REPORT of the Public Hearing held in the Council Chamber of the District Municipal Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, B.C. on Wednesday, June 26, 2002 commencing at 7:01 p.m.

PRESENT:

Mayor: Acting Mayor Doug MacKay-Dunn
Councillors: Ernie Crist, Bill Denault, Heather Dunsford, Janice Harris, Lisa Muri
Absent: Mayor Don Bell
Staff: Mr. I. Torry, Manager – Community Planning
Ms. D. Howes, Section Manager - Transportation
Mr. R. Boase, Environmental Protection Officer
Mr. M. Hartford, Community Planner
Ms S. Burrows, Deputy Municipal Clerk
Ms D. Hibbard, Committee Clerk

BYLAW 7322 THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN, AMENDING BYLAW 51

BYLAW 7323 THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER ZONING BYLAW, 1965 – REZONING BYLAW 1164

Applicant: FNDA Architecture Inc. on behalf of Owner, Eilsha Barlow

Subject Lands:
- Amended Lot 3 (See 149056L) Block 55, DL 598 to 601, Plan 6659, PID 010-825-428, (no civic address)
- Amended Lot 4 (See 149056L) Block 55, DL 598 to 601, Plan 6659, PID 010-825-444, (3115 Crescentview Drive)
- Portion of Lot 7, Block 8, DL 600 and 601, Plan 7829, PID 002-444-674
- Portion of Lot 8, Except: Part Subdivided by Plan LMP 50694, Block 8, DL 600, Group 1, Plan 7829, PID 010-309-403

Proposed Amendments:
1. To change land use designations for a portion of the subject lands in the Upper Capilano Local Plan FROM “Detached Residential” TO “Low Rise Residential”, and amend the District Official Community Plan Schedule C.2, Table 4.2.1.1, “Site 1” by deleting from the column “Unit Type” the wording: “Low rise apts. (a maximum unit size of 900 sq.ft.)” , and adding to the column “Unit type” the wording: “Low rise apts. (average unit size a maximum of 900 sq. ft). Minimum of 50% units to be 1 bedroom.”

2. To rezone the subject lands from “Residential Single Family (RSE)” TO “Comprehensive Development Zone 39 (CD 39)”

Purpose:
1. To adjust the development site size, and make minor amendments to the Upper Capilano Local Plan regarding unit size.

2. To establish specific land use and development regulations for a 21-unit seniors’ apartment development.
Acting Mayor MacKay-Dunn called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. and outlined the agenda for the evening.

Mr. Michael Hartford, Community Planner, outlined the application located at 3115 Crescentview Drive, also known at Site 1 in the Upper Capilano Local Plan. The site currently consists of a single family home and a freestanding carport, both of which are to be demolished to accommodate the proposed 21 unit apartment building.

Mr. Hartford noted that the area is designated for multi family redevelopment through the Capilano Local Plan. The Plan guideline for the site is for a maximum of 25 units and the proposed building is 21 units and therefore is in compliance. The development also notes a preference for an age covenant on the site. Suites range in size from 625 sq ft to 1512 sq ft with an average size of 900 sq ft. Site coverage is currently shown as 56% and parking is underground. Building coverage is somewhat higher than the 50% maximum in the RL3 Zone, but site coverage is much less than the 75% allowed in this zone. A total of 29 parking spaces are proposed in the underground garage, for a ratio of 1.38 spaces per unit. The building has a height of 40 ft, with 46 ft permitted in the RL3 zone. Setbacks averaging approximately 14½ ft from Connaught Crescent and 20 ft from Crescentview Drive.

Mr. Hartford also noted that the developer is required to provide the usual sidewalks, barrier curb and gutter, boulevard landscaping and underground wiring. The applicant has also volunteered to provide funding for an entrance sign for the south end of Edgemont Village. There are also significant environmental improvements for fish and wildlife habitat.

The Advisory Planning Commission reviewed the application at their July 25, 2001, meeting and indicated support for the proposal. The Advisory Design Panel has also reviewed the proposal on March 14, 2002, and supported the proposal after reviewing the application on four occasions. The Advisory Design Panel did recommend some changes and they are reflected in the revised plans.

PUBLIC INPUT:

1. **Mr. Byron Elligott, Carbonite Development**
   300 Block East 10th Street
   - Speaking on behalf of FNDA Architecture for Eilsha Barlow the owner.
   - Submitted a form signed by people in support of the proposed development
   - On behalf of the developers, feels the building will complement the Edgemont Village area.

2. **Mr. Don Livingston**
   2600 Block Poplynn Place
   - Advised that he is legal counsel for his client with regard to litigation over the title of the property.
   - Advised Council that he and his client feel that the litigation could result in a change of legal title.
3. **Mr. Peter Thompson**       IN FAVOUR
900 Block Clements Avenue

- Co-chaired the Upper Capilano Local Area Plan Steering Committee.
- Noted his support for the development.
- Expressed concern over some aspects of the development with regard to ownership, the contribution of a sign for the Edgemont Village area and the enhancement of the watercourse and its reconstruction.
- Referred to the developers desire to have some form of recognition for the sign and how it may be construed as inappropriate.

4. **Ms Maureen Parker**       OPPOSED
3000 Block Brookridge Drive

- Expressed concern over the reduction in trees and its impact on the area and the environment.
- New development may bring more traffic and congestion to the area.

5. **Ms Geraldine Coates**       OPPOSED
3100 Block Crescentview Drive

- Referred to the Capilano Local Plan and the designation of the sites for redevelopment.
- Expressed concerns over the size of the development as well as the height factor.
- Bought her property in 2000 and was later contacted with regard to the proposed development at 3115 Crescentview, and noted that the owner wished to keep in consultation with neighbours but that has not happened.
- In January 2002 she was informed of a public information meeting and the developer asked to meet with them to review the plans.
- Spoke to the developer and were shown revised plans with regard to balconies overlooking their property.
- Communication between themselves and the developer has not been sufficient.
- Expressed concern over the owner previously digging out 10ft of her property and would like part of the proposal to include reinstating of her lost portion of land.
- Not against development of the property but has concerns over the height of the proposal and it’s impact on the immediate area.
- Expressed concerns over parking and the additional impact on an already busy area of the village.
- Has made numerous complaints to the Bylaw Enforcement Department with regard to cars parked in the area and there is a lack of visitor parking already.
- Asked that council address the parking concerns before this development goes ahead.
- Requested that a parking restriction be place on Crescentview and has spoken to Engineering about her concerns.
- Expressed concerns over a negative impact on the immediate area and hopefully some changes can be made to alleviate residents concerns.

Councillor Denault inquired through Mr. Thompson how much input the Community Association had with regard to the Local Plan. Mr. Thompson advised that there were several meetings and over 1600 questionnaires were distributed to residents. Mr. Thompson also advised that a seniors’ development was felt to have a minimal impact on parking problems.

Councillor Crist inquired as to the feasibility of a parking study to allow restricted parking on Crescentview Drive.
6. Mr. Ron Polly  
800 Block Cumberland Crescent  
- Edgemont Village is a special place and needs to be kept that way.
- Inquired as to what is presently allowed on this site. Staff advised that two single family homes with a height of 26 feet are presently allowed.
- Made reference to the public meeting, and how the developer stated that no trees were going to be planted to form a screen between the development and the adjacent neighbour.
- Suggested that Council should slow down this process.
- Inquired about the materials being used for the development, and if this was the developer’s first project of this type. The developer noted that they have worked on several projects of this size.
- Suggested that a smaller development would be more appropriate for this site.
- Inquired as to the membership of Carbonite Development.

7. Ms Libby Soper  
3000 Block Crescentview Drive  
- Expressed concern over the communication from the developer and the lack of information presented to her.
- Suggested that the adjacent residents are the most affected by this proposal not the business community.
- Referred to the parking issues and the impact of the additional units.
- Inquired if the support for this development has arisen from the investors and business merchants, not residents.

8. Mr. Brian Platts  
3100 Block Beverly Crescent  
- Secretary for the Edgemont Community Association, and served on the Upper Capilano Local Area Plan Steering Committee.
- Noted that the Committee received a great deal of public input on the plan.
- Suggested that the general feeling from residents was to maintain the character of Edgemont Village and an alternate type of housing was needed.
- The six sites identified in the plan were for specific purposes, and this site made logical sense for a seniors’ residence.
- The developer has come to the community association twice and the agendas for those meetings were well advertised.
- Noted that the Advisory Design Panel came up with suggestions for the proposal and the developer went with the community’s wishes.
- Referred to other seniors’ developments in the area and their impact on the community.
- Suggested that a traffic study has been on the budget but has been cut every year. The study is important and should be looked at during future budget deliberations.
9. Mr. Robin Delany  
Delany’s Coffee House, 3000 Block Edgemont Boulevard  
• President of the Edgemont Village Merchants Association.  
• Advised that the merchants association has never been approached by Carbonite Development with regard to this proposal

10. Mr. Bill McClintock  
2900 Block Crescentview Drive  
• Advised that he, as a resident of the immediate area, has never been asked about his position on the proposal.  
• Expressed concern over the immediate neighbours and the effect on their properties and the owner’s enjoyment of them.  
• Agrees with the parking concerns and advised that he has had a problem with parking outside his residence.  
• Urged Council to look into the issue of permit parking to alleviate the problems in the area.

11. Mr. Roy Johnson  
3000 Block Crescentview Drive  
• Will be impacted by the development.  
• Urged Council to look at the size and height of the development carefully.  
• Expressed concern over the existing parking problems and how this development will heighten the problems.  
• Suggested that the area needs seniors' housing, but does not agree with the height of this development.

12. Ms Wanda Rule  
3000 Block Crescentview Drive  
• Noted that she has previously e-mailed her comments and would like to have them as part of the public record.  
• Expressed concern over the retaining wall and its impact on neighbours and the environment.

13. Mr. Roy Dawson  
3000 Block Crescentview Drive  
• Noted that the developer has not questioned him about his thoughts on the development.  
• Suggested that if the developer had trouble getting in touch with residents, they should have left messages.

14. Mr. Brian Williams  
3000 Block Crescentview Drive  
• Suggested that there could be a safety issue with regard to traffic and parking.  
• Adjacent residents will have their views impacted by the development and that should be taken into consideration.  
• Development of the local plan didn’t really take into consideration the wishes of all residents.  
• Inquired if there was any other site between Crescentview and Newmarket slated for future development. Staff advised that the only other lots are the ones behind the Super Value site.  
• Expressed concerns regarding the number of multi-family residential developments in the area.
15. Mr. Adrian Chaster       OPPOSED
3000 Block Crescentview Drive

- Has been in attendance at the community plan meetings.
- Referred to the possible relaxation of the parking space regulation and inquired as to where the extra cars will park.
- Suggested that the parking requirement should not be relaxed.
- Noted that he works from home and was never approached by the developer with regard to this proposal.
- Suggested that seniors’ housing is necessary in this area.

16. Ms Susan Westcott       OPPOSED
900 Block Kenwood Drive, West Vancouver

- Is a former resident of the area.
- Concerned about the membership of Carbonite Developments and questioned who signs the cheques for the company.
- Has had a previous business arrangement with Mr. Fleischer and is currently in litigation with his company.

17. Mr. Gundhart Fleischer      IN FAVOUR
3700 Block Delbrook Avenue

- He has helped with the project and the many revisions it has had.
- Noted that he has raised funds for this project and has investors lined up.
- Advised that he has met with the adjacent resident and has addressed the concerns.
- Advised that they held a public information meeting and felt that was the appropriate way to inform residents.
- The building height of the adjacent building could go to 26 ft if the owner chose to redevelop.
- Advised that the site allows 25 units and the developer is only proposing 21 units.
- Advised that the process has taken 1½ years to get to this point and urged Council to look carefully at the proposal.

18. Farouk Noormohamed       IN FAVOUR
FNDA Architecture, 2400 Block Haywood Avenue, West Van.

- Suggested that he has taken residents concerns into consideration when dealing with the development.
- Advised that the Local Plan has designated this site for multi family residential directed at seniors’ housing.
- Concerned about the various issues such as height and the allowable height being 46 ft.
- Considerable discussion has taken place with regard to the retaining wall and referred to the plans presented.
- When designing the layout of the building, the one major concern was to stay as far away as possible from the adjacent single family home.
- Noted that an extensive amount of landscaping has been provided to mitigate the impact on the adjacent home.
19. Mr. Rob Parker
   3100 Block Brookridge Drive
   • Recently moved into the neighbourhood.
   • Inquired about the parking garage and its visibility to surrounding residents.
   • Expressed concern over the full height of the building.
   • Believes that there is a parking problem in the area and it needs to be addressed.
   • Commented on the need for privacy for the adjacent houses and the possible screening that could be done.

20. Corrie Kost
    2800 Block Colwood Drive
    • Hopes to preserve the unique character of the village.
    • Noted that for this site there was an 87.5% approval rate during the consultation process.
    • Commented on the size of the units and noted that smaller units may have been more desirable.
    • Noted that he sees a more than adequate amount of underground parking proposed for the development, but suggested that people prefer parking above ground.
    • Parking will continue to be a problem in the area even if enough above ground parking was provided.
    • When the sites were designated, notification was given to the adjacent owners.
    • Site coverage was to be 50% of the property.
    • Questioned the percentage of the original property that is being used.
    • Inquired as to flat areas of the roof at 40 ft or if it is all peaked.
    • Referred to a document from the initial Local Plan that noted heights for the designated sites.
    • Noted that a model of the development would have been helpful.
    • Inquired as to why no shadow studies were done.
    • Broad community input was put into the Local Plan.

21. Ms Geraldine Coates (Speaking a Second Time)
    3100 Block Crescentview Drive
    • Referred to her meeting with the developer.
    • Noted that she did not say that she was opposed to all potential development on the site, but she would prefer to see a single-family dwelling rather than multi-family.
    • Noted that there are still some windows looking into her property and no trees in the front will block the development.

22. Mr. Byron Elligot (Speaking a Second Time)
    Carbonite Development, 300 Block East 10th Street
    • Referred to a set of photos detailing views from the Barlow residence.
    • Referred to the location of the main driveway and how it was moved to better suit the adjacent residents.
DISPOSITION:

MOVED by Councillor CRIST, SECONDED by Councillor DENAULT and CARRIED
THAT Bylaws 7322 and 7323 be returned to a regular meeting of Council for further consideration.

Voting Against: Councillor MURI, Acting Mayor MACKAY-DUNN

Acting Mayor MACKAY-DUNN declared the Public Hearing in respect of Bylaws 7322 and 7323 CLOSED at 8:38 p.m.

Certified correct:

_______________________      ______________________
Committee Clerk       Chair