The proposed development would have 85 units but would provide only 50 parking stalls. This means there would be potentially 35+ additional cars looking for on-street parking in our neighborhood and those spots do NOT exist. Please note that on W. 22nd St (which I live on, 1 street north of the proposed development) 100% of available parking spots are filled EVERY night. There is no capacity for additional local cars to park on W 22nd, and I am concerned that some of those additional 35+ cars would indeed do so because it is close.

As such, I request that you NOT approve this rezoning application.

Respectfully,

Kelsey Fitzpatrick (owner and resident at the above address)
Christopher Baker  
406-119 West 22nd Street,  
North Vancouver,  
V7M 0B4

September 26th, 2019

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W. 21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting strongly that the council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully ask for no zoning change on this parcel not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need – this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle, including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake “only what is required by the City of North Vancouver”, implying the 10% community benefit for market housing – it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units - this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 more developments already approved which will increase the density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 33 units (6 townhouses and a 27 unit development). While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for a 87 units.
There is insufficient road infrastructure with nearby intersections not being able to handle the dramatic increase in traffic that will occur if rezoning is permitted. With the west end of 21st street being stop-sign controlled with a pedestrian light, in addition to being a main thoroughfare for children walking to school and the recent development of the Green Pathway – this will cause an unprecedented amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.

The development of the Green Pathway, 21st street is a narrow street that limits traffic flow. The intersection of 21st St. and Chesterfield, one half block from this property, does not function well, and is a high-risk intersection for pedestrians with heavy traffic flow, unclear views for pedestrian crossings and high speed vehicles. The intersection is a walking route for neighbourhood students to Carson Graham Secondary School as well as Wag Creek Park and a local day care. With the addition of over 80+ new units within a five-block span over the coming years, it will increase the already high risk of a car accident involving a pedestrian particularly the youth and children who use this area as a thoroughfare to daycare services and schools.

Rapid neighbourhood growth has put a strain on the community, infrastructure and community members enjoyment. The Central Lonsdale area is experiencing rapid growth as evidenced by the significant number of buildings being built along Lonsdale and both to the immediate east and west. This magnitude of change is impacting density dramatically within the area and this existing development within the neighbourhood must be considered.

If this rezoning is approved and the planned development completed, the neighbourhoods surrounding the property will witness a dramatic increase in traffic in an already heavily congested area, which will lead to more accidents, injuries and fatalities.

The lack of proper engagement with the community should also be cause for concern from Mayor and Council. While the property owner and developer claim to have provided adequate time to inform the community of the upcoming development, mailers arrived in local mailboxes between 1 and 4 days before the proposed community meeting. In addition, the mailer contained both the wrong address and the wrong date for the event. In addition, signage outside of the building was put up less than 2 weeks before the community event.

If this application is to be decided by council, please take this as notice that I would like to have additional information regarding the application and decisions. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Sincerely,

Christopher Baker
Ana Gundzik
321-119 W 22nd St
North Vancouver
V7M 0B4

September 11th, 2019

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W.21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting strongly that the council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully ask for no zoning change on this parcel not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need -- this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle, including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake "only what is required by the City of North Vancouver", implying the 10% community benefit for market housing – it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units - this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 more developments already approved which will increase the density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 33 units (6 townhouses and a 27 unit development).
While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for a 87 units.

There is insufficient road infrastructure with nearby intersections not being able to handle the dramatic increase in traffic that will occur if rezoning is permitted. With the west end of 21st street being stop-sign controlled with a pedestrian light, in addition to being a main thoroughfare for children walking to school and the recent development of the Green Pathway – this will cause an unprecedented amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.

The development of the Green Pathway, 21st street is a narrow street that limits traffic flow. The intersection of 21st St. and Chesterfield, one half block from this property, does not function well, and is a high-risk intersection for pedestrians with heavy traffic flow, unclear views for pedestrian crossings and high speed vehicles. The intersection is a walking route for neighbourhood students to Carson Graham Secondary School as well as Wag Creek Park and a local day care. With the addition of over 80+ new units within a five-block span over the coming years, it will increase the already high risk of a car accident involving a pedestrian particularly the youth and children who use this area as a thoroughfare to daycare services and schools.

Rapid neighbourhood growth has put a strain on the community, infrastructure and community members enjoyment. The Central Lonsdale area is experiencing rapid growth as evidenced by the significant number of buildings being built along Lonsdale and both to the immediate east and west. This magnitude of change is impacting density dramatically within the area and this existing development within the neighbourhood must be considered.

If this rezoning is approved and the planned development completed, the neighbourhoods surrounding the property will witness a dramatic increase in traffic in an already heavily congested area, which will lead to more accidents, injuries and fatalities.

The lack of proper engagement with the community should also be cause for concern from Mayor and Council. While the property owner and developer claim to have provided adequate time to inform the community of the upcoming development, mailers arrived in local mailboxes between 1 and 4 days before the proposed community meeting. In addition, the mailer contained both the wrong address and the wrong date for the event. In addition, signage outside of the building was put up less than 2 weeks before the community event.

If this application is to be decided by council, please take this as notice that I would like to have additional information regarding the application and decisions. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Sincerely,

Ana Gundzik
September 11th, 2019

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W. 21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting strongly that the council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully ask for no zoning change on this parcel not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need – this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle, including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake “only what is required by the City of North Vancouver”, implying the 10% community benefit for market housing – it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units - this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 more developments already approved which will increase the density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 33 units (6 townhouses and a 27 unit development).
While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for a 87 units.

There is insufficient road infrastructure with nearby intersections not being able to handle the dramatic increase in traffic that will occur if rezoning is permitted. With the west end of 21st street being stop-sign controlled with a pedestrian light, in addition to being a main thoroughfare for children walking to school and the recent development of the Green Pathway – this will cause an unprecedented amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.

The development of the Green Pathway, 21st street is a narrow street that limits traffic flow. The intersection of 21st St. and Chesterfield, one half block from this property, does not function well, and is a high-risk intersection for pedestrians with heavy traffic flow, unclear views for pedestrian crossings and high speed vehicles. The intersection is a walking route for neighbourhood students to Carson Graham Secondary School as well as Wag Creek Park and a local day care. With the addition of over 80+ new units within a five-block span over the coming years, it will increase the already high risk of a car accident involving a pedestrian particularly the youth and children who use this area as a thoroughfare to daycare services and schools.

Rapid neighbourhood growth has put a strain on the community, infrastructure and community members enjoyment. The Central Lonsdale area is experiencing rapid growth as evidenced by the significant number of buildings being built along Lonsdale and both to the immediate east and west. This magnitude of change is impacting density dramatically within the area and this existing development within the neighbourhood must be considered.

If this rezoning is approved and the planned development completed, the neighbourhoods surrounding the property will witness a dramatic increase in traffic in an already heavily congested area, which will lead to more accidents, injuries and fatalities.

The lack of proper engagement with the community should also be cause for concern from Mayor and Council. While the property owner and developer claim to have provided adequate time to inform the community of the upcoming development, mailers arrived in local mailboxes between 1 and 4 days before the proposed community meeting. In addition, the mailer contained both the wrong address and the wrong date for the event. In addition, signage outside of the building was put up less than 2 weeks before the community event.

If this application is to be decided by council, please take this as notice that I would like to have additional information regarding the application and decisions. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Sincerely,

Jay Gundzik
Subject: FW: Development application for 144 W. 21st St

From: Rick Martin <>
Date: October 9, 2019 at 11:19:27 PM EDT
To: "Linda Buchanan (Mayor)" Kendra McEachern "Holly Back (Councillor)" "Don Bell (Councillor)" "Angela Girard (Councillor)" "Tina Hu (Councillor)" "Jessica Mcilroy (Councillor)" "Tony Valente (Councillor)"
Cc: David Johnson
Subject: Development application for 144 W. 21st St

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing regarding the above development application. I urge you to NOT accept the development application as it stands. I live on the ground floor of the North-West corner of my condo building which is immediately East of the proposed development. I understand that development needs to happen, and, far from NOT wanting development in my yard (almost literally), I encourage high-density development - within reason.

1. The proposed development will reduce the light (and sunshine) for myself and my neighbours. I have a small yard that I enjoy during our summer months; the proposed development will set it almost permanent shade.
2. This level of building density is too much; especially immediately adjacent to the Anderson Walk development which has been built in recent years (I bought my unit in 2004 when the high school was to my north). We have TWO other on-going developments on Chesterfield at the end of 21st Street.
3. The proposal for 40-or so parking stalls is ludicrous when there is ALREADY no parking in this street or surrounding streets. I understand that this is to code, based on your environmental ambitions. This isn't what is happening; people still need cars and there is newly created traffic with residents searching for parking.

FINALLY, and most importantly, I find that this development application is appalling from the owners of this particular building. They have - for YEARS - flouted your requests/bylaws and our requests as neighbours to fix-up their building. The building has been in a disgraceful state for numerous years and has housed numerous wasp nests, birds nests and many rodents. It's galling to accept that after their total contempt for the neighbourhood that they live in, they now request a huge increase in footprint and building capacity. Further, they have - last week - just started to superficially repair their building. This "repair" can be considered nothing but a sham renovation in order to try to regain credibility and good favour such that their development application is accepted.

I do NOT accept that this is good policy to accept this proposal. As Mayor and Council, please restrict the capacity/height of this building (FOUR floors on the SAME building footprint seems reasonable). As the elected mayor and council, I expect that you consider this input - and the input of all our neighbours before making your decision.

Kind regards and respect,

Rick Martin
Suite 103-128 West 21st Street
North Vancouver, BC V7M 1Y9
Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am writing to you to express my strong opposition to the application by Confide Enterprises Inc. requesting a rezone of the property located at 144 West 21st Street North Vancouver from its current zoning of RM-1 to CD-745 to allow the construction of a 6 storey rental building. A 6 storey structure is inappropriate for that specific block location.

Since I purchased my condo 15 years ago the nature of the community has been allowed to erode with the construction of Anderson Walk, a block long 5 and 6 storey building. This development then spurred a redevelopment project for the recently completed 5 storey housing development at 2137 Chesterfield Avenue. I say erode to highlight the loss of sunlight due to the taller developments obstructing the sun from reaching our building as well as the significant loss of available street parking spaces.

I bought my suite for the small yard it offered my north facing suite on the ground floor of our small 26 unit building. With the development of Anderson Walk and the School District Building I have lost 60 to 90 minutes of spring/summer morning sunlight in my small yard. With the recent completion of 2137 Chesterfield Ave. I have also lost access to a couple hours of late afternoon evening summer sunlight. The previously blessed small little yard that previously saw sunlight during the year now see significantly less sun. The previous rezoning allowed by previous Councils are essentially building us into a canyon.

With the new development in the neighbourhood the density has increased significantly making on street parking near our building very very difficult. This summer I had out of town visitors who found it very challenging to park close to our building. An 85 unit rental building will only make this situation worse. Our building lost parking and loading areas in front of the building with the Green Necklace Project. The recent construction of the curb bulges and parking restrictions on 21st Street and on Chesterfield have further eroded our buildings access to any unloading or parking reasonably close to our building.

Finally, on a safety note, it seems a recipe for disaster to allow an underground parking garage that accommodates 85 units parking to outlet onto the Green Necklace Walking/Bike Path, particularly given the gradient of the path in the area and the number of small children that use the path.

I am requesting that you please review these rezoning requests with the objective of improving the lives of the residents, the neighbourhood and the community. This application does neither.

Sincerely yours,

Janet Branch
156 21st Street West, Suite 105
North Vancouver, BC V7M 1Y9
Attention Corporate Officer:

I strongly disagree with the Proposed Zone Bylaw Amendments 8896 and 8897 to the Property at 144 West 21st St.

- The proposed density and height of the building will block any light that reaches the residents of the Anderson Walk Property, affecting the resident owners property resale values and more importantly their mental health.
- The existing apartment structures on the block are all 3 stories high; the slope of the land does not lend itself to a building that is 6 stories high and will create a visual monstrosity in the neighborhood.
- The proposed density of the building will increase the traffic congestion and noise in the neighborhood; the traffic and noise has already increased exponentially due to recent construction within the area.

Thank You in advance for considering the neighborhood residents' concerns to leave the existing zoning in place and NOT allowing for the change in height and density for the property 144 West 21st St. that is clearly not appropriate for the 21st street neighborhood.

Kind Regards
Kathleen Farr
#110-119 West 22nd St
North Vancouver BC V7M 0B4
Good Afternoon,

I would like to provide my input into the subject noted bylaw amendments as part of the public hearing on January 24th. I am against a 6-storey building immediately to the south of me as it would obstruct what little sun I get in my yard. My preference would be for a 4-storey building.

Thank you.

John Leyland
106-139 West 22nd Street
North Vancouver, BC V7M0B5
January 17th 2022

Mayor and Council
City of North Vancouver
141 West 14th Street
North Vancouver B.C.
V7M 1H9

Re. Zoning application 144 West 21st Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the request from Confide Enterprises to increase the size of 144 West 21st Street from RM1 to CD745 allowing a 6 storey building with 85 suites instead of the current 3 storey.

I live at Oceanview, 156 West 21st Street, a three storey Condo building of 26 suites which we have recently upgraded with a full Reclad.

I am opposed to a six storey building in a street of 3 storey buildings where it would take all light from the east side of our building, lowering the value of some suites and create even more parking problems in our neighbourhood. Most rental buildings are not adding parking for every suite but people still own cars and there will be nowhere to park.

I have lived here 17 years and have suffered through many years of construction with first Anderson Walk and Hyad to our North. More recently to our West, 2137 Chesterfield a 5 storey building which was built on two single family home lots and has been developed to within 6ft allowance on all sides. I now look at this monstrous building instead of mountains and trees. On our South there is a townhouse development still in construction.

Parking for any visitors to all these buildings is extremely hard to find and especially for us when we lost street parking and any drop off area due to the Green Necklace development which runs in front of us.

This neighbourhood can not take any more huge developments so I ask that the application be more considerate of those residents who live here.

Yours sincerely

Heather Macfarlane
156 West 21st Street #303
North Vancouver B.C.
V7M1Y9
Lindsay Miles-Pickup  
#211 159 W. 22nd St.  
North Vancouver, BC  
V7M0B6

January 12, 2022

Ref: Planning Application No REZ2019-00010 144 W.21st St.

Dear Mayor Buchanan and Council Members,

I write again in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development based on the density of the building in addition to requesting that the Mayor and Council consider the current state of housing for the current occupants of the building. As a concerned neighbour, I respectfully recommend that the Mayor and Council vote no to the requested zoning change on this parcel. I recommend this not because I am anti-growth but because I am an enthusiastic supporter of smart, planned urban development and supportive community development.

North Vancouver is a growing community where rental housing is a continued need – this is indisputable. Although our vacancy rate has improved, it is hard to argue with any development which brings more opportunities for housing for valued members of our community. However, North Vancouver has also grown at a disproportionate rate with developments increasing far beyond the ability of services that the city can handle, including increased traffic, parking, need for transportation and affordability for its citizens.

As per the 2014 Community Plan, the site of 144 W. 21st street would be considered a moderate to low density neighbourhood and would be subject to similar conditions of newer developments such as Anderson Walk which was required to scale back to a 4 story site at 159 W. 22nd St. The amended community plan in October of 2018 has left 21st street between Lonsdale and Chesterfield designated as Residential Level 4A and Level 5 with a maximum bonus FSR up to 1.0. Based on the community plan, this requires a community benefit which has not been evidenced by the current development plan. As stated by both the developer and the architect at the recent information session, the proposed 6-story (3 story, 40+ unit addition) will undertake “only what is required by the City of North Vancouver”, implying the 10% community benefit for market housing – it is hard to see how the bare minimum constitutes a community benefit when this accounts for 8 units when the building will see an increase of 50+ units.

Comments from the developer and architect at the recent information session are that they have designed the building for the “bare minimum” as required from rental units - this includes having 50 parking spots for 85 units. The current building has one parking spot per unit, placing no extra stress on the already burdened area with the exception of multi-car units and visitors. This particular section of the community has already lost multiple parking spots as a result of the Green Pathway and has 2 recent new developments which have increased density in the neighbourhood by a minimum of 31 units (4 townhouses and a 27 unit development).

While North Vancouver has seen an increase in active transportation, an average of 60% of community members still travel by car (City of North Vancouver Community Plan, 2014). The neighbourhood will already be under intense stress as the result of the development at 17th and Chesterfield in which there will only be 56 parking spots provided for 85 units.
There is insufficient road infrastructure with nearby intersections not being able to handle the dramatic increase in traffic that will occur if rezoning is permitted. With the west end of 21st street being stop-sign controlled with a pedestrian light, in addition to being a main thoroughfare for children walking to school and the recent development of the Green Pathway – this will cause an unprecedented amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.

The development of the Green Pathway, 21st street is a narrow street that limits traffic flow - this has been compounded further by the development of new townhouses at the west end of the street. The intersection of 21st St. and Chesterfield, one half block from this property, does not function well. This is a high-risk intersection for pedestrians and motor vehicles with heavy traffic flow, unclear views for pedestrian crossings and high speed vehicles. The intersection is a walking route for neighbourhood students to Carson Graham Secondary School as well as Wag Creek Park and a local day care. With the addition of over 50+ new units within a five block span over the coming years, it will increase the already high risk of a car accident involving a pedestrian particularly the youth and children who use this area as a thoroughfare to daycare services and schools.

Rapid neighbourhood growth has put a strain on the community, infrastructure and community members enjoyment. The Central Lonsdale area is experiencing rapid growth as is evidenced by the significant number of buildings being built along Lonsdale and both to the immediate east and west in addition to the construction of new Harry Jerome Centre and surrounding buildings. This magnitude of change is impacting density dramatically and unsustainability within the area and this existing development within the neighbourhood must be considered.

If this rezoning is approved and the planned development completed, the neighbourhoods surrounding the property will witness a dramatic increase in traffic in an already heavily congested area, which will lead to more accidents and injuries.

In addition to the challenges of density, I wish to bring forward the challenge in which this proposal faces with respect to the current condition of the building and the seemingly lack of commitment of the current owner to provide adequate housing for individuals within our community as well as an overall commitment to the community plan. Increasingly, members of our community are being priced out of housing with renovictions and demovictions. The current building has been left in abysmal shape – there are holes in the building, a tarp covered half the building for over a year and trees by the City of North Van were left to die within only a few months of being planted. That being said, the building provides affordable rent for 42 units to some of North Vancouver’s vulnerable residents. These units, while being offered first right of refusal, will no longer have access to this affordable rent. The mandated 10% at below market value are still beyond the affordable limits for many individuals – an example would be the current rental rates for the rental property beside London Drugs in which a studio unit rents for $1,600 per month. Even at 10% below market rental, $1,199 for a one-bedroom unit is beyond the monthly income of an individual who is currently living on a BC disability rate.

The City of North Vancouver is increasingly facing an unaffordability crisis and many individuals are having to leave the comforts of their community as a result of these demovictions. As recognized by the City’s Housing Action Plan, “Rapidly rising housing costs have placed pressures on all households in the
We are also increasingly rewarding absent and neglectful property owners who take advantage of increasing property rates and then reap the rewards of new units, increased density while only having to provide the bare minimum of a 10-10-10 system with 0.75 parking stalls per unit (“to save costs”). As a City which has committed itself to supporting lower to moderate income community members, I urge council to consider how they support the proposal of a building development from an owner that has shown little to no regard for the community in which it stands and continues to show little regard by providing the bare minimum moving forward. I also urge council to carefully review the proposal from the owner with respects to relocation packages for the individuals within the building to ensure that more than the bare minimum is provided for those who are disproportionately affected by an unfortunate situation – the need for increased rental stock while also needing to provide incentives to developers to build this stock.

The lack of proper engagement with the community should also be cause for concern from the Mayor and Council. In 2019, the property owner and developer claimed to have provided adequate time to inform the community of the upcoming development, mailers arrived in local mailboxes between 1 and 4 days before the proposed community meeting. In addition, the mailer contained both the wrong address and the wrong date for the event. In addition, signage outside of the building was put up less than 2 weeks before the community event. During the scheduled community meeting, the developer and architect did not engage in discussion with community members but instead insisted that they were abiding by the “what was required by the City of North Vancouver” and that the development of this property was “a favour to the owner” – showing little to no regard for community concerns over the density, the current state of the building or future opportunities for vulnerable residents.

At the end of the day, this building needs to come down. The lack of care and concern for the building and the community has left the building in such a state of disrepair that it is both a hazard and an eyesore. I ask you however to consider limiting additional challenges that the rezoning may pose and to carefully consider who benefits from such a policy decision.

At the end of the day, you will not be judged by the amount that you build, but what you build for this community. High density (or comprehensive density) buildings do not create a community, smart planning and concerned and thoughtful policy that creates homes and neighbourhoods that supports all residents, current and future, does.

Sincerely,

Community resident,

Lindsay Miles-Pickup
**PUBLIC HEARING**

**WHEN:** Monday, January 24, 2022 at 5:30 pm  
**HOW:** View the meeting online at cnv.org/LiveStreaming  
**WHAT:** Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 8896 and Housing Agreement Bylaw No. 8897  
144 West 21st Street

**Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 8896 and Housing Agreement Bylaw No. 8897** would rezone the subject property from a Medium Density Apartment Residential 1 (RM-1) Zone to a Comprehensive Development 745 (CD-745) Zone to permit a 6-storey rental apartment building with 85 units and underground parking.

The Public Hearing will be held electronically via Webex. All persons who believe their interest in property may be affected by the proposed bylaws will be afforded an opportunity to speak at the Public Hearing and/or by email or written submission. All submissions must include your name and address and should be sent to the Corporate Officer at input@cnv.org, or by mail or delivered to City Hall, **no later than 12:00 noon on Monday, January 24, 2022**, to ensure their availability to Council at the Public Hearing. No further information or submissions can be considered by Council once the Public Hearing has concluded.

**To speak at the Public Hearing by phone:** Visit cnv.org/PublicHearings and complete the online registration form, or phone 604-990-4230 and provide contact information, so call-in instructions can be forwarded to you. **All pre-registration must be submitted no later than 12:00 noon on Monday, January 24, 2022.**

Speakers who have not pre-registered will also have an opportunity to speak at the Public Hearing. Once all registered speakers have provided input, the Mayor will call for a recess to allow time for additional speakers to phone in. Call-in details will be displayed on-screen at the Public Hearing (watch web livestream).

The proposed bylaws, background material and presentations are available for viewing at City Hall and online at cnv.org/PublicHearings.

**Questions?** Emma Chow, Planner 2, echow@cnv.org / 604-982-3919
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

BYLAW NO. 8896

A Bylaw to amend “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700”

The Council of The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. This Bylaw shall be known and cited for all purposes as “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8896” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745).

2. Division VI: Zoning Map of Document “A” of “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700” is hereby amended by reclassifying the following lots as henceforth being transferred, added to and forming part of CD-745 (Comprehensive Development 745 Zone):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lots</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
<th>Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-10</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>17051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from RM-1

3. Part 11 of Division V: Comprehensive Development Regulations of Document “A” of “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700” is hereby amended by:

A. Adding the following section to Section 1100, thereof, after the designation “CD-744 Comprehensive Development 744 Zone”:

“CD-745 Comprehensive Development 745 Zone”

B. Adding the following to Section 1101, thereof, after the “CD-744 Comprehensive Development 744 Zone”:

“CD-745 Comprehensive Development 745 Zone”

In the CD-745 Zone, permitted Uses, regulations for permitted Uses, regulations for the size, shape and siting of Buildings and Structures and required Off-Street Parking shall be as in the RM-1 Zone, except that:

(1) One Principal Buildings shall be permitted on one Lot;

(2) The permitted Principal Uses on the Lot shall be limited to:

(a) Rental Apartment Residential Use:

   i. Accessory Home Occupation Use, subject to Sections 507(6), (7) and (8) of this Bylaw;

   ii. Accessory Off-Street Parking Use;

   iii. Accessory Home Office Use;

(3) Gross Floor Area:

   (a) Combined and in total, shall not exceed 1.6 times the Lot Area;
(b) Maximum Gross Floor Area may be further increased to a maximum of 2.6 times the Lot Area, upon entering into a Housing Agreement with the City:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASE DENSITY</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL (BONUS) DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCP Schedule ‘A’</td>
<td>1.6 FSR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL DENSITY CATEGORY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL (BONUS) DENSITY</th>
<th>POLICY REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secured Rental Housing</td>
<td>100% rental housing; 10% mid-market rental units</td>
<td>1.0 FSR</td>
<td>OCP section 2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL DENSITY | 2.6 FSR |

(4) Lot Coverage of Principal Building shall not exceed a maximum of 94 percent;

(5) Height of Principal Building shall not exceed six storeys and 19 metres (62.3 feet) as measured from average Building Grade of north Lot Line;

(6) Siting:

(a) Principal Building shall be sited a minimum:
   i. 8.46 metres (27.7 feet) from Front (south) Lot Line;
   ii. 4.18 metres (13.7 feet) from Rear (north) Lot Line;
   iii. 3.99 metres (13.0 feet) from east Side Lot Line;
   iv. 4.59 metres (15.0 feet) from west Side Lot Line;

(b) Section 410(3) “Siting Exceptions” is varied to permit:
   i. Canopies to project up to 3.29 metres (10.8 feet) from Front (south) Lot Line;
   ii. Unenclosed balconies to project up to 2.31 metres (7.6 feet) from Rear (north) Lot Line;
   iii. Stairwell to project up to 2.50 metres (8.2 feet) from west Side Lot Line;
   iv. Portions of Cellar that are above grade, including outdoor structures directly above the Cellar, to be setback 0 metres from a Lot Line;

(7) Section 510(2) "Unit Separation" be waived;
(8) Section 510(3) “Building Width and Length” be waived.

READ a first time on the 6th day of December, 2021.

READ a second time on the 6th day of December, 2021.

APPROVED pursuant to section 52(3)(a) of the Transportation Act on the 9th day of December, 2021.

READ a third time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

ADOPTED on the <> day of <>, 2022.

________________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________________
CORPORATE OFFICER
RECOMMENDATION

PURSUANT to the report of the Planner 2, Development Planning, dated January 11, 2022, entitled "Housing Agreement Update – Rezoning Application: 144 West 21st Street":

THAT second reading of “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st St, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) be rescinded;

THAT “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st St, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) be amended;

AND THAT “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st St, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) be given second reading, as amended.

ATTACHMENTS

1. “Tracked Changes” version of “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (CityDocs 2115110-v2)
2. “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897”, as amended (CityDocs 2115110-v3)
BACKGROUND

On December 6, 2021, Council directed staff to update policy for Mid-Market Rental (MMR) units concerning the following:

- Baseline eligibility criteria
- Prioritization approach
- Register of interest and advertising requirements
- Monitoring and compliance

At the same meeting, "Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897" was given first and second reading as part of a public hearing referral for a rezoning application for 144 West 21st Street. The Housing Agreement was consistent with current housing policy at time of readings. Councillors asked staff whether the Housing Agreement for 144 West 21st Street could be revised to include provisions in line with the policy recommendations for MMR units and staff advised that they would discuss this with the applicant.

DISCUSSION

In response to Council direction detailed above, the applicant has voluntarily updated terms of the Housing Agreement to reflect the spirit of proposed policy changes, including:

- Improve language around income eligibility and first right of refusal;
- Priority to MMR units for those living or working within the City;
- Priority to larger MMR units (2 or more bedrooms) for those with dependents;
- Minimum advertising period (1 month) for first leasing of MMR units;
- Annual submission of documentation to show income compliance.

Staff are now bringing the amended Housing Agreement Bylaw (Attachment 1) forward for Council's consideration, with staff recommendation that Council rescind second reading of the version of Bylaw as of December 6, 2021, and instead, that Council give second reading to the current version of the Bylaw. This amended Bylaw would also be considered for third reading together with the rezoning bylaw for 144 West 21st Street, following the public hearing.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

[Signature]

Emma Chow
Planner 2, Development Planning
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

BYLAW NO. 8897

A Bylaw to enter into a Housing Agreement (144 West 21st Street)

WHEREAS Section 483 of the Local Government Act R.S.B.C. 2015 c.1 permits a local government to enter into a housing agreement for rental housing.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver, in open meeting assembled enacts as follows:

1. This Bylaw shall be known and cited for all purposes as “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments).

2. The Council hereby authorizes the agreement substantially in the form attached to this bylaw between The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver and Confide Enterprises Inc. with respect to the lands referenced as 144 West 21st Street, “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8896” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745).

3. The Mayor and Corporate Officer are authorized to execute any documents required to give effect to the Housing Agreement.

READ a first time on the 6th day of December, 2021.

READ a second time on the 6th day of December, 2021.

READ a third time on the < > day of < >, 2022.

ADOPTED on the < > day of < >, 2022.

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER
PART 2 – TERMS OF INSTRUMENT

RENTAL HOUSING AGREEMENT AND SECTION 219 COVENANT

THIS AGREEMENT dated for reference the _______ day of ________________, 20____.

BETWEEN:

CONFIDE ENTERPRISES LTD.,
517 - 1177 Hastings Street West,
Vancouver, British Columbia,
V6E 2K3

(the “Owner”)

AND:

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER,
a municipal corporation pursuant to the Local Government Act and
having its offices at 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver,
British Columbia, V7M 1H9

(the “City”)

WHEREAS:

A. The Owner is the registered owner of the Lands.
B. The City is a municipal corporation incorporated pursuant to the Community Charter, SBC 2003, c. 26.
C. Section 219 of the Land Title Act, RSBC 1996, c. 250 permits registration of a covenant in favour of a municipality in respect of the use of land or the use of a building on or to be erected on land, that land is or is not to be built on except in accordance with the covenant and that land is not to be subdivided except in accordance with the covenant;
D. Section 483 of the Act permits a local government to, by bylaw, enter into a housing agreement that may include terms and conditions regarding the occupancy of the housing units identified in the agreement, including respecting the form of tenure of the housing units, the availability of the housing units to classes of persons, the administration and management of the housing units and the rents and lease, sale or share prices that may be charged.
E. The City has enacted a bylaw authorizing this Agreement.
F. The Owner and the City wish to enter into this Agreement pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act and section 483 of the Act.

NOW THEREFORE in consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars ($10.00) now paid by the City to the Owner and for other good and valuable consideration (the receipt and sufficiency of which the Owner hereby acknowledges), the Owner and the City covenant each with the other as follows:
1. DEFINITIONS

(a) “Act” means the Local Government Act, RSBC. 2015 c.1 as amended from time to time;

(b) “Affordable Rent” means with respect to each Mid-Market Rental Unit a rent payment amount equal to 10% below the “Private Apartment Average Rents” for the corresponding bedroom type in the City of North Vancouver as established by CMHC’s Housing Market Information Portal for the year the tenancy is entered into;

(c) “Agreement” means this agreement as amended from time to time;

(d) “Commencement Date” has the meaning set out in section 2.1 herein;

(e) “Council” means the municipal council for the City of North Vancouver;

(f) “CMHC” means Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation;

(g) “Director of Planning” means the chief administrator of the Department of Planning of the City and his or her successors in function and their respective nominees;

(h) “Dwelling Unit” means a dwelling unit as defined in the City of North Vancouver’s “Zoning Bylaw 1995, No. 6700” as amended from time to time;

(i) “Lands” means those lands and premises legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 004-343-638
Lot A-10
Block 206
District Lot 545
Plan 17051;

(j) “Mid-Market Rental Units” means the 6 Dwelling Units in the Residential Building to be constructed on the Lands that are rented to tenants for Affordable Rent;

(k) “Market Rental Units” means all Dwelling Units in the Residential Building other than the Mid-Market Rental Units;

(l) “Maximum Household Income” means an annual gross household income determined by multiplying Affordable Rent by 12 to yield the households’ annual housing costs, and divided by 30% (0.30) to meet the standard definition of affordability.

(m) “Rental Purposes” means an occupancy or intended occupancy which is or would be governed by a tenancy agreement as defined in Section 1 of the Residential Tenancy Act, SBC 2002 c. 78 as amended from time to time between the Owner and the tenant;

(n) “Rental Units” means the Market Rental Units and the Mid-Market Rental Units;
“Residential Building” means the six storey building to be constructed on the Lands to be used for Rental Purposes with 85 Dwelling Units, of which 76 Dwelling Units will be Market Rental Units and 9 Dwelling Units will be Mid-Market Rental Units;

“RT Act” means the Residential Tenancy Act, SBC 2002 c. 78;

“Rezoning Bylaw” means the rezoning bylaw applicable to the Lands described as “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8896”;

“Section 219 Covenant” means a covenant pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act;

“Tenancy Agreement” means an agreement, whether written or oral, express or implied, between the Owner and a tenant respecting possession or occupancy of a Rental Unit; and

“Term” has the meaning set out in section 2.1 herein.

2. TERM

2.1 This Agreement will commence upon adoption by the City’s Council of “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) (the “Commencement Date”) and will continue until the date this Agreement is terminated in accordance with sections 2.2 or 8.3(c) (the “Term”).

2.2 This Agreement will terminate immediately upon the removal or destruction of the Residential Building provided the Residential Building is not repaired or rebuilt following the destruction thereof.

2.3 Subject to section 7.3, upon termination of this Agreement, this Agreement will be at an end and of no further force and effect.

3. SECTION 219 COVENANT

3.1 The Owner covenants and agrees with the City as a covenant in favour of the City pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act, RSBC 1996, c. 250 that during the Term of this Agreement, it being the intention and agreement of the Owner that the provisions in this Agreement be annexed to, and run with and be a charge upon the Lands, that notwithstanding the Rezoning Bylaw, the Lands shall be used and built on only in strict compliance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement and that:

(a) the Lands shall not be subdivided or stratified;
(b) the Rental Units in the Residential Building shall be used for Rental Purposes only;
(c) no Rental Unit in the Residential Building shall be occupied for any purpose except for Rental Purposes pursuant to a Tenancy Agreement.
3.2 The Owner further covenants and agrees with the City that the Lands and any buildings or structures constructed thereon including the Residential Building shall be developed, built, and maintained in accordance with all City bylaws, regulations and guidelines as amended from time to time.

3.3 Pursuant to section 219(6) of the *Land Title Act*, RSBC 1996, c. 250 except for the negligence of the City or its employees, agents or contractors, the Owner will indemnify and save harmless each of the City and its elected officials, board members, officers, directors, employees, and agents, and their heirs, executors, administrators, personal representatives, successors and assigns, from and against all claims, demands, actions, loss, damage, costs and liabilities, which all or any of them will or may be liable for or suffer or incur or be put to by reason of or arising out of:

(a) any act or omission, negligent or otherwise, by the Owner, or its officers, directors, employees, agents, contractors, or other persons for whom at law the Owner is responsible;

(b) the Owner's default under this Agreement; and

(c) the Owner's ownership, operation, management or financing of the Lands for the provision of housing for Rental Purposes.

4. TENANCY RESTRICTIONS

4.1 The unit mix for Rental Units in the Residential Buildings shall be no fewer than 9 three-bedroom units, 13 two-bedroom units and 63 one-bedroom units or as otherwise approved in writing by the Director of Planning in his or her discretion.

4.2 The nine Mid-Market Rental Units shall be provided in the following unit mix: 6 one-bedroom units, 2 two-bedroom unit, and 1 three-bedroom unit. The Owner may only change this mix with the approval in writing by the Director of Planning with such approval to be granted in his or her discretion. The Owner shall be entitled to determine the locations of the six Mid-Market Rental Units within the Residential Building.

4.3 The Owner shall enter into a minimum 1 year Tenancy Agreement for each of the Mid-Market Rental Units which will convert to a month to month tenancy at the end of the 1 year term. If such a tenancy is ended prior to the end of the Term, the Owner must rent the Mid-Market Rental Unit at Affordable Rent. For greater certainty, at the end of each tenancy, the Mid-Market Rental Unit will continue to be rented as a Mid-Market Rental Unit at Affordable Rent, which obligation will be ongoing at all times during the Term.

5. OWNER’S OBLIGATIONS

5.1 Without limiting section 3.1 of this Agreement:

(a) Management and administration: the management, administration, and associated costs with the management and administration of the Rental Units, including the Mid-Market Rental Units, will be borne by the Owner or its designated rental agent, unless otherwise approved by the City in writing;

(b) Advertisement: when the Mid-Market Rental Units first become available, the Owner will advertise such units for a minimum of one month on at least two common rental property search platforms that allow potential tenants to view available properties for rent in North Vancouver without payment of a fee or
requirement for registration, and the Owner will feature the tenure restrictions set out in this Agreement prominently in all advertising of Mid-Market Rental Units;

(c) Tenant Selection: the Owner will make the Mid-Market Rental Units available in the following order of priority:

(i) Tenants from the existing rental building on the Lands will be provided first right of refusal in the Mid-Market Rental Units, regardless of income, and have first priority, provided that if there are multiple applicants in this category for one unit, then applicant families with one or more dependents will have priority for units with two or more bedrooms and if applicants are equal in this regard, then applications will be considered on a first come-first-served basis;

(ii) The Owner will then make any remaining Mid-Market Rental Units not rented by tenants from the existing building on the Lands available to tenants with an annual household income at or below that the Maximum Household Income who are either current residents of the City of North Vancouver or who work in the City of North Vancouver and have done so for at least six months, provided that if there are multiple applicants in this category for one unit, then applicant families with one or more dependents will have priority for units with two or more bedrooms and if applicants are equal in this regard, then applications will be considered on a first come-first-served basis;

(iii) If there are any remaining Mid-Market Rental Units not rented by tenants who meet the criteria in Sections 5.1(c)(i) or (ii) after the expiry of the one-month advertising period, then the Owner will make such units available to tenants who meet the Maximum Household Income requirement; and

(iv) In determining whether a tenant meets the Maximum Household Income requirements, the Owner or its rental agent, so long as it acts honestly and in good faith, is entitled to rely on all information provided by the prospective tenant and the Owner will have no liability if the prospective tenant intentionally or unintentionally provides any incorrect information. The Owner is under no obligation to monitor or update the financial circumstances of the tenant once the lease is signed, the Owner will determine the selection of the tenants of the Mid-Market Rental Units, applying the suggested income qualification of a maximum household income determined by multiplying the low-end of market rents by 12 to yield the households' annual housing costs, and divided by 30% to meet the standard definition of affordability. Tenants from the existing rental building on the Lands should be provided first right of refusal in the Mid-Market Rental Units, regardless of income. In determining financial eligibility, the Owner or its rental agent, so long as it acts honestly and in good faith, is entitled to rely on all information provided by the prospective tenant and the Owner will have no liability if the prospective tenant intentionally or unintentionally provides any incorrect information. The Owner is under no obligation to monitor or update the financial circumstances of the tenant once the lease is signed.
(d) Rent Amount and Permitted Increases: Affordable Rent for Mid-Market Rental Units is to be determined at the time of tenancy. Rent amounts may be subsequently increased by the permitted annual rent increase then set under the RT Act.

(e) Compliance with applicable laws: without restricting the foregoing, the Owner will comply with all applicable provisions of the RT Act and any other provincial or municipal enactments imposing obligations on landlords in relation to residential tenancies;

(f) Performance: the Owner will perform its obligations under this Agreement diligently and in good faith; and

(g) Evidence of compliance: provided that the same can be done without breaching the Personal Information Protection Act (as amended from time to time) the Owner will, at Business License renewal on an annual basis or upon request by the City, supply to the City copies of any documentation in possession of the Owner necessary to establish compliance with the Owner’s obligations under this Agreement.

6. DEFAULT AND REMEDIES

6.1 The City may, acting reasonably, give to the Owner a written notice (in this section 6.1, the “Notice”) requiring the Owner to cure a default under this Agreement within 30 days of receipt of the Notice. The Notice must specify the nature of the default. The Owner must act with diligence to correct the default within the time specified.

6.2 If the default is not corrected within the time specified, the Owner will pay to the City on demand by the City 200 percent of the difference between current market rent, as determined by a third-party appraiser, and Affordable Rent for each Mid-Market Rental Unit in default for the default year to the end of the Term of the Agreement. The monies collected from default will be deposited to the City’s Affordable Housing Reserve Fund.

6.3 The Owner will pay to the City on demand by the City all the City’s costs of exercising its rights or remedies under this Agreement, on a full indemnity basis.

6.4 The Owner acknowledges and agrees that in case of a breach of this Agreement which is not fully remediable by the mere payment of money and promptly so remedied, the harm sustained by the City and to the public interest will be irreparable and not susceptible of adequate monetary compensation.

6.5 Each party to this Agreement, in addition to its rights under this Agreement or at law, will be entitled to all equitable remedies including specific performance, injunction and declaratory relief, or any of them, to enforce its rights under this Agreement.

6.6 The Owner acknowledges and agrees that it is entering into this Agreement to benefit the public interest in providing housing for Rental Purposes, and that the City’s rights and remedies under this Agreement are necessary to ensure that this purpose is carried out and that the City’s rights and remedies under this Agreement are fair and reasonable and ought not to be construed as a penalty or forfeiture.
6.7 No reference to nor exercise of any specific right or remedy under this Agreement or at law or at equity by any party will prejudice, limit or preclude that party from exercising any other right or remedy. No right or remedy will be exclusive or dependent upon any other right or remedy, but any party, from time to time, may exercise any one or more of such rights or remedies independently, successively, or in combination. The Owner acknowledges that specific performance, injunctive relief (mandatory or otherwise) or other equitable relief may be the only adequate remedy of a default by the Owner under this Agreement.

7. LIABILITY

7.1 Except for the negligence of the City or its employees, agents or contractors, the Owner will indemnify and save harmless each of the City and its elected officials, board members, officers, directors, employees, and agents, and their heirs, executors, administrators, personal representatives, successors and assigns, from and against all claims, demands, actions, loss, damage, costs and liabilities, which all or any of them will or may be liable for or suffer or incur or be put to by reason of or arising out of:

(a) any act or omission by the Owner, or its officers, directors, employees, agents, contractors, or other persons for whom at law the Owner is responsible; and

(b) the Owner's ownership, operation, management or financing of the Lands for the provision of housing for Rental Purposes.

7.2 Except to the extent such advice or direction is given negligently, the Owner hereby releases and forever discharges the City, its elected officials, board members, officers, directors, employees and agents, and its and their heirs, executors, administrators, personal representatives, successors and assigns from and against all claims, demands, damages, actions or causes of action by reason of or arising out of advice or direction respecting the ownership, operation or management of the Lands for the provision of housing for Rental Purposes which has been or hereafter may be given to the Owner by all or any of them.

7.3 The covenants of the Owner set out in sections 7.1 and 7.2 of this Agreement will survive the expiration or the earlier termination of this Agreement and will continue to apply to any breach of the Agreement and to any claims arising under this Agreement during the ownership by the Owner of the Lands.

8. GENERAL PROVISIONS

8.1 The Owner agrees to reimburse the City for all legal costs reasonably incurred by the City for the preparation, execution and registration of this Agreement. The Owner will bear their own costs, legal or otherwise, connected with the preparation, execution or registration of this Agreement.

8.2 Nothing in this Agreement:

(a) affects or limits any discretion, rights, powers, duties or obligations of the City under any enactment or at common law, including in relation to the use or subdivision of land;

(b) affects or limits any enactment relating to the use of the Lands or any condition contained in any approval including any development permit concerning the development of the Lands; or
(c) relieves the Owner from complying with any enactment, including the City's bylaws in relation to the use of the Lands.

8.3 The Owner and the City agree that:

(a) this Agreement is entered into only for the benefit of the City;

(b) this Agreement is not intended to protect the interests of the Owner, occupier or user of the Lands or any portion of it including the Rental Units and the Limited Common Property; and

(c) without limiting part 2 of this Agreement, the City may at any time execute a release and discharge of this Agreement in respect of the Lands, without liability to anyone for doing so.

8.4 This Agreement burdens and runs with the Lands and any part into which any of them may be subdivided or consolidated, by strata plan or otherwise. All of the covenants and agreements contained in this Agreement are made by the Owner for itself, its successors and assigns, and all persons who acquire an interest in the Lands after the date of this Agreement. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Owner will not be liable for any breach of any covenant, promise or agreement herein in respect of any portion of the Lands sold, assigned, considered or otherwise disposed of, occurring after the Owner has ceased to be the owner of the Lands.

8.5 The covenants and agreements on the part of the Owner in this Agreement have been made by the Owner as contractual obligations as well as being made pursuant to section 905 of the Act and as such will be binding on the Owner.

8.6 The Owner will, at its expense, do or cause to be done all acts reasonably necessary to ensure this Agreement is registered against the title to the Lands, including any amendments to this Agreement as may be required by the Land Title Office or the City to effect such registration.

8.7 The City and the Owner each intend by execution and delivery of this Agreement to create both a contract and a deed under seal.

8.8 An alleged waiver by a party of any breach by another party of its obligations under this Agreement will be effective only if it is an express waiver of the breach in writing. No waiver of a breach of this Agreement is deemed or construed to be a consent or waiver of any other breach of this Agreement.

8.9 If a Court of competent jurisdiction finds that any part of this Agreement is invalid, illegal, or unenforceable, that part is to be considered to have been severed from the rest of this Agreement and the rest of this Agreement remains in force unaffected by that holding or by the severance of that part.

8.10 Every obligation of a party which is set out in this Agreement will extend throughout the Term and, to the extent that any obligation ought to have been observed or performed prior to or upon the expiry or earlier termination of the Term, such obligation will survive the expiry or earlier termination of the Term until it has been observed or performed.
8.11 All notices, demands, or requests of any kind, which a party may be required or permitted to serve on another in connection with this Agreement, must be in writing and may be served on the other parties by registered mail, by facsimile or e-mail transmission, or by personal service, to the following address for each party:

City: The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver
141 West 14th Street
North Vancouver, British Columbia
V7M 1H9
Attention: Director, Planning
Facsimile: 604.985.0576

The Owner: Confide Enterprises Ltd.,
517 - 1177 Hastings Street West,
Vancouver, British Columbia,
V6E 2K3

Service of any such notice, demand, or request will be deemed complete, if made by registered mail, 72 hours after the date and hour of mailing, except where there is a postal service disruption during such period, in which case service will be deemed to be complete only upon actual delivery of the notice, demand or request; if made by facsimile or e-mail transmission, on the first business day after the date when the facsimile or e-mail transmission was transmitted; and if made by personal service, upon personal service being effected. Any party, from time to time, by notice in writing served upon the other parties, may designate a different address or different or additional persons to which all notices, demands, or requests are to be addressed.

8.12 Upon request by the City, the Owner will promptly do such acts and execute such documents as may be reasonably necessary, in the opinion of the City, to give effect to this Agreement.

8.13 This Agreement will enure to the benefit of and be binding upon each of the parties and their successors and permitted assigns.

9. INTERPRETATION

9.1 Gender specific terms include both genders and include corporations. Words in the singular include the plural, and words in the plural include the singular.

9.2 The division of this Agreement into sections and the use of headings are for convenience of reference only and are not intended to govern, limit or aid in the construction of any provision. In all cases, the language in this Agreement is to be construed simply according to its fair meaning, and not strictly for or against either party.

9.3 The word “including” when following any general statement or term is not to be construed to limit the general statement or term to the specific items which immediately follow the general statement or term to similar items whether or not words such as “without limitation” or “but not limited to” are used, but rather the general statement or term is to be construed to refer to all other items that could reasonably fall within the broadest possible scope of the general statement or term.

9.4 The words “must” and “will” are to be construed as imperative.
9.5 Any reference in this Agreement to any statute or bylaw includes any subsequent amendment, re-enactment, or replacement of that statute or bylaw.

9.6 This is the entire agreement between the City and the Owner concerning its subject, and there are no warranties, representations, conditions or collateral agreements relating to the subject matter of this Agreement, except as included in this Agreement. This Agreement may be amended only by a document executed by the parties to this Agreement and by bylaw, such amendment to be effective only upon adoption by City Council of an amending bylaw to “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897”.

9.7 This Agreement is to be governed by and construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of British Columbia.

9.8 This Agreement can be signed in counterpart.

IN WITNESS OF THIS AGREEMENT the City and the Owner have executed this Agreement by signing the “Form C – General Instrument – Part 1” or “Form D – Executions Continued” attached hereto.
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THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

BYLAW NO. 8897

A Bylaw to enter into a Housing Agreement (144 West 21st Street)

WHEREAS Section 483 of the Local Government Act R.S.B.C. 2015 c.1 permits a local government to enter into a housing agreement for rental housing.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver, in open meeting assembled enacts as follows:

1. This Bylaw shall be known and cited for all purposes as “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments).

2. The Council hereby authorizes the agreement substantially in the form attached to this bylaw between The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver and Confide Enterprises Inc. with respect to the lands referenced as 144 West 21st Street, “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8896” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745).

3. The Mayor and Corporate Officer are authorized to execute any documents required to give effect to the Housing Agreement.

READ a first time on the 6th day of December, 2021.

READ a second time on the 6th day of December, 2021.

READ a third time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

ADOPTED on the <> day of <>, 2022.

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER
PART 2 – TERMS OF INSTRUMENT

RENTAL HOUSING AGREEMENT AND SECTION 219 COVENANT

THIS AGREEMENT dated for reference the _______ day of ____________________, 20____.

BETWEEN:

CONFIDE ENTERPRISES LTD.,
517 - 1177 Hastings Street West,
Vancouver, British Columbia,
V6E 2K3

(the “Owner”)

AND:

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER,
a municipal corporation pursuant to the Local Government Act and
having its offices at 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver,
British Columbia, V7M 1H9

(the “City”)

WHEREAS:

A. The Owner is the registered owner of the Lands.

B. The City is a municipal corporation incorporated pursuant to the Community Charter, SBC 2003, c. 26.

C. Section 219 of the Land Title Act, RSBC 1996, c. 250 permits registration of a covenant in favour of a municipality in respect of the use of land or the use of a building on or to be erected on land, that land is or is not to be built on except in accordance with the covenant and that land is not to be subdivided except in accordance with the covenant;

D. Section 483 of the Act permits a local government to, by bylaw, enter into a housing agreement that may include terms and conditions regarding the occupancy of the housing units identified in the agreement, including respecting the form of tenure of the housing units, the availability of the housing units to classes of persons, the administration and management of the housing units and the rents and lease, sale or share prices that may be charged.

E. The City has enacted a bylaw authorizing this Agreement.

F. The Owner and the City wish to enter into this Agreement pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act and section 483 of the Act.

NOW THEREFORE in consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars ($10.00) now paid by the City to the Owner and for other good and valuable consideration (the receipt and sufficiency of which the Owner hereby acknowledges), the Owner and the City covenant each with the other as follows:
1. DEFINITIONS

(a) “Act” means the Local Government Act, RSBC. 2015 c.1 as amended from time to time;

(b) “Affordable Rent” means with respect to each Mid-Market Rental Unit a rent payment amount equal to 10% below the “Private Apartment Average Rents” for the corresponding bedroom type in the City of North Vancouver as established by CMHC’s Housing Market Information Portal for the year the tenancy is entered into;

(c) “Agreement” means this agreement as amended from time to time;

(d) “Commencement Date” has the meaning set out in section 2.1 herein;

(e) “Council” means the municipal council for the City of North Vancouver;

(f) “CMHC” means Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation;

(g) “Director of Planning” means the chief administrator of the Department of Planning of the City and his or her successors in function and their respective nominees;

(h) “Dwelling Unit” means a dwelling unit as defined in the City of North Vancouver’s “Zoning Bylaw 1995, No. 6700” as amended from time to time;

(i) “Lands” means those lands and premises legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 004-343-638
Lot A-10
Block 206
District Lot 545
Plan 17051;

(j) “Mid-Market Rental Units” means the 6 Dwelling Units in the Residential Building to be constructed on the Lands that are rented to tenants for Affordable Rent;

(k) “Market Rental Units” means all Dwelling Units in the Residential Building other than the Mid-Market Rental Units;

(l) “Maximum Household Income” means an annual gross household income determined by multiplying Affordable Rent by 12 to yield the households’ annual housing costs, and divided by 30% (0.30) to meet the standard definition of affordability.

(m) “Rental Purposes” means an occupancy or intended occupancy which is or would be governed by a tenancy agreement as defined in Section 1 of the Residential Tenancy Act, SBC 2002 c. 78 as amended from time to time between the Owner and the tenant;

(n) “Rental Units” means the Market Rental Units and the Mid-Market Rental Units;
“Residential Building” means the six storey building to be constructed on the Lands to be used for Rental Purposes with 85 Dwelling Units, of which 76 Dwelling Units will be Market Rental Units and 9 Dwelling Units will be Mid-Market Rental Units;

“RT Act” means the Residential Tenancy Act, SBC 2002 c. 78;

“Rezoning Bylaw” means the rezoning bylaw applicable to the Lands described as “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8896”;

“Section 219 Covenant” means a covenant pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act;

“Tenancy Agreement” means an agreement, whether written or oral, express or implied, between the Owner and a tenant respecting possession or occupancy of a Rental Unit; and

“Term” has the meaning set out in section 2.1 herein.

2. TERM

2.1 This Agreement will commence upon adoption by the City’s Council of “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897” (Confide Enterprises Inc. / Ankenman Marchand Architects, 144 West 21st Street, CD-745, Rental Housing Commitments) (the “Commencement Date”) and will continue until the date this Agreement is terminated in accordance with sections 2.2 or 8.3(c) (the “Term”).

2.2 This Agreement will terminate immediately upon the removal or destruction of the Residential Building provided the Residential Building is not repaired or rebuilt following the destruction thereof.

2.3 Subject to section 7.3, upon termination of this Agreement, this Agreement will be at an end and of no further force and effect.

3. SECTION 219 COVENANT

3.1 The Owner covenants and agrees with the City as a covenant in favour of the City pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act, RSBC 1996, c. 250 that during the Term of this Agreement, it being the intention and agreement of the Owner that the provisions in this Agreement be annexed to, and run with and be a charge upon the Lands, that notwithstanding the Rezoning Bylaw, the Lands shall be used and built on only in strict compliance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement and that:

(a) the Lands shall not be subdivided or stratified;

(b) the Rental Units in the Residential Building shall be used for Rental Purposes only; and

(c) no Rental Unit in the Residential Building shall be occupied for any purpose except for Rental Purposes pursuant to a Tenancy Agreement.

3.2 The Owner further covenants and agrees with the City that the Lands and any buildings or structures constructed thereon including the Residential Building shall be developed,
built, and maintained in accordance with all City bylaws, regulations and guidelines as amended from time to time.

3.3 Pursuant to section 219(6) of the *Land Title Act*, RSBC 1996, c. 250 except for the negligence of the City or its employees, agents or contractors, the Owner will indemnify and save harmless each of the City and its elected officials, board members, officers, directors, employees, and agents, and their heirs, executors, administrators, personal representatives, successors and assigns, from and against all claims, demands, actions, loss, damage, costs and liabilities, which all or any of them will or may be liable for or suffer or incur or be put to by reason of or arising out of:

(a) any act or omission, negligent or otherwise, by the Owner, or its officers, directors, employees, agents, contractors, or other persons for whom at law the Owner is responsible;

(b) the Owner’s default under this Agreement; and

(c) the Owner's ownership, operation, management or financing of the Lands for the provision of housing for Rental Purposes.

4. **TENANCY RESTRICTIONS**

4.1 The unit mix for Rental Units in the Residential Building shall be no fewer than 9 three-bedroom units, 13 two-bedroom units and 63 one-bedroom units or as otherwise approved in writing by the Director of Planning in his or her discretion.

4.2 The nine Mid-Market Rental Units shall be provided in the following unit mix: 6 one-bedroom units, 2 two-bedroom unit, and 1 three-bedroom unit. The Owner may only change this mix with the approval in writing by the Director of Planning with such approval to be granted in his or her discretion. The Owner shall be entitled to determine the locations of the six Mid-Market Rental Units within the Residential Building.

4.3 The Owner shall enter into a minimum 1 year Tenancy Agreement for each of the Mid-Market Rental Units which will convert to a month to month tenancy at the end of the 1 year term. If such a tenancy is ended prior to the end of the Term, the Owner must rent the Mid-Market Rental Unit at Affordable Rent. For greater certainty, at the end of each tenancy, the Mid-Market Rental Unit will continue to be rented as a Mid-Market Rental Unit at Affordable Rent, which obligation will be ongoing at all times during the Term.

5. **OWNER’S OBLIGATIONS**

5.1 Without limiting section 3.1 of this Agreement:

(a) Management and administration: the management, administration, and associated costs with the management and administration of the Rental Units, including the Mid-Market Rental Units, will be borne by the Owner or its designated rental agent, unless otherwise approved by the City in writing;

(b) Advertisement: when the Mid-Market Rental Units first become available, the Owner will advertise such units for a minimum of one month on at least two common rental property search platforms that allow potential tenants to view available properties for rent in North Vancouver without payment of a fee or requirement for registration, and the Owner will feature the tenure restrictions set out in this Agreement prominently in all advertising of Mid-Market Rental Units;
(c) Tenant Selection: the Owner will make the Mid-Market Rental Units available in the following order of priority:

(i) Tenants from the existing rental building on the Lands will be provided first right of refusal in the Mid-Market Rental Units, regardless of income, and have first priority, provided that if there are multiple applicants in this category for one unit, then applicant families with one or more dependents will have priority for units with two or more bedrooms and if applicants are equal in this regard, then applications will be considered on a first come-first-served basis;

(ii) The Owner will then make any remaining Mid-Market Rental Units not rented by tenants from the existing building on the Lands available to tenants with an annual household income at or below that the Maximum Household Income who are either current residents of the City of North Vancouver or who work in the City of North Vancouver and have done so for at least six months, provided that if there are multiple applicants in this category for one unit, then applicant families with one or more dependents will have priority for units with two or more bedrooms and if applicants are equal in this regard, then applications will be considered on a first come-first-served basis;

(iii) If there are any remaining Mid-Market Rental Units not rented by tenants who meet the criteria in Sections 5.1(c)(i) or (ii) after the expiry of the one-month advertising period, then the Owner will make such units available to tenants who meet the Maximum Household Income requirement; and

(iv) In determining whether a tenant meets the Maximum Household Income requirements, the Owner or its rental agent, so long as it acts honestly and in good faith, is entitled to rely on all information provided by the prospective tenant and the Owner will have no liability if the prospective tenant intentionally or unintentionally provides any incorrect information. The Owner is under no obligation to monitor or update the financial circumstances of the tenant once the lease is signed.

(d) Rent Amount and Permitted Increases: Affordable Rent for Mid-Market Rental Units is to be determined at the time of tenancy. Rent amounts may be subsequently increased by the permitted annual rent increase then set under the RT Act.

(e) Compliance with applicable laws: without restricting the foregoing, the Owner will comply with all applicable provisions of the RT Act and any other provincial or municipal enactments imposing obligations on landlords in relation to residential tenancies;

(f) Performance: the Owner will perform its obligations under this Agreement diligently and in good faith; and

(g) Evidence of compliance: provided that the same can be done without breaching the Personal Information Protection Act (as amended from time to time) the Owner will, at Business License renewal on an annual basis, supply to the City copies of any documentation in possession of the Owner necessary to establish compliance with the Owner's obligations under this Agreement.
6. DEFAULT AND REMEDIES

6.1 The City may, acting reasonably, give to the Owner a written notice (in this section 6.1, the “Notice”) requiring the Owner to cure a default under this Agreement within 30 days of receipt of the Notice. The Notice must specify the nature of the default. The Owner must act with diligence to correct the default within the time specified.

6.2 If the default is not corrected within the time specified, the Owner will pay to the City on demand by the City 200 percent of the difference between current market rent, as determined by a third-party appraiser, and Affordable Rent for each Mid-Market Rental Unit in default for the default year to the end of the Term of the Agreement. The monies collected from default will be deposited to the City’s Affordable Housing Reserve Fund.

6.3 The Owner will pay to the City on demand by the City all the City's costs of exercising its rights or remedies under this Agreement, on a full indemnity basis.

6.4 The Owner acknowledges and agrees that in case of a breach of this Agreement which is not fully remediable by the mere payment of money and promptly so remedied, the harm sustained by the City and to the public interest will be irreparable and not susceptible of adequate monetary compensation.

6.5 Each party to this Agreement, in addition to its rights under this Agreement or at law, will be entitled to all equitable remedies including specific performance, injunction and declaratory relief, or any of them, to enforce its rights under this Agreement.

6.6 The Owner acknowledges and agrees that it is entering into this Agreement to benefit the public interest in providing housing for Rental Purposes, and that the City's rights and remedies under this Agreement are necessary to ensure that this purpose is carried out and that the City's rights and remedies under this Agreement are fair and reasonable and ought not to be construed as a penalty or forfeiture.

6.7 No reference to nor exercise of any specific right or remedy under this Agreement or at law or at equity by any party will prejudice, limit or preclude that party from exercising any other right or remedy. No right or remedy will be exclusive or dependent upon any other right or remedy, but any party, from time to time, may exercise any one or more of such rights or remedies independently, successively, or in combination. The Owner acknowledges that specific performance, injunctive relief (mandatory or otherwise) or other equitable relief may be the only adequate remedy of a default by the Owner under this Agreement.

7. LIABILITY

7.1 Except for the negligence of the City or its employees, agents or contractors, the Owner will indemnify and save harmless each of the City and its elected officials, board members, officers, directors, employees, and agents, and their heirs, executors, administrators, personal representatives, successors and assigns, from and against all claims, demands, actions, loss, damage, costs and liabilities, which all or any of them will or may be liable for or suffer or incur or be put to by reason of or arising out of:

(a) any act or omission by the Owner, or its officers, directors, employees, agents, contractors, or other persons for whom at law the Owner is responsible; and

(b) the Owner's ownership, operation, management or financing of the Lands for the provision of housing for Rental Purposes.
7.2 Except to the extent such advice or direction is given negligently, the Owner hereby releases and forever discharges the City, its elected officials, board members, officers, directors, employees and agents, and its and their heirs, executors, administrators, personal representatives, successors and assigns from and against all claims, demands, damages, actions or causes of action by reason of or arising out of advice or direction respecting the ownership, operation or management of the Lands for the provision of housing for Rental Purposes which has been or hereafter may be given to the Owner by all or any of them.

7.3 The covenants of the Owner set out in sections 7.1 and 7.2 of this Agreement will survive the expiration or the earlier termination of this Agreement and will continue to apply to any breach of the Agreement and to any claims arising under this Agreement during the ownership by the Owner of the Lands.

8. **GENERAL PROVISIONS**

8.1 The Owner agrees to reimburse the City for all legal costs reasonably incurred by the City for the preparation, execution and registration of this Agreement. The Owner will bear their own costs, legal or otherwise, connected with the preparation, execution or registration of this Agreement.

8.2 Nothing in this Agreement:

(a) affects or limits any discretion, rights, powers, duties or obligations of the City under any enactment or at common law, including in relation to the use or subdivision of land;

(b) affects or limits any enactment relating to the use of the Lands or any condition contained in any approval including any development permit concerning the development of the Lands; or

(c) relieves the Owner from complying with any enactment, including the City's bylaws in relation to the use of the Lands.

8.3 The Owner and the City agree that:

(a) this Agreement is entered into only for the benefit of the City;

(b) this Agreement is not intended to protect the interests of the Owner, occupier or user of the Lands or any portion of it including the Rental Units and the Limited Common Property; and

(c) without limiting part 2 of this Agreement, the City may at any time execute a release and discharge of this Agreement in respect of the Lands, without liability to anyone for doing so.

8.4 This Agreement burdens and runs with the Lands and any part into which any of them may be subdivided or consolidated, by strata plan or otherwise. All of the covenants and agreements contained in this Agreement are made by the Owner for itself, its successors and assigns, and all persons who acquire an interest in the Lands after the date of this Agreement. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Owner will not be liable for any breach of any covenant, promise or agreement herein in respect of any portion of the Lands sold, assigned, considered or otherwise disposed of, occurring after the Owner has ceased to be the owner of the Lands.
8.5 The covenants and agreements on the part of the Owner in this Agreement have been made by the Owner as contractual obligations as well as being made pursuant to section 905 of the Act and as such will be binding on the Owner.

8.6 The Owner will, at its expense, do or cause to be done all acts reasonably necessary to ensure this Agreement is registered against the title to the Lands, including any amendments to this Agreement as may be required by the Land Title Office or the City to effect such registration.

8.7 The City and the Owner each intend by execution and delivery of this Agreement to create both a contract and a deed under seal.

8.8 An alleged waiver by a party of any breach by another party of its obligations under this Agreement will be effective only if it is an express waiver of the breach in writing. No waiver of a breach of this Agreement is deemed or construed to be a consent or waiver of any other breach of this Agreement.

8.9 If a Court of competent jurisdiction finds that any part of this Agreement is invalid, illegal, or unenforceable, that part is to be considered to have been severed from the rest of this Agreement and the rest of this Agreement remains in force unaffected by that holding or by the severance of that part.

8.10 Every obligation of a party which is set out in this Agreement will extend throughout the Term and, to the extent that any obligation ought to have been observed or performed prior to or upon the expiry or earlier termination of the Term, such obligation will survive the expiry or earlier termination of the Term until it has been observed or performed.

8.11 All notices, demands, or requests of any kind, which a party may be required or permitted to serve on another in connection with this Agreement, must be in writing and may be served on the other parties by registered mail, by facsimile or e-mail transmission, or by personal service, to the following address for each party:

City: The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver
141 West 14th Street
North Vancouver, British Columbia
V7M 1H9
Attention: Director, Planning
Facsimile: 604.985.0576

The Owner: Confide Enterprises Ltd.,
517 - 1177 Hastings Street West,
Vancouver, British Columbia,
V6E 2K3

Service of any such notice, demand, or request will be deemed complete, if made by registered mail, 72 hours after the date and hour of mailing, except where there is a postal service disruption during such period, in which case service will be deemed to be complete only upon actual delivery of the notice, demand or request; if made by facsimile or e-mail transmission, on the first business day after the date when the facsimile or e-mail transmission was transmitted; and if made by personal service, upon personal service being effected. Any party, from time to time, by notice in writing served upon the other parties, may designate a different address or different or additional persons to which all notices, demands, or requests are to be addressed.
8.12 Upon request by the City, the Owner will promptly do such acts and execute such documents as may be reasonably necessary, in the opinion of the City, to give effect to this Agreement.

8.13 This Agreement will enure to the benefit of and be binding upon each of the parties and their successors and permitted assigns.

9. **INTERPRETATION**

9.1 Gender specific terms include both genders and include corporations. Words in the singular include the plural, and words in the plural include the singular.

9.2 The division of this Agreement into sections and the use of headings are for convenience of reference only and are not intended to govern, limit or aid in the construction of any provision. In all cases, the language in this Agreement is to be construed simply according to its fair meaning, and not strictly for or against either party.

9.3 The word "including" when following any general statement or term is not to be construed to limit the general statement or term to the specific items which immediately follow the general statement or term to similar items whether or not words such as "without limitation" or "but not limited to" are used, but rather the general statement or term is to be construed to refer to all other items that could reasonably fall within the broadest possible scope of the general statement or term.

9.4 The words "must" and "will" are to be construed as imperative.

9.5 Any reference in this Agreement to any statute or bylaw includes any subsequent amendment, re-enactment, or replacement of that statute or bylaw.

9.6 This is the entire agreement between the City and the Owner concerning its subject, and there are no warranties, representations, conditions or collateral agreements relating to the subject matter of this Agreement, except as included in this Agreement. This Agreement may be amended only by a document executed by the parties to this Agreement and by bylaw, such amendment to be effective only upon adoption by City Council of an amending bylaw to “Housing Agreement Bylaw, 2021, No. 8897”.

9.7 This Agreement is to be governed by and construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of British Columbia.

9.8 This Agreement can be signed in counterpart.

IN WITNESS OF THIS AGREEMENT the City and the Owner have executed this Agreement by signing the “Form C – General Instrument – Part 1” or “Form D – Executions Continued” attached hereto.
To: Mayor Linda Buchanan and Members of Council

From: Meg Wray, Planner 1

Subject: INTRODUCTION OF REZONING APPLICATION: 309 KENNARD AVENUE (LARRY PODHORA / LARRY PODHORA ARCHITECTURE INC.)

Date: December 1, 2021

File No: 08-3400-20-0023/1

The following is a suggested recommendation only. Refer to Council Minutes for adopted resolution.

RECOMMENDATION

PURSUANT to the report of the Planner 1, dated December 1, 2021, entitled “Introduction of Rezoning Application: 309 Kennard Avenue (Larry Podhora / Larry Podhora Architecture Inc.)”,

THAT the application made by Larry Podhora / Larry Podhora Architecture Inc. to rezone the property at 309 Kennard Avenue from Special Industrial (M-3) to Comprehensive Development (CD-748) Zone be considered and no Public Hearing be held, in accordance with the Local Government Act;

THAT notification be circulated in accordance with the Local Government Act;

AND THAT the community benefits listed in the report section “Community Benefits” be secured through agreements at the applicant’s expense and to the satisfaction of staff.
REPORT: Rezoning Application: 309 Kennard Avenue (Larry Podhora / Larry Podhora Architecture Inc.  
Date: December 1, 2021

ATTACHMENTS

1. Context Map (CityDocs 2118214)  
2. Architectural Drawings Consolidated for Council, dated November 22, 2021 (CityDocs 2118536)  
3. Landscaping Drawings Consolidated for Council, dated November 19, 2021 (CityDocs 2118219)  
4. Public Consultation Summary (CityDocs 2118564)  
5. Draft "Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8902" (CityDocs 2118266)

SUMMARY

This report presents a rezoning application for a six-storey self-storage building. The main floor includes an office for the self-storage use, a small commercial unit, and parking at 309 Kennard Avenue. A significant land dedication of 9.2 m. (30.2 ft.) is provided at the south lot line, along the frontage of East 3rd Street.

DISCUSSION

Site Context

The site is located at the corner of Kennard Avenue and East 3rd Street in a light industrial and commercial area of the City.

Across the street to the south are heavy industrial port uses and rail infrastructure. The area is separated from the Moodyville residential neighbourhood to the west by significant grade changes and a vegetated buffer.

The buildings immediately surrounding the subject site are described in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Surrounding uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>333 Kennard Avenue</td>
<td>Metro Vancouver sewer and drainage infrastructure</td>
<td>Special Industrial (M-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East – across</td>
<td>1102-1122 East 3rd Street, 304-314 Kennard Ave</td>
<td>2 storey light industrial (office/warehouse)</td>
<td>Special Industrial (M-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennard Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South – East</td>
<td>1001 Low Level Road</td>
<td>Rail infrastructure, heavy industrial uses, port</td>
<td>General Industrial (M-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1102 Cotton Road</td>
<td>City park</td>
<td>Public Use and Assembly (P-1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is located in very close proximity to transit, and the amenities of the Park and Tilford commercial area.
Planning Analysis & Proposed Variances

The property is designated Mixed Employment in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The Mixed Employment designation allows for light industrial uses, including storage, as a complementary service commercial use.

The existing zoning is M-3 Zone (Special Industrial) and the six-storey building requires rezoning to a Comprehensive Development (CD) Zone proposed to be CD-748. The proposed changes to existing Zoning Bylaw provisions are as outlined in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Requested Changes to the Zoning By-law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Designation/Regulation</th>
<th>Proposed Designation/Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As in the M-3 Zone</td>
<td>In addition to uses permitted in the M-3 Zone, Industrial Area Commercial Use shall be permitted on the main floor of a Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height shall not exceed 12.2 m. (40 ft.)</td>
<td>Height shall not exceed 25 m. (82 ft.) as measured from Flood Construction Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6.1 m. (20 ft.) from front lot line</td>
<td>• 0.4 m. (1.2 ft.) from front (east) lot line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6.1 m. (20 ft.) from exterior side lot line</td>
<td>• 0.5 m. (1.7 ft.) from the exterior side (south) lot line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3.1 m. (10 ft.) from rear lot line</td>
<td>• 0.4 m. (1.4 ft.) from the rear (west) lot line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 space per 95 sq.m. (1,023 sq.ft.) GFA.</td>
<td>0.14 spaces per 95 sq.m. (1,023 sq.ft.) of Industrial Use floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would equate to 222 parking spaces</td>
<td>1 space per 50 sq.m. (539 sq.ft.) of Industrial Area Commercial Use floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This equates to 33 spaces</td>
<td>This equates to 4 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loading</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 space per 1,394 sq.m. (15,000 sq.ft.) of GFA</td>
<td>1 space per 5,000 sq.m. (53,820 sq.ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would equate to 15 spaces</td>
<td>This equates to 4 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use**

The property is designated Mixed Employment in the OCP, which allows for uses such as storage, with some complementary service commercial use. A small commercial unit is proposed to be provided on the main floor, facing East 3rd Street. This unit is intended to assist in activating the street frontage and providing an amenity to the surrounding area. ‘Industrial Area Commercial Use’ is included in the proposed zoning to accommodate potential uses of this space such as an office or café.

The internal layout of the floor plans, for the individual self-storage units, would be determined at Building Permit stage.

**Density**
Industrial zones in the City do not specify maximum densities; buildings are instead constrained by the maximum building envelope (height and setbacks). The rationale for the proposed variances to height and setbacks is detailed in this report.

The proposed six-storey building would be approximately 21,071 sq.m. (226,807 sq.ft.) or 5.1 FSR. A zoning bylaw provision is not required for this density.

**Height**

Under the OCP, properties designated as Mixed Employment do not have a maximum height; however, in considering the proposed height, considerations shall be given to “view impacts, contextual relationships and...use”.

Generally speaking, multi-storey industrial development are encouraged in order to generate economic activity and employment on the very limited industrial land base within the city boundary. For this proposal, the proposed six-storey height has been evaluated for its contextual fit and is deemed supportable:

- There would be very minimal view impacts on residences to the northwest due to the large vegetated buffer and grade separation between the site and the residential neighbourhood;
- Shadow analysis indicates no impact on residences. This is illustrated in the view impacts and shadow analysis provided in Attachment #2 of this report;
- The site is adjacent older two-storey industrial buildings in the surrounding area, some of which may be going through redevelopment and renewal in the future; and,
- Across East 3rd Street are large-scale industrial silos and rail infrastructure.

The impact of the height, from a streetscape and pedestrian perspective, is mitigated through architectural features and details, and incorporation of glazing materials.

**Setbacks**

The proposed minimal setbacks would result in the building being situated in close proximity to the lot lines. This is appropriate, given the site context and proposed development.

Unlike some other industrial uses, the proposed self-storage building is not expected to generate any significant noise, dirt or odour. Therefore, the setbacks often required for industrial buildings are not necessary for this development. Furthermore, a large portion of the main floor is setback from Kennard Avenue which mitigates the impact of the façade on the pedestrian realm. The site is buffered from residential areas to the northwest by a large vegetated park.
A significant land dedication of 9.2 m. (30.2 ft.) is being provided to the City at the south lot line as described further below. Reduced setbacks are supportable to facilitate this dedication, whilst maintaining a reasonable buildable area for the development. Given the land dedication being provided, the building will be set back from the existing lot line further than the current setback requirement of 6.1 m. (20 ft.).

Parking

On the main floor of the building, 33 parking spaces and 4 loading spaces would be provided. A thorough rationale has been provided through the applicant's technical transportation analysis. The analysis indicates that based on local demand in this area of the City, and the low-occupancy nature of self-storage use, this number of parking spaces is sufficient. The standard parking space requirement in the Zoning Bylaw applies broadly to all industrial uses. The proposed variances, for the storage building proposal, are supported by staff.

At Building Permit stage, the detailed design would include: bicycle end of destination facilities, and electric vehicle (EV) charging in accordance with City requirements.

Landscaping

The majority of the site would be covered by the building, so landscaping is primarily focused on the public realm. The large dedication area, which is being sought for future dedicated transit, would allow for a double line of street trees along East 3rd Street in the interim.

Advisory Body Review

Advisory Design Panel

Earlier iterations of the development were for a 13-storey building. This proposal was reviewed by the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) in October 2020, and the Panel did not recommend approval based on concerns primarily regarding the height. A revised 11-storey proposal was presented to the Panel in January 2021. ADP felt that their concerns about the height had not been adequately resolved; the Panel was also concerned that the proposed height may not reflect a reasonable projection of how the surrounding industrial area might be developed in the future.

The applicant has been very responsive to the Panel's feedback by further, substantially reducing the height. The current proposal is for a six-storey building.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

A virtual Developer's Information Session was held on September 22, 2020. Two members of the public attended.

At the time of the public consultation session, the proposal was for a 13-storey building; however, other key elements of the proposal have not changed since the consultation.
Discussion primarily focused on questions regarding sustainability and energy conservation. These questions have been addressed by the applicant. The self-storage use requires relatively low water and energy consumption because the building will be minimally heated and lighting will be on-demand. The proposal is also future-proofed to allow for a Lonsdale Energy Corporation (LEC) district energy connection, once an LEC servicing location comes online in this area of the City.

**Public Hearing and New Process When No Public Hearing Held**

Given the proposal's consistency with the OCP, and minimal feedback from the public during the consultation period, no Public Hearing is recommended.

On November 25, 2021, Bill 26 – Municipal Affairs Statutes Amendment Act (No. 2), 2021 was given Royal Assent and most of the legislative amendments in the Bill came into force. This included a change to the Local Government Act that a local government is not required to hold a public hearing on a proposed zoning bylaw, if the bylaw is consistent with the OCP. This replaced the former provision that allowed local governments to waive a public hearing. Local governments now have to make a positive decision to hold a public hearing, as opposed to deciding to waive a public hearing. At this time, staff are recommending that a public hearing not be held in the same circumstances for which staff would have previously recommended that a public hearing be waived. The proposed rezoning bylaw is consistent with the OCP and staff are recommending that a public hearing not be held.

Bill 26 also changed the notice requirements in the Local Government Act when no public hearing is held. Previously, Council would consider the zoning amendment bylaw and resolve to waive a public hearing and then give first and second reading to the bylaw. Notice would then be published and the public could make submissions that would be provided to Council and considered when the matter came back to Council for the waived public hearing and third reading of the bylaw.

Under the new provisions, the notice must be published prior to first reading, so Council would resolve not to hold the public hearing, then notice would be published, and the public can make submissions, then staff would return with a report recommending consideration of the bylaw, and then Council would consider first, second and third readings.

If a public hearing is to be held, the notice requirements under the Local Government Act remain the same.

Should Council wish to refer the application to public hearing, the first active clause in the resolution should be amended to read:

THAT “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 8902” (Larry Podhora / Larry Podhora Architecture Inc., 309 Kennard Avenue, CD-748) be considered and referred to a Public Hearing;
Council may then also consider giving the draft zoning amendment bylaw (Attachment #5) first and second reading, or staff may bring the bylaw back for Council's consideration prior to publishing notice of the public hearing.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

Flood Construction Level (FCL)

The site is located within a coastal sea level and creek flood plain area. The proposal includes two levels of storage use below grade, which would be below the flood construction level. Typically, the City's Sewage and Drainage Utility Bylaw requires that habitable space, storage and mechanical and electrical equipment, which is susceptible to damage by floodwater, be located at a minimum elevation of 4.5 m. geodetic.

To meet the intent of the bylaw, the underground levels of the building would be designed using a tanking (or better) solution to waterproof the building, to make it insusceptible to floodwater, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official. Through a Third Party Review process, staff would continue to work with the applicant to satisfy this condition. Resolution of the technical waterproofing method would be required as part of the building permit review process. In addition, the building permit submission would need to demonstrate the systems intended to provide life safety and mitigate damage to items in the storage area below the FCL. A flooding covenant will be required, which provides notice on title that the site is within a flood prone area and provides an indemnity in favour of the city.

The building will also be required to meet the City's stormwater management requirements in accordance with the Subdivision and Development Control Bylaw, which requires onsite detention of site stormwater and a maximum discharge flow rate to ensure the City's sewer system is not overburdened.

COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Road Dedication

East 3rd Street is part of the Rapid Bus route, and future Rapid Transit corridor. Additional road right-of-way space is needed to achieve an improved intersection design in support of future transit network enhancements. With the port land to the south, there is no opportunity for a land dedication from the south side of East 3rd Street/Low Level Road.

This development would provide a significant land dedication of 9.2 m. (30.2 ft.), which would secure the much needed right-of-way to meet the City's future aspirations for transit improvements and a protected cycleway.

The proposed design of the public realm (as shown in Attachments #2 and #3 of this Report) is schematic at this stage; a detailed design review would be conducted at the building permit stage to refine the technical details.
Legal Agreements

Should Council approve the proposal, the following legal agreements and documents would be required to be completed prior to final adoption of the bylaw:

- Development Covenant
- Community Good Neighbour Agreement
- Servicing Agreement
- Shoring, Crane Swing and Staging Licence Agreement
- Flooding Covenant
- Plan for Road Dedication.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

[Signature]

Meg Wray
Planner 1
The drawing has been prepared solely for the use of AAA SELF STORAGE ARCHITECTURE INC. to any party with whom LARRY PODHORA | ARCHITECTURE INC. has depot and there is no entered into a of any kind made by LARRY PODHORA | ARCHITECTURE INC. shall not be used for construction purposes until it is issued in the drawing.
CUSTOM CAST IN PLACE CONCRETE
BENCH WITH WOOD SLAT TOP
CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE SHOP
DRAWINGS OR APPROVED EQUAL.

MANUFACTURER: ULINE
MODEL NUMBER: H-8572
COLOUR: BLACK

1. CONCRETE TO BE 32MPa, CLASS C-2 AT 28 DAYS WITH 5-8% AIR ENTRAINED.
2. CONCRETE TO HAVE BROOM FINISH PERPENDICULAR TO THE LENGTH OF THE SIDEWALK.
3. EXPANSION JOINTS TO BE LOCATED AT EVERY 6.0m AND WHERE CONCRETE PAVING ABUTS OTHER STRUCTURES OR BUILDINGS.
4. SAW-CUT JOINTS TO BE LOCATED AT INTERVALS OF 0.6m.
5. CONCRETE TO BE SPRAYED WITH WHITE PIGMENT CURING COMPOUND.
6. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN MILLIMETRES.

NOTES:
- CONCRETE TO BE BOUNDED WITH PVC OR ALUMINUM EDGING
- DRAWINGS OR APPROVED EQUAL
- PVC OR ALUMINUM EDGING TO BE INSTALLED AS PER SHOWN OR APPROVED EQUAL.
- FLOOR SLAB TO BE TYPICAL BROOM FINISH
- TAPER AT TOP OF ROOTBALL SO TREE BASE EXPOSED
- CEMENT BASED CURING COMPOUND FOR CONCRETE AND MASONRY EXPOSED TO THE ELEMENTS
- DO NOT REMOVE LEADERS
- STAKES NOT TO DAMAGE OR PENETRATE ROOTBALL
- 12mm X 175mm ASPHALTFELT BOARD EVERY 6.0m
- 100 mm HIGH TEMPORARY WATER RING / SOIL BASIN AROUND TREE PIT
- 75 mm DEPTH OF BARK MULCH
- 50 mm WIDE WOVEN NYLON BANDING IN FIGURE 8 PATTERN
- TREE GUARD - TO BE ADJUSTED AS NECESSARY
- SCRIBBLE 300 mm HIGH TEMPERATURE GUIDES
- SCRIBBLE GENERAL SUPERSTRENGTH CONCRETE
- 1200 mm DEPTH OF BARK MULCH
- ROOTBALL PLUS 600 mm MINIMUM
- SCARIFY SIDES OF PLANTING HOLE
- PREPARED PLANTING MEDIUM - FIRMLY PACKED
- 100 mm COMPACTED SOIL MOUND
- 50/50 MIX SUPPLIED MEDIUM & EXISTING SOIL
City of North Vancouver  
Planning and Development  
141 W 14th Street, North Vancouver, BC  
V7M 1H9

Attention: Mr. Mike Friesen, Planner

Hello Mr. Friesen,

Re: Virtual Public Information Meeting – 309 Kennard Avenue Self Storage Depot – Developer Information Synopsis

As per the requirements of the City of North Vancouver, the design team conducted a virtual public information meeting regarding the above referenced project on September 22, 2020. The meeting was duly advertised on the subject site as well as local media information outlets. The design team approached neighbours in the immediate site context and informed them of this opportunity to obtain project information and register any potential concerns. Participants included yourself, project architect (Larry Podhora, Architect AIBC), Project Manager (Maral Zholghadr, Architect AIBC) and Process Facilitator David Batten.

Four members of the public registered their intention to participate but only two people attended the meeting. The design team’s architect presented the project and solicited questions. Most questions fielded revolved around the sustainability, energy conservation and ‘green initiatives’ on the project. Owing to the minimal projected energy consumption and use of durable insulating, prefinished panels on the project, assurances were provided that the performance, use and sustainability of the building will be well above the standards of comparably sized buildings accommodating different uses.

The design team understands that with the PIM being complete, we are now to proceed to the next step in the Planning Review process by preparing for an upcoming Advisory Design Panel (ADP). We trust that this can be confirmed and a suitable date for the ADP established as the owner is very keen to advance the rezoning/DP permit reviews as quickly as possible.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned or any member of the design team for additional information and/or clarification.

Yours truly,

Larry Podhora, Architect AIBC, MRAIC
Principal

1952 brackman way, north saanich, b.c., v9l 0c2
PUBLIC NOTICE

WHEN: Monday, January 24, 2022 at 5:30 pm
HOW: View the meeting online at cnv.org/LiveStreaming
WHAT: Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 8902
309 Kennard Avenue

Council will consider Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 8902 to rezone the subject property to permit a 6-storey self-storage building including an office, a small commercial unit and vehicle parking on the main floor.

The Regular Council Meeting will be held electronically via Webex. All persons who believe their interest in property may be affected by the proposed bylaw will be afforded an opportunity to be heard by email or written submission. All submissions must include your name and address and should be sent to the Corporate Officer at input@cnv.org, or by mail or delivered to City Hall, no later than 12:00 noon on Monday, January 24, 2022, to ensure their availability to Council at the meeting. No Public Hearing will be held.

The proposed bylaw and background material are available for viewing at City Hall and online at cnv.org/PublicHearings.

Questions? Leah Karlberg, Planner 1, lkarlberg@cnv.org / 604-982-8352
BYLAW NO. 8902

A Bylaw to amend “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700”

The Council of The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. This Bylaw shall be known and cited for all purposes as “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8902” (Larry Podhora / Larry Podhora Architecture Inc., 309 Kennard Avenue, CD-748).

2. Division VI: Zoning Map of Document “A” of “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700” is hereby amended by reclassifying the following lots as henceforth being transferred, added to and forming part of CD-748 (Comprehensive Development 748 Zone):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lots</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
<th>Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>11817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Part 11 of Division V: Comprehensive Development Regulations of Document “A” of “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700” is hereby amended by:

A. Adding the following section to Section 1100, thereof, after the designation “CD-747 Comprehensive Development 747 Zone”:

“CD-748 Comprehensive Development 748 Zone”

B. Adding the following to Section 1101, thereof, after the “CD-747 Comprehensive Development 747 Zone”:

“CD-748 Comprehensive Development 748 Zone”

In the CD-748 Zone, permitted Uses, regulations for permitted Uses, regulations for the size, shape and siting of Buildings and Structures and required Off-Street Parking shall be as in the M-3 Zone, except that:

(1) In addition to Uses permitted in the M-3 Zone, Industrial Area Commercial Use shall be permitted on the main floor of a Building (the main floor shall mean the floor closest in elevation to the fronting Street);

(2) Height shall not exceed 25 metres (82 feet) as measured from Flood Construction Level;

(3) Siting shall be as in the M-3 Zone, except that Buildings shall be sited not be less than:

   (a) 0.4 metres (1.2 feet) from the front (east) lot line;
   (b) 0.5 metres (1.7 feet) from the exterior side (south) lot line;
   (c) 0.4 metres (1.4 feet) from the rear (west) lot line;
(4) The minimum required number of vehicle parking spaces shall be not less than:

(a) 0.14 spaces per 95 sq.m (1023 sq.ft.) of Industrial Use floor area;
(b) 1 space per 50 sq.m (539 sq.ft.) of Industrial Area Commercial Use floor area;

(5) The minimum number of required loading spaces shall be:

(a) 1 space per 5000 sq.m (53,820 sq.ft.).

READ a first time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

READ a second time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

READ a third time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

ADOPTED on the <> day of <>, 2022.

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER
To: Mayor Linda Buchanan and Members of Council

From: Bram van der Heijden, Planner I

Subject: ACCESSORY COACH HOUSE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT GUIDELINES AND ZONING BYLAW UPDATE

Date: January 12, 2022

The following is a suggested recommendation only. Refer to Council Minutes for adopted resolution.

RECOMMENDATION

PURSUANT to the report of the Planner I, dated January 12, 2022, entitled "Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw Update":

THAT "Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8883" (Additional Coach House Requirements)", to amend the Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700 and Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines, be considered and referred to a Public Hearing;

AND THAT notification be circulated in accordance with the Local Government Act.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines 2021 (CityDocs 2134939)
2. Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines 2018 (CityDocs 1667370)
3. Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8883" (Additional Coach House Requirements) (CityDocs 2092903)

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to present, for Council’s consideration, Zoning Bylaw amendments as well as a new set of significantly simplified Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines (the "Guidelines") to facilitate a more streamlined permitting process for Coach Houses in the city.

Document Number: 2095610 V6
BACKGROUND

Prior to 2010, Coach Houses as an infill building form accessory to single family houses were permitted on a case-by-case basis. Since then, Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw requirements have guided the development permit process. Over time, multiple changes have been made to simplify Coach House requirements as listed below:

- **2010:**
  - Coach House Development Permit (DP) area added to 2002 OCP
  - Adoption of Guidelines for Coach Houses – Two Levels (A and B)
  - Coach Houses require Development Permit (DP), with level B Coach Houses also requiring a Council-approved Development Variance Permit

- **2015:**
  - Removal of distinction between Level A and Level B Coach Houses
  - Delegation of approval authority to Director of Planning for all Coach Houses

- **2017:**
  - Zoning Bylaw Amendment to permit both an Accessory Secondary Suite and an Accessory Coach House on the same lot

- **2018:**
  - Pre-application (PCA) introduced for all development applications, including Coach House DPs, to provide formal interdepartmental feedback on preliminary proposals
  - Zoning Bylaw Amendment to allow basement in Coach Houses (for storage only) and other minor changes
  - Guidelines simplified for a more streamlined DP process (Attachment 2)

Over the last several years, there has been a significant increase in Coach House DP applications as demonstrated in Figure 1.

*Figure 1: Coach House Application Trends*
It is clear that Coach Houses have become an increasingly common building type. By and large, residents have become accustomed and comfortable with this form of development in their neighbourhoods and neighbour feedback on applications has been minimal in most instances. At the same time, the permitting process for Coach Houses remains involved, relative to the scale of development. Reducing processing time and complexity of the Guidelines while increasing clarity of City requirements are strongly supported by designers and homeowners.

In March of 2021, Council directed staff to complete an end-to-end development process review as part of the City’s ongoing commitment to deliver excellent customer service. Removing barriers and streamlining the City’s regulatory framework is a key part of this work.

DISCUSSION

Current Development Permit Process and Guidelines
Currently, a Coach House application goes through a pre-application review (a PCA), followed by a concurrent Development Permit (DP) and Building Permit (BP) review. The current guidelines aim to ensure a desirable design outcome for applicants and the neighbours and have, in general, been working. However, some issues still exist:

- The Guidelines require interpretation from staff, which can lead to a lengthy review process between staff and the applicant. The current influx of Coach House DP applications has resulted in an increase of staff time required to process these applications and, often, delays for applicants.
- The PCA process for Coach Houses is seen by many experienced applicants as adding time delay in comparison to the value it may add.
- Despite general support for Coach Houses in the City, requirements for Coach Houses remain significantly more stringent than other low-density developments such as single family homes and duplexes.

Guiding Principles
Several guiding principles were established in considering the appropriate process for Coach House development permits:

- The complexity of Coach House application requirements should align with other low-density forms of development in the City;
- As much as possible, issue DPs based on Zoning By-law provisions to significantly reduce the need for staff interpretation;
- Focus review on ensuring neighbourly fit; and
- Proactively guide successful application submission by “front-loading” requirements on City websites and through communication materials.

These principles support the removal of existing provisions in the Guidelines that are not critical to a project’s success and the simplification of difficult-to-interpret provisions.
Highlights of Regulation Changes
Two key regulatory changes are explained in this section:

1. **Zoning Bylaw**: The bylaw has been updated to include several requirements currently regulated through the Guidelines (Attachment 1).
2. **DP Guidelines**: Guidelines become more directive and simplified, with some requirements becoming more flexible to eliminate the need for common variances seen today. Additionally the requirement to notify neighbours will be removed to be consistent with other low density development applications (such as duplexes), where no notice is required. Signage at the property for the building permit will remain a requirement, and the City website will include a map and listing of all active applications, providing means for neighbours to remain informed about the development.

Setback, massing and lot coverage requirements, which are currently in the Guidelines, are integrated into the Zoning Bylaw. New or refined Bylaw provisions include:

- maximum size of second storey increased from 60% to 70%;
- maximum height for landscape screens along lane and side street capped at 3 feet; and
- setback to side street (corner lots) reduced to 1.5 m.

The Guidelines are to retain key requirements for building articulation and neighbourliness, with a focus on:

- the Coach House is identifiable from the street (as seen behind the main house);
- the Coach House clearly fronts the side street (if applicable);
- a private outdoor amenity space for the Coach House is provided;
- a landscape buffer along the rear and exterior side property lines;
- an emergency pathway is provided; and
- minimal overlook on neighbouring properties.

A summary of applicable (simplified) coach house design controls is shown in Figure 1 below.
Figure 1 Illustrative Design Objectives

1. The Coach House is sited at the rear of the property and is secondary in size and massing compared to the main building.
2. The parking is located at the back of the property, close to the lane and on permeable pavement.
3. Adequate open space is provided.
4. The Coach House has a private outdoor amenity space.
5. An appropriate setback to the main House is provided.
6. The primary building has direct access to a private outdoor amenity space.
7. A House number/unit identity number is visible from the street.
8. An access pathway is provided from the street to the Accessory Coach House.
9. There is active frontage to the lane with at least one window and one door visible from the lane.
10. There is a well-lit entrance and House number/unit identity number from the lane.
11. Fence heights are not more than 4' along rear and exterior side lot lines to ensure active frontage.
12. A landscape buffer is provided along rear and exterior side lot lines.
IMPLEMENTATION

Should Council approve these regulatory changes, staff will implement the new regulations for all forthcoming coach house applications. The proposed bylaw includes a clause protecting any in-stream applications from complying with the new regulations, though in-stream applicants may wish to proceed, at this option, under the simplified new regulations. In addition to the regulatory changes, the following process improvements are proposed:

- enhancing communication with applicants as part of ongoing process improvement;
- providing a user-friendly informational bulletin for public use; and
- eliminating the PCA process.

Through the third party development process review, additional process changes may be proposed and implemented to streamline the coach house reviews.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

In developing the simplified regulations, staff held workshops and focus group discussions with designers who have worked on Coach Houses in the City.

The following key messages were heard through stakeholder engagement on the current process:

- The current application process has a long turn-around time compared to other low-rise developments in the City and compared to Coach House development permitting processes in other Metro Vancouver municipalities.
- Stakeholders found it challenging to determine their staff contact for specific questions. A single contact point is preferred.
- There is uncertainty regarding some provisions in the current Guidelines as they are vague and can be interpreted in multiple ways.
- Stakeholders pointed out that the PCA process has more value for complex sites (i.e. in Streamside Protection areas), but limited value for standard applications. They would appreciate readily available information and the opportunity to connect with staff on the interpretation of more complex issues ahead of application submission.

The proposed simplification of regulations and new process were well-received, key comments are as follows:

- Directive guideline provisions were encouraged to provide more clarity on requirements for applicants (no ambiguity in interpretation of the Guidelines).
- The efficiency of the revised review process was strongly supported.
- It was recommended to slightly increase the maximum lot coverage and maximum floor area of the second floor. This would improve the liveability of single-storey Coach Houses (suitable for seniors and people with mobility
challenges) and two-storey Coach Houses with multiple bedrooms and bathrooms (suitable for families).

In addition to feedback directly related to the Guidelines and process, stakeholders voiced an interest in relaxing parking requirements for Coach Houses, especially for development close to transit. It was stated that parking reductions would allow more flexibility in Coach House siting for better design outcomes and enhanced lane interface. Staff are currently working on a City-wide Mobility Strategy which lays out high-level framework to consider parking requirements. No changes to parking requirements for Coach Houses are proposed through these guidelines updates and parking standards will be reviewed comprehensively as a forthcoming workplan item.

ADVISORY BODY INPUT

Staff presented the Bylaw and Guidelines to the Advisory Planning Commission and Advisory Design Panel. The proposed amendments were strongly supported by both committees, which passed the following resolutions:

The City's Advisory Planning Commission reviewed the draft guidelines and regularly moved and seconded:

THAT The Advisory Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the overview of changes to the Coach House Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw Requirements as presented by staff and is supportive of the general direction of the Accessory Coach House Bylaw and Process Update.

Carried Unanimously

The City's Advisory Design Panel reviewed the draft guidelines and regularly moved and seconded:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed and considered the overview of changes to the Coach House Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw Requirements and recommends approval;

AND THAT the Panel wishes to thank staff for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed Bylaw and Guideline amendments present no additional costs to the City. With the process improvement, staff resources will be used more effectively, allowing the City to better meet the needs of all clients for development applications.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

Staff from Planning, Building and Development Services have collaborated on this project to ensure that proposed changes do not conflict with building code and servicing requirements.
STRATEGIC PLAN, OCP OR POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This Coach House regulatory streamlining aligns with the Strategic Plan, OCP and other relevant policies. It addresses key goals to support housing diversity and affordability described in the OCP, Housing Action Plan and Strategic Plan. Coach Houses will become easier to develop. This will allow for an increase of rental housing in the City's low-density areas and provide housing options for family members, including support for seniors to age in place.

CONCLUSION

By adopting the proposed streamlined Coach House DP Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw amendment, a more efficient application process can be established. These changes will benefit applicants and City staff alike, while ensuring a good standard of design is achieved.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Bram van der Heijden
Planner I
Accessory Coach House
Development Permit Guidelines

Updated January 2022
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Part I – General Regulations

1. Introduction

Coach Houses are detached rental units, also known as granny suites, laneway houses, garden suites and carriage houses, which are permitted accessory to One-Unit Residential Use on site. Generally, these can be permitted on RS-1 zoned properties within the city, where one principal dwelling unit, one Accessory Secondary Suite (contained within the principal dwelling unit) and one Accessory Coach House (a detached dwelling unit) may be permitted, for a total of three dwelling units on a site.

1.1. Intent and Use of the Guidelines

These guidelines apply to all Accessory Coach House development applications on lots where One-Unit Residential Use is permitted, in accordance with Zoning Bylaw 1995, No. 6700.

The intent is to establish objectives for the form and character of Accessory Coach Houses. All Accessory Coach Houses must comply with zoning requirements and must be self-contained units consisting of a full bathroom, sleeping and living area and cooking facility (kitchen).

These guidelines supplement the Zoning Bylaw and emphasize compatibility with existing single-family surrounding context. Applicants and designers are advised to consider appropriate size, massing and landscape design for a Coach House in the context of any potential impact on adjacent neighbours, in order to achieve integration with the existing residential fabric.

As the guidelines form part of the Zoning Bylaw, applications which are not consistent with the intent of the guidelines may be required to resubmit.
2. Approval Process

2.1. Exemptions

Minor exterior renovations to existing coach houses which do not significantly alter the footprint or character of the building may be exempted from Development Permit requirements at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Development.

2.2. Planning Application Requirements

A Coach House Development Permit application must be accompanied by relevant development information in the form prescribed by the City. This submission includes, but is not limited to:

1) Plans demonstrating:
   a. a site plan showing the proposed location of all buildings and structures on the site;
   b. the proposed siting and pavement material of parking areas on the site;
   c. the proposed siting of private outdoor amenity spaces serving the dwelling units on site;
   d. relevant information such as existing mature trees and heritage status of the principal building;
   e. the proposed siting of entrances;
   f. the proposed siting of pathways;
   g. the proposed siting of all landscape features including pavement, lawns, planters and accessory structures (including fences);
   h. the proposed locations of all exterior lighting;
   i. larger scale floor plans and elevation plans indicating floor area information and heights as required under the Zoning Bylaw.

2) A checklist indicating how the proposal complies with all relevant provisions of the Zoning Bylaw as well as these guidelines, and a design rationale to accompany any deviation from these guidelines.

2.3. Amendments

A Development Permit Amendment Application may be required for minor amendments to Development Permits already issued and registered on title, at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Development.
Part II - Design Guidelines

3. Site Design

3.1. Emergency Access and Unit Identification
1) A 1.0 m (3.28 ft.) wide paved pathway connecting the main entrance of the Coach House to a street shall be provided.
2) The pathway shall be illuminated at night and fully located within the lot except for a direct connection to the sidewalk.
3) The pathway shall not be obstructed or overlap with any parking spaces, garbage storage areas, or other paved areas that may be occupied by movable items.
4) A Coach House shall have addressing (including a unit number) that is clearly visible from both the street and lane and which shall be illuminated at night.
5) If located on a non-corner lot, addressing at the front of the lot shall be located within 0.9 m (3 ft.) of the required pathway to the main entrance of the Coach House.

3.2. Landscaping
1) A 0.9 m (3 ft.) wide landscape buffer along the rear lot line and exterior side yard should be provided within 4.6 m (15.0 ft.) adjacent to the Coach House.
2) The landscape buffer may be interrupted by a maximum of two driveways and two foot pathways each of a maximum width of 1.1 m (3.6 ft.).
3) Landscape Screens such as fences along the Exterior Side Lot Line and the Rear Lot Line located within 4.57 metres (15 feet) of a Coach House should not be taller than 0.91 metres (3 feet).

3.3. Private Outdoor Amenity Spaces
1) The Coach House and Principal Building should each have their own private outdoor amenity space no less than 7.1 sq. m (76.0 sq. ft.), located adjacent to and directly accessible from the unit.

3.4. Parking
1) Where a lane exists, parking should be accessed from the lane and existing driveways providing access from a street should be removed.
2) All uncovered parking areas should be constructed of permeable pavement material.
4. Building Design

4.1. Interface with the Lane
1) If not located on a corner lot, the main entrance of the Coach House should be visible from the rear lane.
2) At least one window on the main floor level should be provided on the elevation facing the rear lot line. The windows should have a minimum clear glazed dimension of 0.9 m (3 ft.) tall by 1.5 m (5.0 ft.) wide including a moderate number of muntins, transoms, casements and mullions, and:
   - The lowest part of clear glazed area should be at least 1.1 m (3.5 ft.) above the main floor level.
   - On lots where a rear lot line is less than 11 m (36.0 ft.) wide, the width of the clear glazed area may be reduced to 0.9 m (3 ft.).

4.2. Interface with Side Streets (for Corner Lots)
1) The Coach House’s main entrance and address number should be provided on the elevation fronting the side street and should be visible from the side street.
2) At least one window on the main floor level should be provided on the elevation facing the exterior side lot line. The windows should have a minimum clear glazed area of 0.9 m (3 ft.) tall by 1.5 m (5.0 ft.) wide including a moderate number of muntins, transoms, casements and mullions, and:
   - The lowest part of clear glazed area should be at least 1.1 m (3.5 ft.) above the main floor level.

4.3. Privacy
1) Balconies and decks located on the second floor should face the rear lot line or exterior side lot line, and any portion of the balcony or deck facing interior lot lines should provide a privacy screen that is minimum of 1.5 m (5 ft.) high.
2) Windows on the second floor facing interior side yards or the front lot line should either have a sill height of at least 1.1 m (3.5 ft.) or should have no clear glazing below that height.
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Part I – General Regulations

1 Introduction

Coach Houses are detached non-strata units also known as granny suites, lane way housing, garden suites and carriage houses. Coach houses have been present in the community over the last century. In the early 1900s, a coach house was sometimes the first unit built on a lot to house the owners while the principal residence was constructed. The coach house sometimes survived afterwards at the rear of the lot. Usually they were replaced by a garage. Other times they were built to provide housing for expanding or extended families.

All lots zoned RS or lots with a zoning designation that permits one-unit residential are allowed to have one principal dwelling unit and one accessory secondary suite which is contained within the existing dwelling. Coach houses are similar to secondary suites except they are detached from the principal residence usually located at the rear of the lot.

COACH HOUSE BENEFITS

There are a number of benefits that coach houses can offer to the community including:

- Additional diversity and choice in the housing stock;
- More opportunities for rental housing units;
- Greater privacy and independence for both the owner and the tenant;
- Ground-oriented living with garden access;
- A more livable alternative to basement suites;
- Potential accommodation for extended family or caregivers;
- Rental income for homeowners;
- Opportunities for people to age in place and stay on their properties as their lifestyles change over time;
- Rental housing for young people, seniors and families;
- Improvement to the “streetscape” and character of our existing laneways.

ACCESSORY COACH HOUSE UNITS VS. INFILL UNITS

The City distinguishes between accessory coach houses and infill units. An “infill unit” is a full principal dwelling unit in a duplex or higher density zoning category that is detached, and may be stratified. A “coach house” is detached unit that is subordinate in size to the principal home, and must be non-stratified (both units under common ownership). The owner must reside on the property. In effect, an Accessory Coach House is a detached accessory secondary suite.
1.1 INTENT AND USE OF THE GUIDELINES

These Guidelines apply to Accessory Coach House development applications on Lots with a One-Unit Residential Use as designated in Zoning Bylaw 1995, No. 6700 for the purpose of establishing objectives for the form and character of Intensive Residential Development. Accessory Coach Houses may be up to 1,000 square feet and two storeys (plus an uninhabitable cellar level) / 6.7 metres (22.0 feet) high and may contain a toilet, bathroom, sleeping and living areas and cooking facilities. Coach Houses should be subordinate in size to the one-unit principal residence on the property and may not be stratified. Applications are reviewed against these Guidelines. Applications which are not consistent with the guidelines may require revisions or a Development Variance Permit or Rezoning at Council’s discretion.

The objective is to introduce detached accessory secondary suites into the housing mix in a way that integrates and blends these buildings into existing one unit neighbourhoods as secondary buildings that add value and provide a new form of rental housing. Applicants and designers are asked to consider the appropriate size and massing, and potential impact on adjacent neighbours, in order to achieve this integration into the existing residential fabric.

These Guidelines have been created to guide applicants through the design process for developing Accessory Coach Houses. Related Zoning Bylaw requirements have also been included (in italics and bold) for the convenience of an applicant and designer. Refer to Divisions II - IV of Zoning Bylaw 1995, No. 6700 for all applicable regulations.

1.2 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Coach houses introduce more detached accessory secondary suites into the housing mix in a way that integrates and blends into existing single family neighbourhoods. A variety of coach house sizes and forms is encouraged to optimize choices for extended families, aging-in-place, and to serve as possible mortgage helpers.

Coach Houses should:

- Be subordinate in size to the principal or future residence on the property;
- Compliment but not replicate the principal residence;
- Respect the scale and built form of neighbouring properties;
- Respect the privacy of adjacent neighbours by trying to minimize overlook and shadowing impacts;
- Animate the lane and/or adjacent streets by locating habitable space at ground level and providing articulation in the facades;
- Respect prominent existing trees and landscape features;
- Incorporate sustainable design elements into site and building design and construction;
- Exhibit design excellence.
2 Approval Process

2.1 EXEMPTIONS

Minor exterior renovations to existing coach houses which do not significantly alter the footprint or character of the building may be exempted from Development Permit requirements at the discretion of the Director of Planning.

2.2 PRE-APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

Prior to application submission, a pre-application proposal summary must be provided to the Planning Department for preliminary review. Staff will work with the applicant to submit a formal application.

2.3 APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

Every application for a Development Permit must be accompanied by relevant development information in the form prescribed by the City. This information includes, but is not limited to:

1) Plans demonstrating:
   a. the proposed location of all buildings and structures;
   b. the proposed siting of parking areas;
   c. the extent and nature of existing and proposed landscaping, including details of trees to be maintained or proposed to be planted;
   d. the proposed exterior finish, materials, and colour of buildings and roofs;
   e. the proposed locations of all exterior lighting.

2) Supporting information demonstrating that neighbours within 40 metres have been notified;

3) A checklist indicating how the proposal complies with the Guidelines. Where some element of the design does not comply with a Guideline, a justification describing the divergence and the reason must be provided.

2.4 AMENDMENTS

A Development Permit amendment may be required for minor amendments to Development Permits already issued and registered on title, at the discretion of the Director of Planning.
Part II – Environmental Guidelines

3 Energy Conservation

Guideline 3.1 Consider incorporating solar energy systems or pre-plumbing for future installation.

“Any portion of a mechanical room containing a Green Building System, up to a maximum of 9.29 square meters (100 square feet) for each building, provided that the system be located in an accessible location within the building, having a minimum headroom clearance of 2.0 meters (6.5 feet);” [Part II: Interpretation Gross Floor Area (Coach House, Accessory)]

4 Rainwater Management

Guideline 4.1 Natural filtration of rainwater into the site is encouraged.

Guideline 4.2 All uncovered parking areas should be constructed of permeable materials.

Guideline 4.3 For hard surface areas (other than roofs) where discharge to infiltration facilities is not practical, permeable paving materials that allow rainwater to filter into the ground should be used.

5 Waste and Recycling

Guideline 5.1 Waste and recycling bins should be provided for each unit.

Guideline 5.2 Bins should be screened and secured within an enclosed structure that is set back a minimum of 1.5 metres (5.0 feet) from the rear property line.

Waste and recycling bins integrated into the coach house building with no interior access may be excluded from Gross Floor Area calculations to a maximum of 4.6 square metres (50 square feet).

“Gross Floor Area (Coach House, Accessory) means the total areas of all of the floors… excluding… floor areas with no access from the interior of the Building up to a maximum 4.6 square metres (50 square feet) for the purpose of storing recycling and waste bins;” [Part II: Interpretation Gross Floor Area (Coach House, Accessory)]

Part III - Form and Character Guidelines

6 Site Requirements

MINIMUM LOT AREA - Accessory Coach Houses are permitted on lots that are a minimum 10 metres (32.81 feet) in width. Lane access is not required.
An Accessory Coach House “shall not be permitted on a Lot with a width of less than 10 metres (32.81 feet);” [S.509(6)(a)]

MAXIMUM NUMBER OF UNITS - A property may have both a secondary unit as part of the principal residence (Accessory Secondary Suite) and a detached Accessory Coach House.

OWNER OCCUPANCY - The owner must reside on the lot, either in the Accessory Coach House or in the Principal Building.

“An Accessory Coach House Use shall be permitted where the One-Unit Residential building or the Accessory Coach building is Owner-occupied;” [S.507(12)(b)]

MAXIMUM SITE LOT COVERAGE - Maximum of 40% for all buildings on the lot of which the coach house should not exceed 15%.

Lot Coverage (Principal Building plus Accessory Coach House Building) “shall not exceed a maximum total combined Lot Coverage of 40% of which the Principal Building shall not exceed 30%;” [S.509(3)]

7 Building Scale and Massing

7.1 MAXIMUM GROSS FLOOR AREA

Accessory Coach House Gross Floor Area is limited by both (a) the total Gross Floor Area permitted on a Lot with a One-Unit Residential Use AND (b) by the maximum allowable Gross Floor Area for an Accessory Coach House building. Please note that the GFA of the Principal Building and Lot Coverage may limit the potential size of the Accessory Coach House.

MAXIMUM SITE GROSS FLOOR AREA - The total density on a Lot with an Accessory Coach House may not exceed 0.5 x lot area.

“...on a Lot with Accessory Coach House Use, Gross Floor Area (One-Unit and Two-Unit Residential), combined and in total, may be increased to, but shall not exceed, 0.5 times the Lot Area;” [S. 509(2)]

AND

MAXIMUM GROSS FLOOR AREA (COACH HOUSE, ACCESSORY) - The total Gross Floor Area of an Accessory Coach House is limited to 92.9 square metres (1,000 square feet);

“...the maximum Gross Floor Area (One-Unit and Two-Unit Residential) for Accessory Coach House Use shall not exceed 92.9 square metres (1,000 sq. ft.)” [S. 509(2)]

7.1 HEIGHT ENVELOPE

Height shall not exceed a maximum overall Building Height of 6.71 metres (22 feet) as measured from the average Building Grades on the Rear Lot Line.

"shall not exceed a maximum overall Building Height of 6.7 metres (22 feet) as measured from the average Building Grades on the Rear Lot Line;" [S. 509(6)(b)]
Guideline 7.2.1 Height shall not exceed one storey and a partial second storey. The second storey shall not exceed 60% of the total area of the floor beneath it. For example, the maximum coach house floor area of 92.9 sq. m. (1,000 sq. ft.) could be divided between a 58 sq. m. ground floor (625 sq. ft.) and a 35 sq. m (375 sq. ft.) upper floor.

Guideline 7.2.2 Coach houses with a one-storey form must be built lower, generally to a maximum of 4.57 m (15 feet).

8 Site Design

8.1 GENERAL

Guideline 8.1.1 Identify and maximize usable and private outdoor space associated with both the Accessory Coach House and the Principal Building.

Guideline 8.1.2 Coach houses should be located in the rear 25% of the lot.

Guideline 8.1.3 Coach houses should be visible from the street if site conditions allow. Clear address unit identity signage and/or directional signage should be incorporated.

8.2 LOT COVERAGE

Lot Coverage - should not exceed a Lot Coverage of 15%, or 92.9 square metres (1,000.0 square feet) whichever is less. The total combined Lot Coverage (Principal Building plus Accessory Coach House Building) shall not exceed a maximum of 40%.

“Lot Coverage (Principal Building plus Accessory Coach House Building) shall not exceed a maximum total combined Lot Coverage of 40% of which the Principal Building shall not exceed 30%;”[S.509(3)]

8.3 CORNER LOTS

Guideline 8.3.1 Accessory Coach Houses at the rear of corner lots should front the flanking street;

Guideline 8.3.2 Living space should front the flanking street and parking uses should be located off the lane towards the interior side yard;

Guideline 8.3.3 Create transition in the massing by increasing the scale from the interior side property line to the flanking street.

8.4 LANDSCAPE

Guideline 8.4.1 Prominent existing trees and landscape features outside of the coach house footprint should be retained unless proven to be diseased by a certified arborist or in conflict with utilities and services.
Guideline 8.4.2  Tree protection fencing should be installed before land clearing, demolition or construction phases are commenced.

Guideline 8.4.3  Conserve existing significant vegetation through flexible and innovative design and siting of the coach house.

Guideline 8.4.4  Private outdoor spaces with direct connection to habitable space should be provided for each unit.

Guideline 8.4.5  Define and screen outdoor spaces through the use of landscaping: plantings, architectural elements such as trellises, low fencing or planters; and changes in grade or elevation.

Guideline 8.4.6  Rear space between a coach house and the rear property line should be enhanced by incorporating, low maintenance soft landscaping and/or high quality permeable paving materials.

Guideline 8.4.7  Side yards should be attractively landscaped and integrated with usable outdoor spaces. Narrow side yard spaces should be landscaped using permeable surfaces and drought resistant plant materials.

Guideline 8.4.8  Exterior side yards on corner lots should be designed and treated as the front yard to the coach house development using high quality soft and hard surface treatments. Screening and landscaping between the street and the outdoor space should be incorporated to define the transition between public and private spaces.

9  
Size, Shape and Siting

9.1  SETBACKS

Guideline 9.1.1  Accessory Coach Houses should be sited not less than:

(a) 1.52 metres (5 feet) from the Rear Lot Line;

(b) 1.22 metres (4 feet) from the Interior Side Lot Line;

(c) 3.05 metres (10 feet) or 0.2 times the Lot width; whichever is less, from the Exterior Side Lot Line. On corner lots with a lot width of 10.0 metres (33 feet) or less, a setback of 1.5 metres (5.0 feet) from the Exterior Lot Side Lot Line may be considered;

(d) 3.05 metres (10 feet) from a Principal Building including porches and balconies;

(e) 7.62 metres (25 feet) from the intersection of the Lot lines along two Streets;

(f) 4.52 metres (15 feet) from the intersection from the point of intersection of two lanes, or of a Street and a Lane.

“All driveway crossings providing ingress and egress to a Parking or Loading area shall be located at a minimum distance of 7.62 metres (25 feet) from the point of intersection of two streets, or 4.52 metres (15 feet) from the point of intersection of two lanes, or of a Street and a lane, when such road allowances intersect at an interior angle of 135 degrees or less;”[S. 906(4)(h)]
Guideline 9.1.2
For upper storey: at least 50% of the rear façade fronting the lane should be set back a minimum of 3.0 metres (10 feet) from the rear property line.

Guideline 9.1.3
Allowable projections into the recommended setbacks include eaves, cornices, leaders, gutters, canopies or sunlight control projections, which may project beyond the face of the Accessory Coach House Building; the minimum distance to an abutting Lot Line as recommend elsewhere in the Guidelines may be reduced by:

(a) 0.91 metres (3.0 feet) from an abutting Rear Lot Line;
(b) 0.61 metres (2.0 feet) from an abutting Interior Side Lot Line;
(c) 1.52 metres (5.0 feet) from an abutting Exterior Lot Line;
(d) 1.22 metres (4 feet) from a Principal Building.

Guideline 9.1.4
Where Unenclosed balconies, Unenclosed porches or steps project beyond the face of the Accessory Coach House Building, the minimum distance to an abutting Lot Line as permitted elsewhere in the Guidelines may be reduced by:

(a) 0.76 metres (2.5 feet) from an abutting Rear Lot Line;
(b) 0.46 metres (1.5 feet) from an abutting Interior Side Lot Line;
(c) 1.52 metres (5.0 feet) from an abutting Exterior Lot Line;
(d) 1.22 metres (4 feet) from a Principal Building.
10 Building Design

10.1 HABITABLE SPACE AT GRADE

Guideline 10.1.1 A minimum of 30% of the total habitable floor area of an Accessory Coach House should be located on the ground floor, with habitable space fronting the rear lot line.

Guideline 10.1.2 A minimum of 30% of the width of the façade facing the rear lot line should be designed to communicate the residential use behind it, which can be achieved by placing windows and doors facing the lane.

Guideline 10.1.3 Articulation of all facades including the lane façade are encouraged. Direct connections between indoor living spaces and usable outdoor landscaped spaces are also encouraged.

10.2 RELATIONSHIP TO NEIGHBOURS

Guideline 10.2.1 Create visual interest by providing variations in height and massing within the design.

Guideline 10.2.2 Incorporate living areas within the volume of sloped roofs and eliminate enclosed parking to reduce massing.

10.3 SLOPING SITES

Guideline 10.3.1 On steeply sloping sites, the views from adjacent properties should be respected by adapting the scale, massing and location of the coach house development to follow the topography and natural features of the site.

10.4 UNIT IDENTITY

Guideline 10.4.1 Accessory Coach Houses must have an individual address or a unit identity number clearly visible from the street and illuminated at night.

Guideline 10.4.2 The primary entrance should be accessible directly from the street.

Guideline 10.4.3 For all lots, a minimum 1.0 metre (3.28 feet) clearance for emergency pedestrian access must be provided from the street to the coach house unit and be illuminated at night.

10.5 ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

Guideline 10.5.1 Accessory Coach House elevations should be articulated to create depth and architectural interest.

Guideline 10.5.2 Garage doors should be designed to minimize the visual impact to the lane through careful detailing and sensitive design.
Guideline 10.5.3 Design and locate windows to maximize light penetration into the coach house interior while mitigating overlook into other units.

Guideline 10.5.4 All outdoor private spaces, including decks, porches and balconies, should be strategically located to mitigate privacy concerns. Roof decks should not be included as part of a coach house design.

Guideline 10.5.5 Balconies and decks should be screened and located to provide privacy for both the coach house unit and to minimize overlook on to adjacent units or properties.

Guideline 10.5.6 Building products should demonstrate sustainable principles with high quality design and detailing.

Guideline 10.5.7 Architectural style should not imitate the style of the principal residence but should respect its character;

Guideline 10.5.8 One storey Accessory Coach Houses are encouraged to be designed to meet Level 2 of the City of North Vancouver Adaptable Design Guidelines.

10.6 HERITAGE

Guideline 10.6.1 Accessory Coach House development proposed for a property that is listed on the Heritage Register should be designed to respect the architectural character of the heritage listed home without replicating the original house;

Guideline 10.6.2 Legally protecting heritage homes listed on the City’s Heritage Registry is encouraged as part of the application process.

11 Parking and Access

11.1 REQUIRED PARKING STALLS

Two on-site parking spaces are required (one parking space for each unit);

*Two off-street parking stalls are required.* [S.908(8) Figure 9-3]

A maximum of one enclosed stall in the Accessory Coach House is permitted.

*Accessory Coach Houses “shall be permitted a maximum of one enclosed or covered parking stall;” [S.509(6)(e)]*

11.2 PARKING ACCESS AND LOCATION

Guideline 11.2.1 All parking is encourage to be provided in open stalls.

Guideline 11.2.2 Parking should be located in the rear 25% of the lot, with direct access from the lane, where a lane exists.

Guideline 11.2.3 Parking should be accessed from a lane, and existing driveways providing access from a
street should be removed.

“For a Lot abutting on both an opened Street and an opened lane, vehicular access shall be from the lane. No access will be permitted from the Street...” [S.906(4)(c)(i)]

Guideline 11.2.4 For corner lots with no lane access, parking should be located in the rear yard with access via a driveway from the flanking street.

11.3 DRIVEWAYS

Guideline 11.3.1 Should be minimized in width and surface area and shared between units with a maximum width of 3.0 metres (9.8 feet);

Guideline 11.3.2 Permeable surfaces such as grasscrete or narrow wheel lanes with planting in the middle are encouraged;

Driveways should be accessed off the lane and minimum 4.57 metres (15 feet) from the intersection of the lane and street.

“Driveways shall provide an unobstructed view of pedestrians and traffic where such driveways intersect a street. Notwithstanding Principal Buildings, Accessory Buildings, or Accessory Coach House Buildings otherwise permitted in this Bylaw, no Structure or landscaping except high-branched trees shall exceed 0.914 metres (3 feet) in Height within the area Bounded By the driveway, the Lot line, and a line joining points along said lines 4.572 metres (15 feet) from their point of intersection;” [S.906(4)(h)]

12 Servicing

Servicing and off-site improvements will be determined through the Subdivision and Development Control Bylaw No. 6200, 1991.

Guideline 12.1.1 Sanitary, storm and water connection servicing requirements will be evaluated according to their ability to serve the entire site and not only the coach house unit;

Guideline 12.1.1 Undergrounding of hydro and communication service lines is preferred.

Site conditions may require additional works to conform to the Subdivision and Development Control Bylaw 6200.

13 Accessory Uses

ACCESSORY HOME OCCUPATIONS USE

The number of Accessory Home Occupation Uses on a Lot is limited to one.

“On a Lot containing an approved Accessory Secondary Suite Use or an Accessory Coach House Use both the principal Dwelling Unit and the Accessory Secondary Suite/Accessory Coach House may independently contain only one Accessory Home Occupation Use...”[S.507(6)(b)]
ACCESSORY HOME OFFICE USE

An Accessory Home Office Use is permitted in both the Principal Building and Accessory Coach House Building.

“...Accessory Home Office Uses are allowed in both Dwelling Units;”[S.507(6)(b)]
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The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver

Bylaw No. 8883

A Bylaw to amend “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700”

The Council of the Corporation of the City of North Vancouver, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. This Bylaw shall be known and cited for all purposes as “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8883” (Additional Coach House Requirements).

2. “Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No. 6700” is amended as follows:

   A. In Division I – Administration, Part 2 – Interpretation, by deleting the definition for “Accessory Coach House Use” and replacing it with the following:

   “Accessory Coach House Use” means a detached non-stratified residential use accessory to a One-Unit Residential Use that contains a bathroom, sleeping and living area and cooking facilities subject to the provision of Section 507(13) of the Bylaw.

   B. In Section 410 – Siting Exceptions, section (1), by inserting a new subsection (c) as follows:

   (c) Where eaves, cornices, leaders, gutters, canopies or Sunlight Control Projections project beyond the face of the Accessory Coach House Building, the minimum distance to an abutting Lot Line or Principal Building as permitted elsewhere in this Bylaw may be reduced by:

   (i) 0.61 metres (2.0 feet) from the Interior Side Lot Line;
   (ii) 0.46 metres (1.5 feet) from the Exterior Lot Line; and
   (iii) 0.61 metres (2.0 feet) from the Rear Lot line and Principal Building;

   where Unenclosed Balconies, Unenclosed Porches or steps project beyond the face of the Accessory Coach House Building, the minimum distance to an abutting Lot Line as permitted elsewhere in this Bylaw may be reduced by:

   (i) 0.76 metres (2.5 feet) from the Rear Lot Line;
   (ii) 0.61 metres (2.0 feet) from the Exterior Lot Line; and
   (iii) 1.22 metres (4 feet) from a Principal Building;

   and renumbering subsequent sections.

   C. In Section 509 – Size, Shape and Siting of Buildings for One-Unit Residential Use and Accessory Coach House Use, section (6) – Accessory Coach House Standards, by adding subsections (f) and (g) as follows:

   (f) the total Floor Area of the second storey shall not exceed 70% of the total Floor Area of the first storey;

   (g) shall be sited on the lot as follows:
(i) no less than 1.22 metres (4 feet) and no more than 3.05 metres (10 feet) from the Rear Lot Line, as measured from the building face closest to the Rear Lot Line;

(ii) no less than 1.22 metres (4 feet) from the Interior Side Lot Line;

(iii) no less than 1.52 metres (5 feet) and no more than 1.83 meters (6 feet) from the Exterior Side Lot Line, as measured from the building face closest to the Exterior Side Lot Line;

(iv) no less than 4.57 metres (15 feet) from the intersection of the Lot Lines along two Streets, or a Street and a Lane or two Lanes;

(v) the minimum distance between the Accessory Coach House and the Principal Building, including porches and balconies, shall be determined according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance between the Principal Building and the Rear Lot Line</th>
<th>Minimum Distance between Principal Building and Accessory Coach House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 15.8 metres (52 feet)</td>
<td>6.09 metres (20 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6 to 15.8 metres (48 to 52 feet)</td>
<td>4.90 metres (16 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5 to 14.6 metres (44.5 to 48 feet)</td>
<td>3.96 metres (13 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 13.5 metres (44.5 feet)</td>
<td>3.05 metres (10 feet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except that, in the case when the Rear Lot Line is less than 11 metres (36.01 feet) in width, the minimum distance shall be no less than 3.05 metres (10 feet), regardless of the distance between the Principal Building and the Rear Lot Line.

D. In Section 906 – General Parking and Access Regulations, section (3) – Parking Design Standards, subsection (c), by inserting a new subsection (ii) as follows:

(ii) on a Lot with lane access and an Accessory Coach House, parking spaces shall be sited no more than 3.05 metres (10 feet) from the Rear Lot Line, as measured from the point of the parking space closest to the Rear Lot Line;

and renumbering subsequent sections.

E. In Division VII – Development Permit Guidelines, by replacing the “Accessory Coach House Development Permit Guidelines” as attached to this Bylaw.
F. This bylaw comes into force and effect upon final adoption by Council, except that the provisions in this bylaw will not apply to any complete development applications submitted to and received by the City prior to final adoption of this bylaw.

READ a first time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

READ a second time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

READ a third time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

ADOPTED on the <> day of <>, 2022.

_________________________________________
MAYOR

_________________________________________
CORPORATE OFFICER
REPORT

To: Mayor Linda Buchanan and Members of Council

From: Leah Karlberg, Planner I

Subject: 2022 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FEE REVIEW AND UPDATES TO DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES BYLAW AND CONSTRUCTION REGULATION BYLAW

Date: January 12, 2022 File No: 08-3010-01-0001/2021

RECOMMENDATION

PURSUANT to the report of the Planner I, dated January 12, 2022, entitled “2022 Development Application Fee Review and Updates to Development Procedures Bylaw and Construction Regulation Bylaw”:

THAT the following bylaws be considered:

“Development Procedures Bylaw, 2001, No. 7343, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8906” (2022 Development Application Fee Review); and

Construction Regulation Bylaw, 2003, No. 7390, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8907” (2022 Development Application Fee Review)

AND THAT staff be directed to advise the development and building community of the development application related fee changes.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Development Procedures Bylaw, 2001, No 7343 (CityDocs 501376)
2. Review of Metro Vancouver 2022 Development Application Fees (CityDocs 2123892)

PURPOSE

This report presents, for Council's consideration, an updated development application fee schedule. This update includes the introduction of new fee categories for significant and large developments as well as fee increases for the majority of application types. The report also proposes flexibility to allow for City-led project processing fees to be waived. With regularly assessed application fees, the City can remain regionally competitive while ensuring appropriate resources are in place to continue to ensure timely and high quality development outcomes to support City goals.

BACKGROUND

Development application fees were last assessed and moderately increased in 2017. At that time, Council endorsed periodic fee reviews (every 2 - 4 years) to account for inflation and to reflect:

- Current market conditions and development trends;
- Processing time, staff resources, and cost recovery estimates;
- Fees at comparable local governments.

On March 8, 2021, Council endorsed staff to complete an end-to-end development process review as part of the City’s ongoing commitment to deliver excellent customer service and ensure alignment with modern best practices. A key component of this review process is regulation streamlining for increased efficiency. The assessment of development fees and resourcing is considered a key part of this comprehensive regulatory framework review.

DISCUSSION

Section 194 of the Community Charter gives Council the authority to impose fees for providing municipal services including processing and approval of development applications. Section 462 of the Local Government Act provides authority for a local government to collect fees for development application types discussed in this report.

Development application fees in the City do not reflect cost recovery, and a strong trend in increased volume of development applications over the past five years has necessitated new strategies for alignment of desired timelines and service levels with staff resources required, including increasing the level of cost-recovery through fee review. Given the significant staff resources across multiple review groups to process each application, even after an update to the fees, development application review will not reach full cost recovery. Applications for development are subject to a range of other municipal fees including substantial Building Permit fees at later stages in the development process.
Key issues and corresponding goals which have guided this fee review include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Guiding goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Outdated fee structure fails to account for complex development proposals and large sites.</td>
<td>• Ensure new fee calculation mechanism that accounts for complex development proposals and large sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low compared to average Metro Vancouver municipalities.</td>
<td>• Ensure updated fees fall within average Metro Vancouver rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fees not regularly adjusted for inflation.</td>
<td>• Ensure fair and regular fee adjustment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Increased Review Complexity* - As the region and City have grown, so have the complexity of development proposals and the depth of their review process. The average number of complex development applications (e.g., large sites, OCP amendments, and complex mixed use projects) processed has nearly doubled in recent years (comparing applications received from 2011-2016 to 2017-2021). Ongoing area-wide developments, such as Harbourside, necessitate intensive staff resources from Development Planning as well as inter-departmentally.

New City policies to guide high quality development have also increased in number and complexity. There are now over 22 disparate Council adopted policies and guidelines against which staff review development applications for compliance. These include the *Housing Action Plan*, *Sustainable Development Guidelines*, *Economic Development Strategy*, and *Child Care Action Plan*. Staff are currently simplifying the policy framework and developing the following forthcoming policies which will help guide the growth and development: the *Tree Protection Bylaw*, *Community Wellbeing Strategy*, *Mobility Strategy*, and *Climate & Environment Strategy*.

A key approach of this fee review, therefore, is to introduce differentiation between applications based on scale and complexity of review.

*Stay Competitive on Fee Charges* – Remaining regionally competitive and welcoming innovative development remains an overarching goal. Currently, the City falls below the regional fee averages charged for small scale development applications and significantly below the regional fee averages charged for complex and large developments. The proposed fee structure aims to retain relatively low fees for small and mid-scale development; proposing moderate increases. For complex and large scale developments, the proposed fee structure is designed to better reflect required resources and increase cost-recovery.

**Summary of Fee Updates**

A key concern identified by staff is how current development fees are unable to reflect the scale and scope of development proposals. For example, the same fee is charged
for a Development Permit for a 10 unit townhouse as a 75 unit townhouse. Similarly, the same Rezoning fee is charged for a duplex as for a 6 storey apartment building. As expected, complex projects require additional staff input, review time, and undertakings such as legal agreements.

The following proposed fees aim to address the scope of review required for larger projects, while retaining low fees for minor scale applications. To assist in reflecting the scale of proposals, staff propose the following definition of minor and major to apply in the case of certain fees. For context, less than 20% of 2020-2021 applications fall under this definition of "major".

Minor – 1-5 principal residential units, primary child care use, or non-profit applicants (where a minimum of 80% of proposed residential units are secured at a minimum of 10% below market rental rates).

Major – 6 or more principal residential units, mixed-use, commercial, industrial, or institutional uses.

Official Community Plan Amendment
The City currently charges a flat rate of $5,000 for an OCP Amendment. An increased fee of $10,000 is proposed for any site-specific changes to use, height, or density. The proposed increase would place the City’s fee slightly above the municipal average, while remaining significantly lower than the other two North Shore municipalities. An additional scaled fee is proposed for sites with an area exceeding 8,000 m² and for policy development within any Special Study Area.

Rezoning Application
The City currently charges a flat rate for Rezoning applications (text amendment, existing zone, or Comprehensive Development Zone) with an additional fee triggered for sites over 1,500 m² site area. However, many municipalities scale Rezoning fees based on number of residential units and/or proposed floor area. Staff propose retaining the base fee of $4,000 for a text amendment and applying it for a Rezoning to an existing zone. For CD Zones, staff propose an increased base fee of $6,000. To reflect scale, the following additional fees will also apply to major Rezoning applications, capped at a maximum of $25,000:

$50 per principal residential unit
$1 per m² of proposed commercial floor area
$1 per 2 m² of proposed industrial floor area

Development Permit
An ongoing volume of Development Permit (DP) applications is anticipated through active DP Areas (including Moodyville, Harbourside, and Coach Houses) as well as pending Areas (including Central Lonsdale and for Rental Apartment Buildings) which could be adopted at a future time. The City currently charges a flat rate for form and character DPs. However, many municipalities calculate DP fees based on number of residential units and/or proposed floor area. To reflect
project scale, staff propose an updated DP fee of $4,000 + $75 per principal residential unit capped at a maximum of $15,000.

Staff process a steadily increasing number of Coach House DPs, receiving a record 25 applications in 2021. Considering efforts underway to streamline coach house regulations, staff propose a slightly updated fee of $1,250, which remains below municipal average ($1,650) and significantly below North Shore municipalities ($3,280).

**Development Variance Permit**
The Development Variance Permits (DVP) are a relatively uncommon application type, with the City having processed an average of three per year over the last five years. Staff propose a fee of $1,500 for DVP applications requiring staff consideration, and a fee of $3,000 for DVP applications requiring Council consideration.

**Pre-Application**
The practice of a pre-application has become standard across municipalities, with applicable fees differentiating between scales. The City's implementation of a pre-application in 2017 has been considered largely successful. However, the current pre-application does not carry any fee of its own, since the fee is deductible from the full application. Staff recommend a non-deductible pre-application fee, remaining at $500 for minor proposals and increased to $1,500 for major proposals. A separate additional fee of $1,500 will be charged for pre-applications requiring Council consideration (e.g., early direction reports). These fees will allow for greater cost recovery of staff time while remaining below municipal pre-application fee averages.

**Waived Fees**
To support civic initiatives, staff propose to introduce discretion to allow the waiver of development and construction fees for City-led projects. As these projects are within City-control, the City has the flexibility to consider resourcing requirements and organizational capacity to process City-initiated projects on a case by case basis.

Findings from the review of Metro Vancouver fee schedules for common development application types can be found in Attachment #2.

**Current and Proposed Fee Highlights**
The following table summarizes the current and proposed fees for common development application scenarios.
Table 1. Highlighted Current and Proposed Development Application Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>Current Fee</th>
<th>Proposed Fee</th>
<th>Municipal Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Consultation RS-1 to RT-1 duplex</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500 (non-deductible)</td>
<td>$882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Consultation 6 storey apartment</td>
<td>$500 (deductible)</td>
<td>$1,500 (non-deductible)</td>
<td>$2,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Amendment minor change to height</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$8,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Policy Amendment Special Study Area of 50,000 m² at 3.0 FSR</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$103,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning - Base Zone RS-1 to RT-1 duplex</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning - CD Zone 6 storey apartment</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning - CD Zone 20 storey mixed-use building</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Permit 10 unit townhouse</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$4,750</td>
<td>$5,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Permit 75 unit townhouse</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$9,625</td>
<td>$12,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPLEMENTATION

Should Council approve the proposed Development Procedure Bylaw updates, the revised fee schedule would come into effect March 1, 2022 as set out in the Bylaw. The amendments to the Construction Regulation Bylaw would come into effect upon adoption.

Staff also propose to return regularly to Council (every 2-4 years) to recommend periodic development application fee updates to account for inflation and process changes.

As part of this fee review, staff have informed the industry of proposed changes via the City’s liaison committee. Industry comments emphasized the need for fee increases to be accompanied by service level improvements and timeline reductions.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Development Planning review function is directly supported by a team of ten full-time staff. Staff in this work area spend the majority of their time processing development applications, in addition to responding to general planning and
development related inquiries. In addition, staff from a number of departments support the review of development applications, typically including staff from Transportation, Environment, Building, Fire, LEC, Real Estate, and Engineering Development Services, who conduct sub-reviews. Approximately 20 additional staff through the organization have some involvement in the development review process and allocate portions of their time to support the function and process active applications. A review of total staff input required was considered as part of this fee review.

The proposed increase to application fees more accurately reflects the staff time required to process development applications and would have positive financial implications for the City. The increase in fees will allow the City to move toward increased cost recovery for staff time required to process common development applications as well as complex and unique development proposals.

**Table 2. Comparison of Current and Proposed 2021 Development Application Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current fees paid</th>
<th>Proposed fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 minor applications</td>
<td>$64,215</td>
<td>$124,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 major applications</td>
<td>$68,967</td>
<td>$150,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fees paid</td>
<td>$133,182</td>
<td>$274,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This fee update is anticipated to yield additional revenue in 2022 onwards and will lessen the City’s cost of providing this function.

**CONCLUSION**

By adopting the proposed fee schedule, with current-day fees based on application scale and with methods comparable to Metro Vancouver municipalities, the City can recover a greater portion of the staff time required for development applications and improve service to applicants. These changes will support the delivery of high quality development aligned with City strategies.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

[Signature]

Leah Karlberg
Planner I
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Bylaw, 2006, No. 7760</th>
<th>Development Permit Areas for Streamside Protection and Enhancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Bylaw, 2010, No. 8066</td>
<td>Accessory Coach House Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Bylaw, 2010, No. 8136</td>
<td>Streamside Protection and Enhancement Development Permit Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Bylaw, 2012, No. 8240</td>
<td>Sections 3 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Bylaw, 2014, No. 8348</td>
<td>Sections 2, 3, 4, 9, 13 and Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Bylaw, 2015, No. 8424</td>
<td>Approval of Strata Conversions Less Than Three Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Bylaw, 2015, No. 8408</td>
<td>Schedule A / Level-B Accessory Coach House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Bylaw, 2015, No. 8454</td>
<td>Clarification of Public Meeting Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Bylaw, 2017, No. 8538</td>
<td>Schedule A Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Bylaw, 2017, No. 8485</td>
<td>Schedule A Fees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

BYLAW NO. 7343

A Bylaw to Establish Procedures to Amend the Official Community Plan, the Zoning Bylaw, Adopt a Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw, or to Issue Permits Under Part 26 of the Local Government Act

The Council of The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. TITLE

This bylaw shall be cited as the City of North Vancouver "Development Procedures Bylaw, 2001, No. 7343."

2. DEFINITIONS [Bylaw 8348, June 9, 2014]

"Applicant" means a person who is an owner of the property which is the subject of an application, or a person acting with the written consent of the owner;

"City" means the City of North Vancouver.

3. SCOPE

This bylaw shall apply to:

(a) An amendment to:

   (i) The Official Community Plan
   (ii) The Zoning Bylaw
   (iii) A Land Use Contract

(b) Issuance of:

   (i) Development Permits;
   (ii) Development Variance Permits;
   (iii) Temporary Use Permits. [Bylaw 8348, June 9, 2014]

(c) The adoption of a Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw.

4. APPLICANT, FEES, LEGAL FEES, AND REFUND POLICY [Bylaw 8348, June 9, 2014]

(a) Applications for bylaw amendments, permits, and permit extensions shall be submitted in writing to the City by the Applicant, and shall be accompanied by all information relevant to the proposed development required by the City to
conduct a thorough review and analysis of the proposed development. The Applicant must apply in the form prescribed by the City and must provide the information required by the form.

(i) If the Director of Community Development is not satisfied that the information is sufficient either in scope, level of detail, accuracy or in any other respect, the Director of Community Development may, within 30 business days of receipt of the information submitted by the applicant, require the applicant to provide, at the applicant’s expense, further information reasonably required to comply with this section;

(ii) Every report or other document provided to the municipality must contain an express grant of permission to the municipality to use and reproduce the information contained in the report or other document for non-commercial purposes.

(b) All legal fees directly associated with amendments or permits covered by this bylaw shall be borne by the applicant. [Bylaw 8454, December 9, 2015]

(c) Refunds of application fees shall be made on the following basis:

(i) If the application is rejected by the Council of the Corporation of the City of North Vancouver (Council) prior to any Public Hearing or Public Meeting process being authorized by Council, 50 percent of the application fee shall be refunded to the applicant;

(ii) If prior to any Public Hearing or Public Meeting process being authorized by Council the applicant withdraws the application within six months of submission, 50 percent of the application fee shall be refunded;

(iii) If an application is withdrawn prior to any significant work being commenced by the City, an amount up to the full application fee may be refunded to the applicant at the discretion of the Director of Community Development;

(iv) If the applicant fails within one year to respond to requests for further information in support of the application, the application shall be deemed void and in which case no refund of fee will be granted.

5. PROCESS

(a) An application under Section 2 shall be processed by the Director of Community Development, or his designate, who shall submit a report to Council for consideration other than applications which may be approved by the Director of Community Development.
(b) The review of applications by the Council or the Director of Community Development may include referrals to persons or groups for such reports or advice as is deemed necessary to evaluate the application.

(c) In the event the Director of Community Development rejects a Development Permit, the applicant may apply to the Council for reconsideration of the application. [Bylaw 8454, December 9, 2015]

6. DELEGATION OF COUNCIL POWERS

(a) The Council delegates to the Director of Community Development the powers of the Council under s.920(2) of the Local Government Act to issue Development Permits in respect of Development Permit Areas established by the Official Community Plan, 2014, No. 8400, provided that they do not involve a variance to the Zoning Bylaw, 1995, No.6700, including the powers of the Council to require that the applicant provide security for the purposes of s.925 of the Local Government Act, however:

(i) The Director of Community Development reserves the ability to refer the Development Permit Application to Council for consideration.

(b) In imposing security requirements under s.925 of the Local Government Act, the Director of Community Development may require the applicant to provide as security:

(i) undertaking works, construction or other activities to satisfy a condition in the permit respecting landscaping; plus

(ii) provide a letter of credit in the amount of 1% of the estimated value of all construction occurring within the scope of the permit as calculated by a quantity surveyor, to be cashed if conditions of the permit with respect to development energy usage are not met and certified as such by a recognized professional within a period of 24 months following the issuance of a certificate of occupancy and/or at the discretion of the Director of Community Development.

(c) In imposing the security requirements set out in section (d), the Director of Community Development may require security to be maintained for so long as there is a reasonable possibility of contravention of a landscaping condition, the creation of an unsafe condition, and the causing of harm to the environment in connection with the development authorized by the permit.

(d) An owner of land whose Development Permit application is subject to this section may, within 10 business days of being notified in writing of the Director of Community Development’s decision on their Development Permit application, request the Council to reconsider the Director of Community Development’s decision, by giving notice in writing to the City Clerk setting
out the grounds on which the applicant considers the decision is inappropriate and what decision, including what Development Permit conditions and what amounts of security the Council ought to substitute, and paying the applicable amendments thereto.

(e) At any time following the submission of a Development Permit application or up to 10 business days following being notified in writing of the Director of Community Development’s decision on their Development Permit application, the owner of the land may request Council consideration of their Development Permit application, including what Development Permit conditions and what amounts of security the Council ought to substitute, provided the owner has paid the applicable fee set out in Schedule “A”. [Bylaw 8454, December 9, 2015]

(f) The City Clerk must notify the applicant of the date of the meeting at which the reconsideration will occur.

(g) The Council may either confirm the decision of the Director of Community Development; or substitute its own decision, including the Development Permit conditions and amounts of security.

(h) The Council delegates to the Director of Community Development the powers of the Council under s.242 of the Strata Property Act to act as the approving authority for applications to convert previously occupied buildings with fewer than three units to strata title. [Bylaw 8424, June 22, 2015]

7. AMENDMENTS TO OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN, ZONING BYLAW OR LAND USE CONTRACTS AND ADOPTION OF HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT BYLAWS

Council shall, following receipt of a staff report with respect to an application to amend the Official Community Plan, the Zoning Bylaw, or a Land Use Contract, or adopt a Heritage Revitalization Agreement Bylaw: [Bylaw 8454, December 9, 2015]

(a) Proceed with the consideration of the bylaw or bylaws as set forth in Part 26 or 27 of the Local Government Act;

(b) Withhold consideration of the bylaw or bylaws pending further input from the applicant or City staff;

(c) Reject the application.

8. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS AND DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS
[Bylaw 8454, December 9, 2015]

Following receipt of a staff report with respect to a Development Permit or a Development Variance Permit application, Council may, at its discretion, hold a Public Meeting to provide an enhanced opportunity for public input. In the event that a development application involves a zoning amendment and a Development
Permit / Development Variance Permit, the requirement for a Public Meeting shall be waived in lieu of the Public Hearing for the Zoning Amendment Bylaw.

Upon receipt of a staff report with respect to the Development Permit or a Development Variance Permit, Council shall:

(a) Issue the permit; or

(b) Withhold the permit pending resolution of issues raised by Council, staff or the public; or

(c) Reject the permit application.

9. TEMPORARY USE PERMITS [Bylaw 8348 June 9, 2014]

Council may, following receipt of a staff report with respect to a Temporary Use Permit Application, hold a Public Meeting, and shall: [Bylaw 8454, December 9, 2015]

(a) Upon compliance with the requirements of the Local Government Act, issue the permit with or without conditions and undertakings; or

(b) Withhold the permit pending resolution of issues raised by Council, staff, or the public; or

(c) Reject the permit application.

10. POSTING OF A SIGN

A sign may be required to be posted at the development site for public information prior to a Public Hearing, Public Meeting or public information meeting. Failure to post the sign may result in a delay in the process. [Bylaw 8454, December 9, 2015]

11. REFUSAL

Where an application under Section 2 has been rejected by Council, the City Clerk shall notify the applicant in writing within fifteen (15) days of the date of Council's rejection.

12. RE-APPLICATION

Where an application under Section 2 has been rejected by Council, no re-application for the same amendment shall be considered within one year from the date of Council's rejection.

13. EFFECT OF THIS BYLAW

Nothing in this bylaw shall be construed as:
(a) Prevențing Council from initiating an application to amend any plan, bylaw or land use contract or issuing to itself any permit;

(b) Affecting the referral of any plan, bylaw, amendment or permit to any Council Committee, Commission or Panel; [Bylaw 8348, June 9, 2014]

(c) Preventing the Council from tabling or otherwise dealing with any application in the manner it deems appropriate;

(d) Compelling the Council to consider an application provided for in this bylaw.

14. SEVERABILITY

If any portion of this bylaw is for any reason held to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the invalid portion shall be severed and the portion that is invalid shall not affect the validity of the remainder of this bylaw.

15. REPEAL

"Development Procedures Bylaw, 1998, No. 7000" is hereby repealed.

READ a first time by the Council on the 23rd day of July, 2001.

READ a second time by the Council on the 23rd day of July, 2001.

READ a third time and passed by the Council on the 23rd day of July, 2001.

RECONSIDERED and finally adopted by the Council, signed by the Mayor and City Clerk and sealed with the Corporate Seal on the 30th day of July, 2001.

__________________________________________
“Barbara A. Sharp”
MAYOR

__________________________________________
“Bruce A. Hawkshaw”
CITY CLERK
### SCHEDULE “A”
#### FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Application</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amend the Official Community Plan (OCP)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Amend the Zoning Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) To allow a Coach House</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) To rezone to an existing zone</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) To rezone to a Comprehensive Development (CD) zone</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Text Amendment</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amend a Land Use Contract (LUC)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Obtain a Development Variance Permit (DVP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Within a One-Unit or Two-Unit Zone</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) All other zones</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Varying the Sign Bylaw</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) In combination with a concurrent rezoning</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All rezoning applications for lots greater than 1,500 sq. m. (16,146 sq. ft.) are subject to an additional fee calculated as follows:

\[
\text{(SITE AREA – 1,500 SQ. M.) x PROPOSED FSR x 0.45 = ____}
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Application</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Obtain a Development Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Streamside Protection and Enhancement DP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Minor (Landscape, Accessory Building or Accessory Structure)</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Full (Principal Building in any zone)</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Full with Variance (variance to zoning or not meeting guidelines)</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Form and Character DP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Coach House</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Two-Unit (Duplex)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Commercial, Residential Multi-family or Mixed Use</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Council Consideration of DP [Bylaw 8454, December 9, 2015]</td>
<td>$1,250 (in addition to original base fee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Rooftop Antenna [Bylaw 8485, December 11, 2017]</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Minor Amendment to a Development Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Streamside Protection and Enhancement</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Coach House</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Two-Unit (Duplex)</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Commercial, Residential Multi-family or Mixed Use</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Obtain a Temporary Use Permit (TUP)</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Liquor License Consultation Fee</td>
<td>$406 / first 70 sq. m. (750 sq. ft.) $94 / each additional 10 sq. m. (108 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Obtain a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Exemption from Development Permit (DP) for Streamside Protection and Enhancement</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Additional Public Hearing Advertising Fee</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Additional Public Meeting Advertising Fee</td>
<td>$875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pre-Application Review (applied to future application fee[s], if application is submitted)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Bylaw 8538, March 27, 2017]
**REVIEW OF METRO VANCOUVER 2022 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FEES**

The following Metro Vancouver municipalities most closely resemble demographics of the City of North Vancouver (based on 2016 Census Data), have updated their development fee bylaw within the last five years, and/or are neighbouring municipalities on the North Shore.

*Figure 1. Cities Included in Regional Fee Review*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Coquitlam</td>
<td>139,284</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of North Vancouver</td>
<td>85,935</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>85,795</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>4405</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>70,996</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>4222</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of North Vancouver</td>
<td>52,898</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>4073</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver</td>
<td>42,473</td>
<td>-0.10%</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody</td>
<td>33,551</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 2. Examples of Common Development Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>City of Coquitlam</th>
<th>District of North Van</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>New Westminster</th>
<th>CNV (proposed)</th>
<th>West Vancouver</th>
<th>Port Moody</th>
<th>Municipal Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-application (RS-1 to RT-1)</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$870</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$1,020</td>
<td>$882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-application (6 storey apt of 60 units)</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$3,130</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,020</td>
<td>$2,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Amendment (change to height / 100 m² new GFA)</td>
<td>$8,606</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>$1,002</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$5,282</td>
<td>$8,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Amendment (Special Study Area of 50,000 m² at 3.0 FSR)</td>
<td>$165,600</td>
<td>$110,150</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$141,600</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,192</td>
<td>$103,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Rezoning (RS-1 to RT-1 2 units on 700 m² lot)</td>
<td>$4,504</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$1,923</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$5,372</td>
<td>$4,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD Rezoning (duplex and infill 4 units on 1000 m² lot at 1.5 FSR)</td>
<td>$6,171</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
<td>$2,208</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$5,552</td>
<td>$6,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD Rezoning (6 storey apartment, 60 units, 4,400 m² GFA)</td>
<td>$6,183</td>
<td>$11,780</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
<td>$8,520</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$10,592</td>
<td>$9,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD Rezoning (20 storey mixed-use building, 120 units, 14,292 m² res, 2,000 m² commercial, on lot of 200 m²)</td>
<td>$5,827</td>
<td>$24,710</td>
<td>$14,146</td>
<td>$17,797</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$16,172</td>
<td>$15,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Permit (10 unit townhouse of 1,295 m² GFA)</td>
<td>$3,029</td>
<td>$4,985</td>
<td>$9,238</td>
<td>$2,692</td>
<td>$4,750</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$5,174</td>
<td>$5,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Permit (75 unit townhouse of 9,500 m² GFA)</td>
<td>$7,750</td>
<td>$7,845</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$9,620</td>
<td>$29,750</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$12,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Type</td>
<td>City of Coquitlam</td>
<td>District of North Vancouver</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>City of North Vancouver (current)</td>
<td>West Vancouver</td>
<td>Port Moody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-application (minor)</td>
<td>$1,049</td>
<td>$870</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$1,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-application (major)</td>
<td>$1,049</td>
<td>$3,130</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Amendment</td>
<td>$8,606</td>
<td>$4,190 + $67.5 /100m² of new GFA</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,001</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$5,192 + $90/100m² of GFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Policy Amendment</td>
<td>$8,606</td>
<td>$4,190 + $67.5 /100m² of new GFA</td>
<td>$4,000 + $2000/res unit</td>
<td>$42.02/1,000 ft², of site area (min $2,984) + $17.29/1,000 ft² of site area over 20,000 ft²</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$5,192 + $90/100m² of GFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning (Text Amendment)</td>
<td>$4,330</td>
<td>$4,190-15,810 (+$44/res unit)</td>
<td>$2,000-7,500 + $0.5m² of new GFA</td>
<td>$1,923</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$6,000-18,000</td>
<td>$5,192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning (Existing Zone)</td>
<td>$4,165</td>
<td>$4,190-15,810 (+$44/res unit)</td>
<td>$2,000-7,500 + $0.5m² of new GFA</td>
<td>$35.60/1,000 ft² OR $142/res unit (min $2,208)</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$6,000-18,000</td>
<td>$5,192 + ($90/100m² of GFA or $90/res unit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning (CD Zone)</td>
<td>$5,685 + ($27-106/100m² of land)</td>
<td>$4,190-15,810 (+$44/res unit)</td>
<td>$2,000-7,500 + $0.5m² of new GFA</td>
<td>$2,208</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$6,000-18,000</td>
<td>$5,192 + ($90/100m² of GFA or $90/res unit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. Development Permits (DP), Development Variance Permits (DVP) and Heritage Revitalization Agreements (HRA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>City of Coquitlam</th>
<th>District of North Vancouver</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>New Westminster</th>
<th>City of North Vancouver (current)</th>
<th>West Vancouver</th>
<th>Port Moody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP Coach House</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,560</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,379</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP Form and Character - minor</td>
<td>$2,203</td>
<td>$1,641</td>
<td>$2,000-6,000 + $2.50m² of new GFA</td>
<td>$2,693</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>$5,000+$500/lot</td>
<td>$4,274 + ($90/res unit or $90/100m² of GFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP Form and Character - major</td>
<td>$3,227 ($82/100 m² of GFA)</td>
<td>$4,545 +$44/res unit</td>
<td>$2,000-6,000 + $2.50m² of new GFA</td>
<td>Greater of $42 / 1,000ft² of site area, or $156/res unit (min $2,693)</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$5,000+$500/lot</td>
<td>$4,274 + ($90/res unit or $90/100m² of GFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP Amendment</td>
<td>$500-1,400</td>
<td>$1,560</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$285-1,379</td>
<td>$250-750</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVP</td>
<td>$1,652-3,029</td>
<td>$728-1,666</td>
<td>$750+</td>
<td>Greater of $42 / 1,000ft² of site area, or $86/res unit (min $1,400)</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$3,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA</td>
<td>$3,227</td>
<td>$4,190-15,810 (+$44/res unit)</td>
<td>$2,000-7,500 + $0.5m² of new GFA</td>
<td>$35.60/1,000ft² (min $1,002)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 5. Additional Development Related Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>City of Coquitlam</th>
<th>District of North Vancouver</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>New Westminster</th>
<th>City of North Vancouver (current)</th>
<th>West Vancouver</th>
<th>Port Moody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>$1,267</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,002-1,848</td>
<td>$875-1,750</td>
<td>Actual cost</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Site Disclosure</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$51</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Site Fee</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$150,000/first 10,000m² of site area + $350/100 m² site area to max of $750,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$78,030/ first 10,000m² of site area + $364/100 m² of site area to max of $416,160</td>
<td>(site area - 1,500 m²) x FSR x $0.45</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$99+</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Fee Items</td>
<td>Major and minor differentiation</td>
<td>Additional staff review</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Time extension, Additional staff review</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Extraordinary work or review required</td>
<td>Time extension Inquiries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BYLAW NO. 8906

A Bylaw to amend “Development Procedures Bylaw, 2001, No. 7343”

The Council of the Corporation of the City of North Vancouver, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. This Bylaw shall be known and cited for all purposes as “Development Procedures Bylaw, 2001, No. 7343, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8906” (2022 Development Application Fee Review).

2. “Development Procedures Bylaw, 2001, No. 7343” is amended as follows:
   A. By deleting Schedule “A” Fees in its entirety and replacing it with a new Schedule “A” attached to this bylaw.

3. This bylaw is to come into force and take effect as of March 1, 2022.

READ a first time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

READ a second time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

READ a third time on the <> day of <>, 2022.

ADOPTED on the <> day of <>, 2022.

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER
SCHEDULE “A”
FEES

INFORMATION

Minor vs. Major Applications
For the purpose of this Bylaw, the following definitions differentiate between the scale of minor and major proposals:

Minor – 1-5 principal residential units, primary child care use, or non-profit applicants (where a minimum of 80% of proposed residential units are secured at a minimum of 10% below market rental rates).

Major – 6 or more principal residential units, mixed-use, commercial, industrial, or institutional uses.

Waived Fees
Fees for City-led projects will be waived.

TYPE OF APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Official Community Plan (OCP)</th>
<th>FEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCP Amendment</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The following additional fee applies to any site area exceeding 8,000 m² or to policy development within any Special Study Area* ($1 per m² site area x FSR)/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Zoning Bylaw Amendment</th>
<th>FEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text Amendment or Rezoning to an Existing Zone</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning to a New Comprehensive Development (CD) Zone</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The following additional fees apply to major proposals, to a maximum total rezoning fee of $25,000*

- Per proposed principal residential unit | $50 per unit |
- Per m² of proposed commercial space | $1 per m² |
- Per m² of proposed industrial space | $1 per 2 m² |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Development Permit</th>
<th>FEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment to Development Permit</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Consideration of Development Permit (additional fee)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach House Development Permit</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooftop Antenna Development Permit</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Form and Character Development Permit</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The following additional fees apply to major proposals, to a maximum total development permit fee of $15,000*

- Per principal residential unit | $75 per unit |
- Per m² of proposed commercial space | $1 per m² |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF APPLICATION</th>
<th>FEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Development Variance Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance with staff consideration or variance concurrent with rezoning</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance with Council Consideration</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Temporary Use Permit (TUP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain, amend, or renew a TUP</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor HRA (including amendment to existing HRA)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major HRA</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre-Consultation Application (PCA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor PCA</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major PCA</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early direction from Council (additional fee)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public Meeting or Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For any application requiring a public meeting or public hearing (to be charged per instance)</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Environmental Site Disclosure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For any application requiring a Site Disclosure Statement (otherwise waived)</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Council of The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. This Bylaw shall be known and cited for all purposes as “Construction Regulation Bylaw, 2003, No. 7390, Amendment Bylaw, 2022, No. 8907” (2022 Development Application Fee Review).

2. “Construction Regulation Bylaw, 2001, No. 7343” is amended as follows:

   A. In Schedule “A” – Fees and Deposits, section 1 – General Regulations, by adding the following:

   19. Waived Fees:
   Permit fees for City-led civic projects on City-owned land may be waived in whole or in part, at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Development.

   READ a first time on the <> day of <>, 2022.
   READ a second time on the <> day of <>, 2022.
   READ a third time on the <> day of <>, 2022.
   ADOPTED on the <> day of <>, 2022.

   MAYOR

   CORPORATE OFFICER
RECOMMENDATION:

WHEREAS the City of North Vancouver and Council have a goal of making this municipality “the healthiest small city in the world”;

WHEREAS the City has prioritized an All Ages and Abilities (AAA) active transportation network of “mobility lanes” providing protection and separation from people walking and motor vehicle traffic for active modes, like bikes and other people-powered and electric assist “micromobility” devices;

AND WHEREAS a multitude of micromobility devices are increasingly used for daily, practical transportation, as well as for commercial cargo in the City and around the world, and the City is a participant in the Province of BC’s Electric Kick Scooter Pilot project;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Mayor, on behalf of Council, write a letter to Transport Canada requesting that it establish clear and consistent technical specification, testing, labelling and safety standards for the range of available electric assist micromobility devices, including, but not limited to e-cargo bicycles, e-bikes, e-scooters and e-skateboards, and conduct robust consultation with key stakeholders on universal accessibility, active transportation and road safety, given the importance of consumer safety and protection, and to provide clarity for businesses that manufacture, import, distribute, retail and provide insurance products for micromobility.
NOTICE OF MOTION

15. City of North Vancouver Multicultural Community Festival
   – File: 15-8100-01-0001/2022

Submitted by Councillor Girard and Councillor Hu

RECOMMENDATION:

WHEREAS the City of North Vancouver is made up of residents from diverse cultures, multi-ethnic backgrounds and ancestries with distinct languages and traditions that enrich the lives of all residents within the City;

WHEREAS the 2018-2022 Council Strategic Plan reflects that 38% of the City’s population have emigrated from more than 100 countries;

WHEREAS the City’s Cultural and Diversity Policy, adopted by Council on June 1, 1998, sets out objectives to promote and reflect a positive and proactive attitude towards community diversity among City employees and representatives, promote inclusion and welcome the participation of community members from various backgrounds in community and civic life;

WHEREAS multicultural events provide opportunities to: 1) promote awareness and education for residents to learn more about another culture in positive ways; 2) enhance intercultural interactions and breaking down barriers by celebrating the ethic and cultural diversity of our residents through official celebrations; and, 3) engage residents through volunteerism and participation in the delivery of such events;

WHEREAS other cities in Canada, which have hosted ‘destination’ multicultural festivals, have demonstrated there to be financial and economic spin-offs through additional tourism dollars spent at local businesses during such festivals;

AND WHEREAS there are numerous cultural organizations and societies, within Metro Vancouver and beyond, whose mission is to celebrate and preserve cultural traditions through the delivery of performances at such festivals;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT staff be directed to create a Task Force for the purpose of investigating a potential model for a coordinated, annual, multi-day, Multicultural Festival, for the celebration of cultural performances and presentations, offered by cultural organizations and societies, and utilizing a variety of City-wide community spaces and participation from community members;

AND THAT the Task Force report back to Council on a proposed model, estimated cost implications and the role for the City.