



**TRANSCRIPT OF THE PUBLIC HEARING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, 141 WEST 14<sup>th</sup> STREET, NORTH VANCOUVER, B.C., ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2007 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**PRESENT:**

**COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Mayor D.R. Mussatto  
Councillor P.J. Bookham  
Councillor R.N. Heywood  
Councillor C.R. Keating  
Councillor B.W. Perrault  
Councillor S.A. Schechter

**STAFF MEMBERS**

A.K. Tollstam, City Manager  
S.E. Dowey, City Clerk  
J.M. Rowe, Assistant City Clerk  
G. Penway, City Planner  
G. Venczel, Community Planner  
S. Ono, City Engineer  
T. Barber, Acting Manager, Engineering Planning & Design  
N. Hoglund, Supervisor, Operations Support Services  
K. Huettl, City Clerk's Department

**ABSENT**

Councillor R.J. Fearnley

**Bylaw No: 7844 – OCP Amendment re Western Avenue Planning Study –  
File: 3330-02-W2 and**

**Bylaw Nos. 7806 – OCP Amendment, 7807 Zoning and 7808 Heritage Designation  
– File: 3345-02 23W 116**

The Public Hearing was called to order at 7:13 p.m.

**Mayor D.R. Mussatto**

Ms. Dowey!

**Ms. S.E. Dowey, City Clerk**

Thank you Your Worship. The first Public Hearing this evening is regarding Bylaw No. 7844 is to amend the "City of North Vancouver Official Community Plan, 2002, No. 7425" Schedule A Land Use Map to implement the Western Avenue Planning Study, as follows:

| <b>Lands</b>                    | <b>Proposed Designation</b>                    |
|---------------------------------|--|
| West Side of Western Avenue to  | Level 3: Low Density (0.75 FSR)                |
| West 23 <sup>rd</sup> Street to | Level 3: Low Density (0.75 FSR)                |
| East Side Western Avenue to     | Level 4: Medium Density (1.0 FSR)              |
|                                 | <b>all from Level 2: Low Density (0.5 FSR)</b> |

The applicant is **THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER** and Council will consider this under item 6 this evening, Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

We have Ms. Venczel here for the staff presentation. Thank you.

**Mr. G. Penway, City Planner**

Yes, Your Worship, and I'll just very briefly describe the way we are going to try and handle the Public Hearings. There are four bylaws being considered this evening. The first one deals with the Western Avenue and the map up here with the area that is outlined as proposals to Level 3 and Level 4. We will be speaking to those first and Gloria will do that presentation and then we will be speaking secondly to the property known as 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup>, which is on the map here, shown as the proposal for Level 5, 1.6. So, Gloria will open with her presentation, she'll close this one.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you Mr. Penway!

**Ms. G. Venczel, Development Planner**

Thank you, Your Worship! A quick overview of the Western Avenue Special Study Area as it was identified in the Official Community Plan. This area warrants special study consideration to determine whether a slightly higher density would provide a better transition from Lonsdale's Medium-Density Apartment Uses to Western Avenue's Low-Density Single-Family Detached Dwelling. This may be an appropriate location for additional Ground Oriented Family Housing so those are the Terms of Reference for the Official Community Plan as outlined and the southern portion of the Western Avenue Study Area was considered below the Upper Levels Highway as the upper portion of the Study Area was qualitatively significantly different. This area right here is currently under the Official Community Plan as 1.6 Level 5, sorry, Level 5 Official Community Plan designation was a maximum potential density of 1.6 FSR. This lot is actually currently empty and it is owned by the Ministry of Transportation and this property is currently very close to being built out at the 1.6 FSR under the Official Community Plan. The rest of the area currently is Level 2 in the Official Community Plan at an FSR maximum potential of 0.5 FSR and that is under the Attached Form basically, duplexes.

So, in terms of the process overview, we had our first community meeting in April 2006 and there was an introduction on what are some of the Official Community Plan objectives in general as it relates to this study as well as a survey, general nature. The second community meeting happened on May 2006 where Official Community Plan density options were considered and there was a subsequent survey of the residents and the neighbours in the area and the third meeting was held in September 2006 with a refinement of the Official Community Plan density options. Following that was a Policy Committee Meeting in December 2006 and public input appeared to be positive except for two families and the committee was interested in how affordable housing might be achieved in the area. Which brings us to today's Public Hearing in February, 2007.

In terms of the density recommendation the dotted outline is the Study Area itself right through here and I'll just quickly go through the densities themselves. This one stays the same. It is existing at Level 5 in the Official Community Plan with a maximum density of 1.6 FSR. Then we go to Level 4 east side of Western Avenue which has a maximum density potential of 1.0 and then we move on to the low-density Level 3 with a maximum potential density of 0.75 and then outside of the Study Area is the Level 1 Low Density Single-Family homes at 0.5 FSR of a maximum potential density. And then we move on to the northern portion of West 23<sup>rd</sup>, sorry, too many Westerns in this one, yes, it is West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, the northern portion of it and it is a Level 3 Low Density at potential maximum of 0.75 FSR. So, those are the staff recommendations in this area and the rest is self explanatory in terms of the Official Community Plan designations in the area and later on today you will also be hearing about this particular area which is 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> which will be asking for an Official Community Plan amendment to Level 5 with a potential maximum density of 1.6 FSR.

In terms of the Advisory Planning Commission that review, the Western Avenue Planning Study Recommendations, I will go through it very briefly: That the Advisory Planning Commission supports the staff recommendations for the western side of Western Avenue and the east side of Western Avenue portions but believes the density of .75 FSR for the north side of West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street is too low given a proximity to Lonsdale and public transportation and the much higher densities on the south side of West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, therefore the APC recommends that consideration be given to exploring a higher density on the north side of West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street provided a way can be found to incorporate a reasonable amount of affordable housing, and that the City seek contributions to the Affordable Housing Fund should the density not be sufficient to generate affordable units and that consideration be given to including innovative forms of housing such as lock-off suites within townhouses or row housing with attached suites.

So, the next steps, if this recommendation is approved by Council would be to update the design guidelines looking at transitional building forms as you move from one density to another and housing affordability with the notions of lock-off units and creating option for a variety of finishes to the unit not necessarily offering the highest end and then subsequent rezoning applications and process around that. Thank you Your Worship.

**Mayor D.R. Mussatto**

Thank you Ms. Venczel. Mr. Penway, are we done. Thank you. So does the applicant or his representative wish to make a presentation this evening.

**Mr. Penway**

Sorry, Your Worship, just to clarify this. The intention is to get feedback about Western Avenue only and then we'll deal with the applications and their site separately. I'll just bring back the slide that showed the overall study area and the recommendations before us so that it is available.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Right, I apologize. So, then it is the opportunity for members of the public to come forth and make their opinions known. Before we do that though I'm just going to read, the City has established a number of guidelines to help us through the rezoning process, this process study so the Speaker's List is such that we would like people to limit their comments to 5 minutes. If they feel they have more to offer or more to add they are welcome to speak again a second time once everybody else has had an opportunity to speak. Please be respectful of other people's comments and concerns. We want to hear what you have to say about your opinions and your questions and we can judge everybody by their own merits. We did have a Speaker's List, I think, Ms. Dowey. This is the one, the shorter one to start off with, wasn't it?

**Ms. Dowey**

That's correct Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

The first person we had on our list is Mr. Mario Tancredi. You'll notice there is a clock just here. That is your five minute time and then if you have more to add certainly we would appreciate your coming back. Welcome Mr. Tancredi.

**Mr. Mario Tancredi, 2324 Western Avenue, North Vancouver**

Thank you Your Worship and Councillors, for being able to speak tonight. I just have a few comments to make on the Western Avenue Study. It is hard to comment on the Study in isolation from the development being proposed that is going to be spoken about later tonight but I would just like to make two quick points. One is that this whole study, I believe, was initiated because of the application that is being put forth to develop the Lodge property so it is not something that the area residents wanted to move forward with. The hand was forced a little bit simply because there was something large happening on our street and we thought it would be better to have sort of a plan for the whole street rather than develop things in isolation.

The other thing I'd like to mention is that the levels, the 1.0 FSR Level 4, that was the maximum level that people felt was a good faith compromise, if you will. A lot of people moved to agree to the compromised Study result that you have now. They moved from a position of no development to recognizing that something would be done on the street and so the Level 4 is a maximum that people had said that they would be able to live with. I know that the application that is coming forth later is going to have a proposed Level 5. Significantly higher than what was agreed too and I would just like to come up later and speak to that in combination with this Study.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Certainly. Thank you very much Mr. Tancredi. The next speaker I have is John Pilley. I neglected to ask, you don't have to, but it would be helpful if we just had your name and address but welcome. Thank you very much.

**Mr. John Pilley, 194 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, North Vancouver**

Thank you Your Worship. My name is John Pilley and I live at 194 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street which is the western most property within the area under study and I was unable to attend the last meeting but I did follow it on the Internet and I'm glad to see that the comments that the size of the lots and the frontage on the street of West 23<sup>rd</sup> it makes that a very different, that area has a very different character than Western Avenue and that to have .75 FSR in both sections of the area would not yield the results. I should say perhaps might stymie the evolution of the neighborhood in a constructive direction. I'm glad to see that the Advisory Planning Commission has given a consideration to and is recommended movement to a 1.0 FSR and I just wanted to be on record of saying that I'm very strongly in favour of that. Thank you Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you Mr. Pilley and I apologize for the pronunciation. The next speaker I have is Ian Ferguson. Is Mr. Ferguson here. Welcome.

**Mr. Ian Ferguson, 168 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, North Vancouver**

My name is Ian Ferguson. I live at 168 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. I have been involved in the process of the special study since it's inception and was one of the residents requesting it be undertaken. I have spoken with all the area residents and with the Planning and Council over the course of this special study. The initiation of the Study was resident driven and a majority of residents in the area, including the entire block of West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, recommended a minimum of a Level 4 Official Community Plan amendment. The Official Community Plan amendment has the potential to revitalize this area of the City and provide smaller, affordable housing as well as having a positive outcome for current property owners over the long-term. However, at this time the recommendations fall short of resident's expectations as well as the Advisory Planning Commission's recommendations. I am concerned and disturbed by the process that has unfolded both in terms of resident responses to the potential Official Community Plan modifications as well as with the Planning Department recommendations and lack of leadership and vision on this file. First, relating to the written resident responses. In her letter to the City, Joan Elliott of 2329 Western called legitimate points made for higher density on West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, extreme and selfish demands. I would counter that there was a not in my back yard sentiment towards change. I am confused as to why Joan would endorse the density of 1 FSR on the west side of Western and nothing more than a .75 on West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. On Western the properties are larger and therefore the overall building envelope and density will be greater when developed and anything that could possible along 23<sup>rd</sup> Street given that the existing properties are much smaller.

It just doesn't make sense. I would also argue that by not allowing young couples with families the opportunity to enter into the housing market by way of creating smaller, more affordable homes in the slightly higher density range, the City would be remiss in providing an opportunity for change. It makes sense in the long term. Joe and Tracy may have since ..... to Western and discuss their concerns in the increase of use of the laneway behind the houses on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. Joe is a standup guy. I've talked to him a number of times and I respect his concerns there. The large majority of residents along 23<sup>rd</sup> Street use the west lane entrance from Chesterfield to access and exit their homes or park on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. Any density increases along 23<sup>rd</sup> Street would likely see the traffic pattern continue with the cars parking on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street or exiting and entering the laneway from Chesterfield to access the traffic light. Perhaps consideration could be given to closing the lane in the middle if that would appease people providing the usage from each access point in half. If the new homes were affordable and marking the traffic users due to the proximity to Lonsdale we could potentially see purchasers who don't require cars. I too am concerned about the use of the laneway having lived at the west end of it for nearly eight years, however, my concern is the use of the lane as a high speed thoroughfare by residents of Western to avoid turning left from 23<sup>rd</sup> Street to Western or turning left from Western to 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. A solution to this that has not been discussed could be to put a weight controlled flashing green traffic light at Western and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street allowing Western traffic easier access to and from their properties, safer pedestrian crossing and acting as a traffic calmer along 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. Colleen Gibbons of 2360 Western writes that while she is not opposed to an increase in density to a 1 FSR for her property and her neighbours on the east side of Western the maximum retainable, I would add, she is opposed to an increase in density for the properties on West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. It seems unreasonable to lend credit to such an opinion as it is unlike other properties.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Ferguson, I'm just going to stop you for a moment please and Kathy if you would not mind stopping the clock. I think it is very important that we don't question the motives of others, okay.

**Mr. Ferguson**

These are all letters.

**Mayor Mussatto**

I know they are out there but we are not going to do that here so if you would just state your opinion and not question the motives of other peoples.

**Mr. Ferguson**

Okay, like other conversations I have had with her in the past. Upon redevelopment of her lands it will be of no consequence to her what happens on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street anyway. To address the Planning Department recommendation, the development on the south side of 23<sup>rd</sup> Street is calling a 1.46FSR.

I thought it was a 1.49 FSR and were density bonusing more likely 1.6 FSR. This represents one of the higher density Level 5 projects in the City of North Vancouver. To the north of our lots on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, across the lane on the left side, are two narrow properties on Chesterfield that were created when a variance was granted for an RS-3 zoning and one lot was divided into two parcels, each one achieving a density of .5 FSR. From the vantage point of the homes on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street the new construction appears as multi-family row housing style dwellings with residential units both up and downstairs which of course we have no problem with. North of the five easterly on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street across the lane, the properties on the west side of Western that are recommended as being designated a Level 3. These properties have a potential to achieve a density of .75 FSR under the Official Community Plan amendment recommendations. In contrast, according to the North Vancouver City Development Guidelines for Low Density Attached Form Housing, which is right here, under a Level 3 Official Community Plan amendment along West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street such recommendations would mean one lot on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street at approximately 3740 sq.ft. could only achieve .6 FSR at 2 units. A 2 lot assembly could achieve a .6 FSR and actually drop in the number of units per lot to a maximum of 3 units. A 3 lot assembly could achieve a range of .6 to .75 FSR and not until there is an assembly of at least 4 lots can the maximum density of a .75 FSR be achieved and at this maximum density the density cliff going from the south side of 23<sup>rd</sup> Street north which would be a 1.6 FSR plummeting to a .75 FSR to a .5 FSR for the Chesterfield properties north of the lane and remaining constant at a .75 FSR for the western properties north of the lane. Under a Level 4 Official Community Plan amendment as governed by the City of North Vancouver Garden Apartment Guidelines, which is this document right here, one lot on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street could achieve a maximum of .7 FSR, far less than the maximum under a Level 3 Official Community Plan designation. A two lot assembly could only achieve a .7 FSR, still less than the maximum achievable under a Level 3 designation. Am I out of time.

**Mayor Mussatto**

We can bring you back and you can slow down a bit or you can finish in 10 seconds.

**Mr. Ferguson**

I cannot finish in 10 seconds.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Why don't you come back at the end.

**Mr. Ferguson**

I'm the last guy on the list actually.

**Mayor Mussatto**

We are going to go to the rest of the gallery and ask if other people wish to speak. Certainly, I want to make sure Council gets your position. I apologize for that. Are there any other members of the gallery who wish to speak on this? I have this gentleman in the front here and then I will go to the gentleman in the back. If you wouldn't mind coming forward and give us your name and address. Thank you.

**Mr. Ivo Van Selst, 2401 Western Avenue, North Vancouver**

Good evening, Your Worship and Councillors. Ivo Van Selst, 2401 Western Avenue. I live in the North Vancouver Special Study Area. As a representative of one of the families in the area with young children and opposed to kind of any change within the zoning designation in the area I just think that it is important, and some of the other words, and where we have come from, be heard, in the sense not only myself or our family but there are a number of neighbouring families on both side of the street from us who have young children and have specifically chosen this area a number of years ago as the quiet, peace and solitude, if you will, in the City, and we are prepared to acknowledge absolutely that this close to Lonsdale some redevelopment and increase in density is entirely appropriate. But, we want to make sure that it is done in a reasonable progression and this is why, there was not quite, animosity, but it took some process to get to the point where a lot of people have made some compromises to arrive at the recommendations before Council and I just want to make sure that those compromises from some of the residents in the area, because we are looking across, particularly on the west side of Western, looking across at significant density increases and potential changes in the area. I just want to make sure that the calls to calm are being heard perhaps and that is about all I have to say.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much for your presentation and then I have the gentleman here in the middle. Welcome, sir.

**Mr. Paul Culling, 2340 Chesterfield Avenue, North Vancouver**

My name is Paul Culling and I live at 2340 Chesterfield just on the outside of the Special Study Area just in the first yellow block there ..... .75. I wanted just to make a couple of points and I am going to speak more to the, again, to the Lodge project but a lot like Mario was saying I think that I was ..... of the fact that there was going to probably going to have to be some change. I did not want any change in our neighborhood. I felt when it came down that the recommendation was .75 basically surrounding me and then 1.0 on the other side, I felt that it was the best that we could do considering how much some people were looking for. The other thing I wanted to make a point of was that it is important to note that in hope of we'll probably talk about this later, but with the Lodge project being that property being torn out of the Western Study, I think, after we had already started the process.



It just seems strange to me as well that we are talking about this one area and not that one and why that one gets the special treatment of having, you know, drastically different, because really what is the point of the Western Study Planning thing if they were going to pick and choose which properties actually get the density. So, the main thing was that I was okay with the .75 and 1.0 as a maximum and I wanted to make that known. That's how I felt.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Paul. Are there any other members of the gallery that have any questions to ask or comments to make? Please sir, if you wouldn't mind just coming down to the microphone. Thank you.

**Mr. Tony Caldwell, 2400 Chesterfield Avenue, North Vancouver**

Good evening Council. My name is Tony Caldwell and I live at 2400 Chesterfield which is in the yellow area on the west side of the study area. The impact from this would be to the rear of the lot. My only comment, unfortunately I missed most of the meeting here, but I pass this on through the questionnaires back to the Planning Committee here, sort of a sidebar issue not nearly as contentious as where everybody else is coming from, but over the years previous planning was to put in an alley between Western and Chesterfield. It appears that that is probably going to be abandoned in the future and I would like to see any lands that have been set aside for a laneway returned to the original properties involved. Really, it is just a side comment. Thanks.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Is there anybody from Engineering here. Mr. Barber would you mind just commenting on that lane to help out Mr. Caldwell. Are you able to answer any questions.

**Mr. Tony Barber, Acting Manager, Engineering, Planning & Design**

Yes, Your Worship, the lane in question is the lane north of 23<sup>rd</sup> between Chesterfield and Western and the suggestion that it is no longer going to be concluded as a transportation amenity or a facility and there are about six properties with undedicated portions but the intention of the Engineering Department, depending on how the development is consolidated and proceeds, we think that will most likely be opened between Chesterfield and Western.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Eventually.

**Mr. Barber**

Yes, most likely.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you Mr. Barber. Are there any other members of the gallery that wish to ask questions or have comments? Mr. Ferguson I am going to invite you down again. Sorry, Mr. Barber is there a time line for that?

**Mr. Barber**

Your Worship, I think it really depends on how the Level 3 Low Density proceeds on West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, if their individual units and I think even if it goes everything from Chesterfield to Western I think that the lane would be opened but If there was ever a suggestion that the corner was actually developed so that properties on Western and were combined with properties on 23<sup>rd</sup> then there is a chance some other configuration could happen but perhaps that would be a cul-de-sac lane from Chesterfield. But this is the sort of thing we will have to look as the development proceeds.

**Mayor Mussatto**

So, Mr. Ferguson, there is the potential that the lane could be opened in the future. I will go to you again. This is being taped and welcome back.

**Mr. Ferguson**

All that stuff is just numbers. It is just basically to show that a Level 3, you know, we cannot achieve what all these numbers that are being passed around, these maximums. So under a Level 4 one lot on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street could achieve a maximum of .7 FSR less than the maximum under Level 3 Official Community Plan designation. A two lot assembly can only achieve a .7 FSR still less than the maximum of achievable under a Level 3 designation. Again the density cliff here would be a 1.6 FSR plummeting to a .7 FSR to a 5 FSR for the Chesterfield properties and potentially increasing to a .75 FSR for the Western properties. Three lots can achieve a .8 FSR and not until four or more lots are achieved along 23<sup>rd</sup> Street can the maximum of a 1 FSR be achieved under a Level 4 Official Community Plan designation and even at this highly unlikely maximum density of a 1 FSR the density cliff begins at a 1.6 FSR drops to a likely, unattainable value of 1 FSR to a .5 FSR for the Chesterfield properties and a .75 FSR for the Western properties. This decline, though unlikely, seems to make the most sense for a reasonable transition giving the nature of the surrounding streets, redevelopments and potential Official Community Plan designations. For the City's development guidelines the difference between a Level 3 and a Level 4 Official Community Plan designation for one lot on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, at the maximum attainable density, is approximately 374 sq.ft. with a maximum of 2 units allowed even under a Level 4 designation that amounts to 187 sq.ft. per unit basically the size of a room.

I think there has been a failure in this process by the Planning Department. The purpose of this process is to amend the Official Community Plan which is measured in levels, Level 1, 2, 3, 4 etc., densities measured by floor space ratios and is applied for via a building permit upon redevelopment of a land parcel.

All the FSR numbers that have been thrown around over the last year are maximum densities and are not likely to be allocated to the small lots on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. These numbers, coupled with pictures of projects too large for the scope of properties on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, have stemmed fear with area residents creating a perception of another large scale development along 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, which is not possible given the size of the lots and in the process such as this it is crucial to have a changed management plan led by City planners who are responsible for public consultation but in this study there has been no evidence of one. When area residents are commenting to the City that other residents are selfish and that the whole process is being directed by special interest groups the City should recognize that these are symptoms of people concerned about what is in it for them. There has been little discussion on the pros and cons of an overall plan in a way that makes real sense other than a limited visioning exercise put forward by the City and related not to development per se but to the community post development dealing with storm water management and country lane treatments.

There has been no direction towards building a sustainable community that meets the City's growth requirements with an overall desire to provide affordable housing and the positive influence that new homeowners in the area can have versus what could be 10 more years of holding properties along 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and the drug, crime and the non-maintenance issues associated with such properties that this area has seen in the past. This happened prior to the redevelopment on the south side of West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street as for over 5 years we awaited redevelopment we watched the drug dealers, the criminals and the police come and go from the drug and crime house across the street. I would like to paraphrase what I've repeatedly heard from planners, developers, and politicians, where properties are in a transition period phase but not able to achieve their highest and best use due to the various restrictions they will likely be purchased over a long period of time by potential developers and treated and maintained as holding properties. They will essentially be run with a slumlord mentality. When a developer or developers have accumulated enough parcels they will apply to the City for a much higher density than designated citing the obvious concerns of the need for revitalization in the area. The City will get financial kickbacks for density bonusing and the developer and the City will enter into a win-win situation all at the expense of the original property owner who is essentially forced out due to the lack of demand for their property with no sign of achieving realistic density.

The Advisory Planning Commission looked at the Planning Department's recommendations for West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and disagreed with them based on the impact by the very high density development on the south side of the street, proximity to Lonsdale, and access to public transportation. Why have the residents not been actively informed of this inspiration until this evening. Every couple of weeks there is another article in the North Shore News quoting Council members, Your Worship, members of the Greater Vancouver Regional District, and other people involved in planning to find the areas in North Vancouver that can be reclassified as higher density.

The Advisory Planning Commission recommended the higher density coupled with smaller, more affordable units for the north side of 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. I would urge Council to adopt this long term strategy, follow the recommendations of the Advisory Planning Commission and grants minimum Level 4 designation for West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. That is it.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Ferguson for your comments. Are there any other members of the gallery that have any questions to ask or comments to make with regards to the first Public Hearing, please just raise your hand. Okay, once, twice, thrice. Then Ms. Dowey, our next motion.

**Ms. Dowey**

The next would be Council questions, Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Questions from members of Council. Are there any questions from members of Council? Councillor Bookham!

**Councillor P.J. Bookham**

Thank you Your Worship, a couple of questions. Could we have a comment from staff on the condition of the homes in this neighbourhood, the general condition. Are they run down. Are they in need of replacement or do they still have life in them.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Ms. Venczel!

**Ms. Venczel**

Your Worship, they actually vary. They are in reasonably good shape. There doesn't appear to be a lot of site significant problems. In addition to that comment many of these homes actually are not approaching the as their .5 FSR so there could be redevelopment without any change in the Official Community Plan itself. But, generally the condition of the homes appear to be in rather good shape.

**Councillor Bookham**

Thank you. I would like to follow up on a comment that was made regarding, what was it, that initiated the Western Avenue Study. It was written into the 2002 Official Community Plan but it seems to me that it took some time and I want to know was it the desire to redevelop the property at 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> or had there been any discussion with people from the other part of that neighbourhood seeking certainty. I do recall that we had a delegation, I believe, a while ago where some residents came forward and indicated that they wanted some certainty. They wanted to know one way or another what direction the neighbourhood was going in. So, could you clarify the sequence there please.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Penway!

**Mr. Penway**

Yes, Your Worship. This area was identified prior to this application for West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, at 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup>. The Official Community Plan process evolved over several years leading up to 2002. During this time this area was identified as the words are described in the Official Community Plan as one that appeared to be an area that could handle more density. The designation that is there now has been there since 1980, that Level 2 at 0.5 FSR. It has really resulted in no development, no optic of providing additional housing as the 1980 Official Community Plan would have anticipated and that is felt to be for a number of reasons but one of them certainly that the change of Level 1 to Level 2 being insignificant in terms of creating a market for redevelopment. So, those lands did not come up for redevelopment over the last 27 years, I guess. Looking at the Official Community Plan this seemed to be an area where, it is an awkward area in terms of transition, and I can speak to this maybe using the PowerPoint.

This is the current Official Community Plan and all of this orange area is all this residential Level 2 and to the west we have Level 1. So, it's a fairly large chunk of this full both sides of Western transitioning to what has then 1.6 in this area here. If you think about how our Town Centre is shaped it tends to start wide in Lower Lonsdale, move up to Central Lonsdale, and it tapers down to almost a point on the highway and then it kind of just goes up a little bit on either side of Lonsdale, above the highway. So, it is a transition that is coming to a point almost at the highway. The transition is trying to do that. The 1980 version of that transition, in our minds, didn't seem to do that all that effectively. It jumped from .5 Level 2 to 1.6 immediately to the east. The rationale then for putting this area into the Special Study Area category predates the current application for 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. It was based on a rationale of doing a better job relating to the transition and also trying to provide more, I guess, realistic potential for the market to respond to provide more housing in that area.

**Councillor Bookham**

Thank you for that information but it was not the answer to the question as I asked so I will try to be more clear in asking my question. I want to know whether or not the applicant to redevelop 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> came forward with that intention prior to the decision to actually activate the Western Avenue Study that had been written into the 2002 Official Community Plan.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Penway!

**Mr. Penway**

Yes, Your Worship, the Official Community Plan designation was in place and the Western Avenue Study was not in the works. It was not going to be in a work program for 2006. This property came on the market which is a large property with a Heritage building on it. Our applicant for that property acquired an interest in the property, an option, and was interested in advancing an application for that particular property. I don't recall the exact details now of exactly at what point we got to Council but I think that Council will recall that about a year ago we had a variety of people from the Western Avenue area seeking for a resolution of that area below the highway and so we had some of the speakers that are here tonight suggesting that Council activate the Western Avenue Study south of the highway, that we do that as a priority this year, and we did do that. Certainly those coincided at that time in terms of a virtual common request to activate that Study between our applicant and residents and property owners in that area. I don't know if that comes closer to answering your question. Certainly it was not in my mind driven by the application. I think there was a concern that we could not resolve 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> without also resolving what would happen with the lands around it and that's why this Public Hearing is going to deal with both properties at this time now.

**Councillor Bookham**

So, just to be very clear, the application to redevelop 116 preceded the activation of the Western Avenue Study.

**Mr. Penway**

That is my recollection.

**Councillor Bookham**

Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Councillor Heywood!

**Councillor R.N. Heywood**

Thank you Your Worship. Mr. Penway, if I could just get you to stay there for a minute and go back to that first, the one you had up a minute ago.

**Mayor Mussatto**

The current Official Community Plan I think it is.

**Councillor Heywood**

I notice on that one the Level 1, in white, also included the block 116, that is the one that we are going to be dealing with later, that was zoned as Level 1, was it.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Penway!

**Mr. Penway**

No, Your Worship. This is actually kind of a simplified map that was prepared for a different purpose. It is really just trying to show those lands which we are currently proposing changes too in the Study Area. I believe Council received a three page copy of a PowerPoint presentation. If I could just check Councillor Perrault's and I'll just see if it is here.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Was that in our package tonight or was that on Friday's. Ms. Dowey!

**Ms. Dowey**

It is on your desk, Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Oh, good, thank you.

**Mr. Penway**

I have it here, Your Worship, so I'll just bring it up here. I did not want to go to it if it was not going to be helpful. So, here we have Your Worship, the current Official Community Plan designation. The yellow area to the west on Chesterfield is single-family Level 1, 0.5 FSR. This orangey colour is the Level 2 which includes all of the lands that are up for the consideration this evening. To the east of that is the Chevron site which has a commercial designation as does the site south of that which is Kentucky Fried Chicken and White Spot and then this all has a 1.6 FSR designation here and there is also a 1.6 FSR designation on Lonsdale.

**Councillor Heywood**

Through you Your Worship, the lots facing West 23<sup>rd</sup>, on the diagram here they appear a little shorter and they also look narrow. Could you give us an idea on the size of those lots. I just want to hear your comments on if they are zoned .75, will that level of building be achievable within reasonable building guidelines and the comments that one of the speakers made about if it was zoned Level 1, 1 FSR rather, what would be the difference in the building capability.

**Mr. Penway**

Your Worship, I'll just get two tables and put them on the overhead projector here so you could take a look at those. In terms of the lot size Your Worship they are relatively small lots in the City. They are in the area of 30 to 35 feet, 40 foot lots, they vary a little bit and the depths in the area of 120. There is some lane dedication that have not happened but for the most part I believe they are in the area of 120. Does that sound about right, from the owners?

Yes, so about 110 and they range sort of 30 and up somewhat. So, they certainly are smaller lots. Just while I'm preparing these tables with our Official Community Plan we set aside maximum densities that could be achieved. Not all lots will achieve them. We use guidelines to give some indication to both owners and prospective developers and Council, what we think might be reasonable to fit on those lots and lot size has a lot to do with that. Essentially the larger the lot the easier it is to accommodate the maximum density that's possible and the smaller the lot the more difficult that is. We have kind of a sliding scale that we use.

So, I'll just put up first what we use for our low density guidelines which would be both the Level 2 and Level 3 categories and it would be the Level 3 that is being considered for these lands on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. If the City Clerk could just zoom in for me it would give a little bit more clarity here. That should do. That's good. So, we are looking then at this part of this table here and we look at the Official Community Plan designation and then the lot area so the first column here is dealing with lot sizes of below 6000 sq.ft. and then below 7500 sq.ft. to 12,000 sq.ft. and above 12,000 sq.ft. and the FSR maximum, and this is a guideline only that Council can vary from this, but on a smaller lot below 6000 sq.ft. .6 is recommended, below 7500 sq.ft. .6 is recommended. As you get in the area above 7500 sq.ft. you begin to achieve .75 FSR and then over 12,000 sq.ft. .75 is usually achievable. And again these are guidelines for Council but would not be automatic. They might or might not get approved at those numbers. It could be that you wouldn't achieve even those numbers or it might be that a smaller lot would get higher than what is specified here. Our intention would be that we would come up with some guidelines for this area if this change is made that might depart from this somewhat. And I should mention too, these would be the above grade portions. There could be below grade space that also might be habitable. This is the Level 3 low density .75 density table that we work with. I think we can zoom in on this one quite a bit more. Very similar table. Same lot sizes but here we are dealing with a maximum FSR of up to 1.0. In this situation then on lots below 6000 sq.ft. the recommended FSR is 0.7. Up to 7500 is the same and then it goes up to .8 and 1.0. So, those are the range of densities that we work with and try to work out a guideline for how much density might fit on smaller versus larger lots.

### **Councillor Heywood**

So, on a lot that has 3700 sq.ft., I think that's the number I heard, roughly. If you were going to build a duplex and it was a .75 but this is .6 above grade what square footage would be achievable on either one of those duplexes.

### **Mr. Penway**

Your Worship, the lot sizes will vary somewhat but if we are looking at a 33 x 110 lot that would be a 3630 sq.ft. and so at .6 that would be a building of about 2178 sq.ft., so roughly 2200 sq.ft.



**Councillor Heywood**

That's for both?

**Mr. Penway**

For two units, yes. But to caution again there could be this additional .15 FSR below grade or other exempt space, .15 FSR below.

**Councillor Heywood**

That's 1100 sq.ft. or a little less, above grade?

**Mr. Penway**

Assuming the units are made of equal sizes and it could be one unit would be larger and one be smaller.

**Councillor Heywood**

Okay, that's fine. Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Councillor Keating!

**Councillor C.R. Keating**

Thank you very much Your Worship. I think Councillor Heywood asked a lot of the questions I had. I did have one brief question. Is there any just in relationship to the graphs and the charts that have just been shown us do we know if there is, in fact, legally non-conforming structures on those properties now which would be in excess of the allowable lot coverage even under Level 4, 1.0 FSR.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Penway!

**Mr. Penway**

Your Worship, I don't believe so. The buildings are relatively small. Some are very small. I suspect that there is probably lots of non-conformity in terms of the siting of the buildings. Probably most would not have a full 5 foot setback on each side.

**Councillor Keating**

In terms of the question Your Worship I have been to a couple of Council debates before in my life and I have a feeling that I sense an issue coming up in this one and that is where all this process began from. I guess, Your Worship, through you to Mr. Penway again, just to clarify the comments because I have quite a distinct recollection of the way things went. We had a delegation from a number of people that lived on West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street who wanted us to act on this Special Study Area and around the same time we also had the beginnings of an application as regards to 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Mr. Penway I believe used the language that they were virtually issues in common. Does Mr. Penway actually mean that they were issues that rose concurrently or in common.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Penway, are you able to answer.

**Mr. Penway**

Your Worship, I have got the file in front of me here now so I think if I could I would like to take just a minute and see if I can get an actual date. Because I am looking at this date of the application for example which is showing that an application was received in August of 2005, well before that delegation occurred in 2006. I just need to refresh my memory as to what action Council took that resulted in that.

**Councillor Keating**

Your Worship, I guess the question would be, if the two issues were linked, in terms of the resolutions that Council took, because I do not recall it that way at all. I recall Council dealing with two separate issues, two different ways, and then ultimately they became linked after the fact and I think that's the important question here.

**Mayor Mussatto**

It was a while ago so see if Mr. Penway can get the information.

**Councillor Keating**

You know what, Your Worship, I am in no hurry for the answer so if he wants to take a few minutes to do that.

**Mayor Mussatto**

I think that is a good idea. Councillor Bookham did ask about process as well so maybe yes, that's good, we will just let Mr. Penway do that. Councillor Perrault, I am going to go to you only if it is not a question of Mr. Penway because he is busy.

**Councillor B.W. Perrault**

It is actually for Planning staff.

**Mayor Mussatto**

For Planning staff so maybe we will just wait and then, or Ms. Venczel may be able to answer.

**Councillor Perrault**

My question is, for clarification, I wonder if Ms. Venczel could explain the difference between what the Advisory Planning Commission is recommending and what staff is recommending and if you could do that in simple layman's terminology.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Ms. Venczel!

**Ms. Venczel**

There may be value in me going to the front and just showing with the cursor.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Yes, certainly can.

**Ms. Venczel**

Your Worship, thank you. Using the graphics here Your Worship what the Advisory Planning Commission has suggested they liked this staff recommendation. They liked this one. They suggested that we consider this as being 1.0 FSR, Level 4.

**Councillor Perrault**

Increasing them?

**Ms. Venczel**

Increasing the density and their reasons are outlined.

**Councillor Perrault**

My next question, just for clarification, the top northwest corner, Level 5 Medium Density, now that, is it my understanding we would be down-zoning that. Is that the recommendation to Level 4?

**Ms. Venczel**

Your Worship, that would stay the same.

**Councillor Perrault**

It would stay at Level 5.

**Ms. Venczel**

Yes.

**Councillor Perrault**

But why is it in the dotted area then?

**Ms. Venczel**

Well, our understanding of it is that there is a building existing here and that this particular lot is empty. Senior planning staff seem to think that it should have only included this piece right here that is currently empty. Sorry, may I just clarification on the question again, Your Worship.

**Councillor Perrault**

I guess my question is, I am looking at the dotted line and I am assuming when I look at the dotted line that that corner lot, the northwest corner lot, Level 5 Medium Density is what it says and the way I am reading it that will be reduced to Level 4 so that it will be the same as all the lands east of Western Avenue.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Is that the intention?

**Councillor Perrault**

Is that the intention?

**Ms. Venczel**

If I may confirm, Your Worship, this is the section you are speaking of?

**Councillor Perrault**

Yes.

**Ms. Venczel**

Okay. That is not the intention. That stays the same at Level 5.

**Councillor Perrault**

So then why wouldn't the dotted line, why wouldn't it exclude that. Why is including. That's very confusing.

**Ms. Venczel**

A very good question Your Worship. That was included so that something would actually happen with this Ministry of Transportation site. It is currently empty so the thinking was, at the time, that something needs to happen to this one and this one is currently at a Level 5.

**Councillor Perrault**

So, it is going to stay there and the apartment block that is south of that, within that dotted area that is going to stay the same?

**Ms. Venczel**

Yes.

**Councillor Perrault**

Okay, so we are really only dealing with then the purple area there, we are not looking at that which is dotted?

**Ms. Venczel**

That is correct Your Worship.

**Councillor Perrault**

Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Penway, I am assuming we need to give you a bit more time and throw you a life line here, do we?

**Mr. Penway**

Well, Your Worship, I have got a partial answer and I think it is coming clear. There are two different files for this. One of them deals with the rezoning application. The other one deals with the Western Avenue application. I can tell you that in September of 2005 Council concluded that they would direct the staff to delay processing, the 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street application, until such time as the Western Avenue study was done and that resulted in neighbours taking their own initiative actually to begin some meetings amongst themselves to talk about that study and that included the applicant for 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> as well in November and later. That culminated in their common appearance before Council, I believe, last year requesting that this study commence and I believe at that time, I haven't got through to that part of the file, felt that these could be sort of done coincidentally and it was following that there was an effort to bring forward a bylaw for 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street separately in advance which Council supported at the time and that led to the Public Hearing that we had last fall. At that time Council confirmed again that they wanted to resolve both of these properties together and that is why we have both bylaw packages before you here tonight.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Councillor Keating is that fine with you?

**Councillor Keating**

*Not audible.*

**Mayor Mussatto**

Are there any other questions from members of Council. Councillor Schechter!

**Councillor S.A. Schechter**

Thank you Your Worship, just briefly, perhaps I am missing the Advisory Planning Commission recommendation in my package but I understand that the Advisory Planning Commission that the 100 block West 23<sup>rd</sup> between Western Avenue and Chesterfield have a Level 4, 1.0 FSR, Official Community Plan designation but I cannot see the rationale. Perhaps staff could direct me to it or explain it.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Ms. Venczel, I think you were at the meetings. Are you able to answer? Please.

**Councillor Schechter**

The rationale would be helpful Your Worship.

**Ms. Venczel**

Your Worship, my recollection of the meeting was that seeing as that this portion of West 23<sup>rd</sup> which is the north side was so close to Lonsdale Avenue that it would warrant a higher density in terms of housing and mainly some of the things that the Advisory Planning Commission was actually looking for was to include in some way, shape or form affordable housing, or housing affordability in some way shape or form, or lacking that a contribution to the Affordable Housing Fund. So, I think it was coming from the direction of well, so two things, this is close to Lonsdale and lets see if we can actually provide more housing and then number two is if we're going to provide more housing can we actually provide more housing affordability. So that was my understanding of Advisory Planning Commission recommendation.

**Councillor Schechter**

And perhaps staff would explain the rationale behind differing with that opinion.

**Ms. Venczel**

Your Worship, staff decided on .75 FSR as a compromise. It was a rather involved process involving the neighbourhood and so we actually wanted to create a balance between, it actually started off with a very strong no change and change opinions in the neighbourhood and then after a number of sessions, probably after the second meeting, or possibly the third one, it appeared that there was a spirit of compromise coming from those meeting and so the staff recommendation was searching for balance that would be acceptable both to the community that didn't want any change and the other portion of the community who wanted significant change. So, we were thinking that that would actually provide a balance that would be overall acceptable to both parties so to speak.

**Mr. Penway**

Your Worship, just further to that if I could, and I'll use the PowerPoint to sort of deal with the transitions. Whenever you are dealing with these sort of transitions in these areas where it is not a very clear grid pattern that is moving from east to west or north to south there are these lines that need to be drawn and they wind up being somewhat arbitrary and sometimes it is very difficult to find the right place for the line. The rationale we used in this is that we are looking at the single-family area here and there has been no intention to change that area. It is not part of the Western Avenue Special Study area. We took that to be our direction that this is an area that is not expected to change so part of the rationale then is we don't want to destabilize this area by putting such high density adjacent to it that it begins to roll over and give the impression as if densities will then need to shift in that area as well. That was not our mandate heading out into this area. In looking at that then you need to deal with, you're trying to get from .5 FSR Single-family or one unit on Chesterfield Avenue to Lonsdale which is really less than a block away and so how do you achieve that transition.

We have already got 1.6 FSR on Lonsdale and the commercial use, currently a service station. So, the categories we have as options that are 1.0 FSR, .75 FSR, .5 FSR Level 2 and .5 FSR Single-family. We looked at this east-west transition as being a logical one to do the 1.6 FSR down to 1.0 FSR then down to .75 FSR then to .5 FSR and there is a two category jump between the ones that are single category jumps up, or steps, I should call it I suppose. Then in this direction we do have 1.6 FSR in here although Council appointed 1.6 FSR for this area none of the projects there have actually achieved 1.6 FSR. They are all in the area of 1.4 FSR something and that was again to try and help with the transition. Then there is this question of what to do with this block. Should it be where it currently is at Level 2, .5 FSR, and that is certainly a significant jump from across the street to 1.4 FSR, 1.6 FSR. We felt the .75 FSR made the most sense here because to go to 1.0 FSR would put 1.0 FSR against single-family homes immediately across the lane. That is a transition that we don't have very often. The 1.0 FSR development to achieve it usually results in some very significant building forms both in the front and the rear of the projects. The 1.0 FSR in this area will be hard to achieve because of the lot assembly there is no question but lot assembly may happen. We don't know what will happen in terms of the acquisition of lands over time. You would need to get three of those lots to get up to a 1.0 FSR through a rezoning or it could be more than that. But, the other awkward with going to 1.0 FSR, you usually wind up going into an underground building form, underground parking. The underground parking is expensive but it is particularly difficult to achieve because you have more units, more density, you need more parking. That has to come off of the lane because street access off of 23<sup>rd</sup> Street will not be supported for vehicular safety reasons. So, coming in off the high side meant that that 1.0 FSR density that would be parked either on the high side of the buildings which would tend to increase the mass of that building adjacent across the lane from single-family one unit dwellings or try and ramp in or come in from some other location for that parking access. In terms of practicality we're a bit doubtful it would actually achieve 1.0 FSR but alternatively it would be the biggest jump that we would then have from 1.0 FSR to .5 FSR across the lane. The Advisory Planning Commission felt differently and we respect their opinion. Neighbours here feel differently as well and we respect that opinion. 1.0 FSR could be argued here. We're still talking about ground oriented housing in either event. We are talking about housing that will provide more housing and diversity housing. Our rationale for this has been to try and provide for a transition that to us makes the best transitional sense and not destabilizing the areas to the west.

**Councillor Schechter**

Thank you Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

All right Ms. Dowey, I see no further questions then. We shall move on.

Councillor Keating briefly left and returned to the meeting.

**Ms. Dowey**

Thank you Your Worship. The next item would be the second Public Hearing this evening, Your Worship, with regards to 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and the following bylaws:

**OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN - BYLAW NO. 7806**

To amend Schedule A of the City of North Vancouver Official Community Plan to change the Land Use Designation for 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, legally described as Lots 19 & 20, except the east 10 feet now lane, of Lot B, Block 215, D.L. 545, Plan 1064, from “Residential Level Two: Low Density” to “Residential Level Five: Medium Density”

**ZONING - BYLAW NO. 7807**

To rezone Lots 19 & 20, except the east 10 feet now lane, of Lot B, Block 215, D.L. 545, Plan 1064, located at 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. The amending bylaw will have the effect of reclassifying the said property from RT-1 (Two-Unit Residential 1) Zone to CD-521 (Comprehensive Development 521) Zone to permit the conservation and relocation of the existing heritage building to the southwest corner of the site and a new building to be constructed along the north side of the subject site. There would be a total of 29 adaptable units, five units in the heritage building and 24 units in the new building. Underground parking will be provided for 34 parking stalls plus four tandem parking stalls. This proposal includes changes to the building design from that presented at the previous Public Hearing held on September 25, 2006.

**HERITAGE DESIGNATION - BYLAW NO. 7808**

In conjunction with Bylaw Nos. 7806 and 7807, Lots 19 & 20, except the east 10 feet now lane, of Lot B, Block 215, D.L. 545, Plan 1064, at 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, the lot occupied by the heritage home known as the H.D. Green Armytage Residence would be designated as a Municipal Heritage Site.

The applicant is **FRANCIS CONNOLLY, NEWPORT CONSULTANTS LTD./INTEGRA ARCHITECTURE INC.** and Council will consider this under items 3e, 7, 8, and 9 this evening, Your Worship.

Also Your Worship, we have received 19 letters in favour of the application plus one petition in favour with 18 signatures. We also received seven letters not in favour plus one 24 signature petition and one four signature petition not in favour. Copies of all this information has been circulated to Council prior to this Public Hearing Your Worship.

Councillor Schechter briefly left and returned to the meeting.



**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you Ms. Dowey. Mr. Penway!

**Mr. Penway**

Thank you, Your Worship, just a few context images here to confirm the site. We are speaking now of the property on West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street at Western Avenue. This is the piece of land which is actually two lots but has functioned as a single site now for close to 100 years. It is a corner property, has a lane backing onto the east and further to the east there is the Chevron service station site which has a commercial designation. There are lands to the north that are single-family homes. They have an existing Level 2 designation. The proposal there is for 1.0 FSR in the future under the Western Avenue Bylaw before you tonight. Across the street on Western we have got single-family homes fronting onto 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, cross over to Chesterfield. These are properties that have a combination of single family and duplex zoning with a Level 2 designation and the staff recommendation in the Bylaw before you today is for a .75 FSR Level 3 Residential Density there.

The lot is an unusually large size. It is approximately 18,800 sq.ft. so that is basically 3 duplex lots if you would in terms of a typical duplex lot area. The lot sizes are 129 x 145 feet. I mentioned that there is an existing house on this property which is a Heritage building listed in our Heritage Inventory. That building is proposed to be retained and incorporated into the development.

This property then is within the Western Avenue Special Study Area, it is being considered and it is a separate application. The other Bylaw before Council tonight would wind up in an Official Community Plan amendment change if it were to be adopted. This comes with a package of three bylaws. In fact there is an Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw, a Rezoning Bylaw, and a Heritage Protection Bylaw and together that would approve the development with the design that has been presented here by the applicants.

There was an effort to consider this application earlier. That resulted in a Public Hearing on September 18, 2006. At that time Council did not approve or reject the application but rather referred it back until completion of the Western Avenue Planning Study and that would allow Council to consider this application in the context of their decision on the other lands. In response to the concerns that were raised at the Public Hearing the applicant has modified their project in a number of ways. Council saw that in October, 2006 and made amendments to the Bylaw at that time and asked that this be brought back to a Public Hearing in conjunction with the Western Avenue Study and again that is why we are here tonight together.

In summary, and I will let the applicants describe the project that they have proposed, it is a 29 unit apartment development. There has been some confusion about it being 40 units in some of the correspondence that we have received. It is a 29 unit proposal with 38 underground parking stalls proposed which would be accessed from the lane to the east. The floor space ratio proposed within the Zoning Bylaw would be 1.55 FSR. Of that total about .25 FSR would be floor area within the Heritage building itself so it is sort of 1.3 FSR plus the Heritage building at .25 bringing it to a total of 1.55 FSR. The project was previously reviewed by the Advisory Design Panel, the Advisory Planning Commission and the Heritage Advisory Commission and all three have supported it in it's earlier reiteration that came forward to Council. The plan here shows what the resulting Official Community Plan categories would be in the event that this were approved and anticipating the question in terms of a rationale for why this would be 1.6 FSR from a planning perspective. There is an angular transition happening as densities transition into Lonsdale coming to a point near the highway or above the highway so this 1.6 FSR category sort of follows through a line in this way over to that 1.6 FSR and these Level 2, Level 3 categories transition over as well heading over in that same direction. So, those are the thoughts about the fact that in our minds in the planning level 1.6 FSR here with the proper edge conditions could be a reasonable transition to 1.0 FSR to the north of that.

Your Worship, the applicants are here to speak and they have a presentation.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Penway. Now is the time, and I apologize for earlier, to come forward, the applicant or his representative. Welcome.

**Mr. Bob Heaslip, Development Planning Strategies**

Thank you Mr. Mayor. Mr. Mayor and Council and members of staff and the community, my name is Bob Heaslip. I'm with Development Planning Strategies and I'm representing the team which I will introduce. I am the Planning Consultant for the project. Joining me is Dwayne Siegrist of Integra, Francis Connolly is here representing the ownership which is Newport Developments, and Trevor Holgate, who is a Heritage Architect, also representing the project. All of us will be available at your leisure to answer any questions that can arise.

In terms of starting off, Your Worship, what we will do is we'll use the Elmo tonight and what I would like to do is just to give a brief overview of the process we have gone through, the input that was received, the concerns that were raised and how we have addressed those concerns and then I will wrap up with a summary of what we believe are the public benefits of the proposal.

As mentioned earlier and I don't need to restate but the community discussion began in about May 2005. We did make our application in September. That was followed with a facilitated workshop in November and those minutes, I believe, are probably buried in your papers somewhere but I have provided those minutes. I facilitated that session. It was a very good session. As staff have pointed out the subsequent steps occurred. As far as the previous Public Hearing goes we of course were monitoring that. We were involved in it as well and in fact the three meetings that occurred were held in the United Lodge property so it is something obviously that has been important to keep involved in.

In terms of the key issues that we felt came out and I am going to separate it from the Western Avenue side and speak specifically about the United Lodge property, we believe there were seven key items. One was density. One was rear yard privacy and overlook. Another was building height, mass and transition, both to the north and to the west, location of the Heritage building on the site. Neighbourhood parking congestion was an item that was raised particularly along Western and 23<sup>rd</sup>. There was pointed out a need for a Western Avenue sidewalk on the east side and lastly there was a concern about vehicle congestion and what to ensure that restrictions to access to and from this site would occur and they wouldn't occur from Western.

In terms of attempting to resolve those issues, Your Worship, we did the following. In terms of density, based on the concerns that were raised about the 1.6 FSR, that is an Official Community Plan designation. The rezoning is actually for .155 FSR and I'll talk to that in a second. Gary has pointed out quite well, I think, the transitions we are trying to achieve here; the avoidance of zoning cliff as they are called to make sure that you are not dropping off largely. We are faced with an opportunity here: to recognize (1) heritage (2) adaptability and (3) the nature of the uses that are going on this area. This is a very busy and dense corridor. We do have the Chevron to the east. There will be change to 1.0 FSR to the north.

The importance of the 1.54 FSR, Gary touched on as well, or a 1.55 FSR pardon me. And that is, if you treat the base density which is to say, set aside for a moment the bonusing for retaining the Heritage, set aside for a moment that the 100% adaptability, what we are saying is that we are around .125 FSR, so in fact the transition is from 1.0 to the north, the 1.25 FSR to 1.6 FSR in the south, commercial to the east and .7 FSR or 1.0 FSR whatever comes with the sites to the west, so we believe that that is fair. The bonusing is a good thing because this Heritage building Francis determined was a really good one and it offers an opportunity and is worth the bonus effort and in fact will house a different use and house more affordable housing and it will be adaptable. In terms of the next issue it was the rear yard and the original proposal that we had was putting the building about 12 feet from the north property line. Through the points that were made by our immediate neighbour to the north, which were good ones, all valid concerns, we actually doubled that. We increased it to 25 feet. We did a number of other things. We also made sure that obviously not going to affect those trees. We created more landscape area in the back.

We created a breezeway through the middle to break up the building somewhat. We took the balconies back into the upper levels and stepped the building back. The combination of new landscaping to supplement the existing quite extensive trees and so forth that are there we are going to add a five foot fence as well. The balconies are centered so there is actually only four balconies in two levels at the centre of the building and then a privacy concern obviously would be if you had clear plexiglas or something that might be an overlook problem so we have gone to a slated type of approach so that when people are sitting down they are not evident, you know, that they are staring at you.

The other thing that occurred on the site plan is that we had originally in that 12 foot area in the northeast corner off the lane, we had the garbage and recycling area. That has now been totally moved underground and that offered an opportunity again to increase the landscaping and make it more of a personal type area.

In terms of building height, mass and siting, we basically again, stepped back the top levels both at the north and at the west and Integra has done, I think, quite a nice job of lessening the impact in both directions in terms of that density. Again, I'll say that we also wanted to split the building in two at the main level to again address sort of the bulk issue.

In terms of the Heritage building location, it is really important that we stress that its original location as people know, is in the east side of the site. The proposal is to move it to the southwest corner and that is for two key reasons. One was that both staff and the Heritage Advisory Commission felt that it was important to keep the exposure to the general community available and make it proud. Secondly, and this is a key one, it is for structure and building health purposes. You may or may not know that when you take Heritage buildings, if you suddenly shift them or turn them or drastically alter them that can affect the nature of the wood, how it is retained, it can rot. There are a number of other items that can occur so we want to be very careful about how we shift this building, Your Worship.

In terms of parking or traffic, I mentioned that the access to the underground parkade is from the lane. The traffic study that was commissioned by staff was determined that with this number of units there would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of 10 to 12 cars during the peak period and that was not judged to be significant nor was it felt that the existing levels of service for the intersections and so forth would be affected with that kind of traffic.

In those terms, that is how we address those issues, Your Worship. Additional pauses that we saw, we are retaining two trees on the west side, one in the northwest and one in the southwest. The one in the southeast will not be retained but will be replaced with a new large tree.

The sustainability issues that we have done are wide ranging; water collection, storm water management, rain barrels, all of those are contained in the approach we are taking; the glass, energy reduction in use, and so forth, is pretty solid and we were commended by Advisory Planning Commission for that.

In terms of the Heritage retention, the other aspect I would mention is that it is being completely upgraded to today's building code standard. It will have five totally adaptable units in it. All commissions and committees endorsed it quite favourably and we also would like to offer a commemorative plaque that we would work out with staff the location but somewhere that could be easily seen by people that are going by in the neighbourhood, Your Worship.

In terms of the Planning Area Study we have made every effort to respond to density, the building forms, the massing, the sensitivity, landscaping and tree retention, the Heritage retention, and we believe that we have done our best efforts to do this, Your Worship, and we think we have got an outstanding project.

I would like to summarize briefly what we believe the community benefits for the project.

**Mayor Mussatto**

This will be your last slide, will it?

**Mr. Heaslip**

Yes, this is the last one Your Worship. So, in terms of the Western Avenue Planning Study, it is respectful in terms of land use, building form and density, the transition needs and the reduction of street noise from 23<sup>rd</sup>. There is minimal view and shadow impact. All of those studies have been done. The increase on the north helps as well, of the rear yard. Provides housing variety and affordability which was important to us and I believe important to the community. The ability to retain, enhance, refurbish and change the use of that Heritage building is a critical component of this. Providing for 100% of the adaptable units, not 20% which is the City minimum, but 100% which we also feel is a very big positive, protection and retention of existing significant trees, strong sustainability initiatives and again, the parking access and non-effect by the project on existing traffic, Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Heaslip for that. I think if you will just stay in front there may be some questions but we will see how it goes. We do have a Speakers' List that was circulated earlier and we are going to go to that first and then allow anyone else in the gallery who wish to speak to come forward. The first speaker I have is Mr. Mario Tancredi, again. Again, I'm going to ask if you could keep it to five minutes. If you can't we are going to allow you to come back again, no problem, but you have to go to the end of the list. Welcome again, Mr. Tancredi.

**Mr. Mario Tancredi, 2324 Western Avenue, North Vancouver**

Thank you, Your Worship. My name is Mario Tancredi. I am on the property directly to the north of the proposed site. I must say I do like what the people are proposing here for this development but it is the wrong site to put it at. They have many good features in the building but I don't think that it fits the site that they have chosen to put it on and I'd like to just outline seven quick reasons for that. The first thing is that I believe it would make a mockery of the results of the consultation process that the residents went through because many residents reluctantly moved from their no development position to a good faith compromise of a Level 4 for the area and as noted here tonight this particular proposal is a Level 5. The effect of density the Western Avenue residents would see is well beyond the site average of 1.55 FSR that is quoted here because of the density is all focused on the north side. There is no, or limited use on the south side of all the space, particularly in the southeast corner of the lot where it is just open space so they push the whole development up to the north side of the property. By concentrating the density on the north side of the property the proposed development contravenes the City's Official Community Plan guidelines for density transitions. In this particular case there is the existing use of a single family residential property to the north and the only transition from that to a Level 5 at this particular development is a simple fence line.

I would also contest that what the development offers the area in general, there is a lot of nice courtyards and walkways and all that sort of stuff but my understanding is there will be no public use of those areas so, I kind of wonder, it almost seems like it is going to be some sort of closed community with a fence around it and it is not going to merged into the local community to any great degree at all. And I also question the contention that the traffic will not increase significantly. There is already many problems with the traffic coming out from the alley onto West 23<sup>rd</sup> that has been noted in previous meetings we have had here and the Traffic Consultant has gone over that point and the more traffic we have in the area I believe, the more difficult and more dangerous it will be to get off of Western Avenue onto 23<sup>rd</sup>. We don't live in an area that has other egress options. The only way we can get onto 23<sup>rd</sup> from Western Avenue is directly on to it or taking the alley and neither one of those options will improve with what is being proposed here.

One of the slides the developer had up here proposes that there is three trees on our property that provide some sort of privacy corridors between the development and our side but in the recent storm we lost one of those three trees so we have two left and I don't think it unreasonable to assume sometime in the near future we may lose one of the other two trees or both of them and I don't think it is good practice to rely on trees to provide a permanent buffer between properties like that. I think it is a better practice to stick with good density transitions to avoid that sort of thing.

And lastly, changing this property from park-like setting to a huge condo block which is what we will see from our property to the north is a bit high of a jump in a currently residential area. The lodge property is a most prominent site in our area and developing it to Level 5 density I think will change the whole tone of the area. So, I ask Council, well maybe I should just make a note of on other thing here, I guess I would like to make a couple of quick points on the last presentation. Increasing the set back from 12 or 12 ½ feet to 25 feet is a good thing but the structure is almost like saying I'm going to move a skyscraper 25 feet. It really is not going to have a significant impact on the visual from the north and also I believe the structure is 50 odd feet. Putting in a five foot fence on a 50 foot odd high structure I don't think it is going to afford any privacy either on that matter. So, I just ask Council to give consideration to the residents expressed wishes for a maximum FSR in the area and how the proposed development doesn't align with those wishes and from a personal point of view I ask that you not approve this application because it thrusts my property from a quiet residential setting into the shadow of a wall of condos. Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Tancredi and amazing timing. The next speaker I have is a Mick Webb. Mr. Webb, you are welcome, sir.

**Mr. Mick Webb, 1207 Harris Avenue,**

Your Worship and members of Council, good evening. A lot of the discussion this evening is of necessity being very sterile in nature, however I would like inject a human touch into it. Many years ago my parents moved out of London to live what they felt was the retirement dream; a small bungalow, the seaside resort. Sadly they all too soon realized their mistake, away from their friends and family, their social life dwindled to nothing; no chats over a cup of tea with familiar faces or a pint at the locals that have been there for probably a hundred years. No joking with the shopkeepers Mom had known for virtually a lifetime. Dad refused to join any of the local seniors groups looking upon them as a bunch of old fogies and so they suffered their loneliness in stoic silence although not quite. My Mother cried long and often at this self imposed exile. Real estate prices have particularly risen in London. To return to their former familiar world was financially impossible. Despite each others presence my parents died lonely and unhappy.

My point here is that like so many elderly people my parents did not adapt well to leaving the security of their old neighbourhood. Their experience has left me very aware of the importance ..... of a familiar community. As a newly minted senior citizen myself this is an issue that I find myself examining more and more. This sense of belonging to a community is applicable to young people too. Why should we, young and old alike, have to be exiled from our community because of unattainable real estate prices. There have to be answers to the modest needs of both seniors and young people seeking a home of their own in keeping with their financial abilities.

This development proposal under discussion tonight is such an answer. Here we have a well thought out, and sensitive response to addressing not only the needs of more affordable housing but one that would also provide the lasting legacy to the community of a sympathetically restored and valuable Heritage building and in return will once again be a living, breathing part of the very fabric of that local community. Heritage homes provide a comforting sense of permanence to a neighbourhood. This, coupled with the sensitive esthetics of the project that will share design cues with the relatively new nearby developments to the southwest of the site can only have a positive impact on the general appearance of the neighbourhood making this, in my estimation, a win-win situation for all parties concerned. I would urge Council support of this imaginative use of this site. Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Webb. The next speaker I have is Veronica Shields. Is Ms. Shields here? Welcome Ms. Shields.

**Ms. Veronica Shields, 30 – 3939 Indian River Drive, North Vancouver**

Good evening Your Worship and members of Council. My name is Veronica Shields and I live at 3939 Indian River Drive. I wish to add my support to the rezoning and proposed amendments regarding the above address as someone from outside the area involved but possibly looking at moving closer to the City Centre in the future.

As I see it the proposed development and conservation and conversion of the Heritage building would be nothing but beneficial to this area. The location lends itself to needing an improvement of just this type for many reasons. Firstly, it would serve different generations and therefore provide a well balanced community. Young couples wanting to purchase their first home would be offered an affordable nicely located dwelling close to schools, parks and amenities. They would be able to enjoy the fact that they would be close to family, friends and their jobs. Older people, empty nesters and seniors would have a convenient location in which to enjoy recreation, close transportation links with downtown and tourist attractions, and shops, services and various medical facilities close at hand. Secondly, the design of the building is such that it would afford a pleasant neighbourhood feeling to residents, hard to find in urban areas these days. The conversion of the Heritage building is an excellent way for an elegant piece of our history to be preserved in a useful, long lasting way, to be admired for many more generations. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, this proposal addresses North Vancouver's need for affordable housing in the community. I'm sure there will be great interest in all 29 of the new apartments as there is a variety of sizes and floor plans available to suit different needs. I believe the 29 apartments will be built in two buildings ranging from 690 sq.ft. up to 1080 sq.ft. with one and two bedroom units and also two bedroom plus den units. The proposed underground parking is also a sensible and well thought out idea giving added security and convenience to the residents as well as less street congestion. Obviously the applicant and the architects have considered this proposal at great length and I cannot see a down side to it.



The neighbours have been thoughtfully considered and it would be a valuable asset to the area. The tasteful design, blended with the original Heritage house can do nothing but enhance the image of the community, an added bonus as we celebrate 100 years in the City. I hope Council recognizes this effort made by the applicant and architect and I urge you to support this development application as I believe it can only be beneficial to the City. Thank you Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Ms. Shields. If you could just give it to the City Clerk it would be much appreciated. Thank you. The next speaker I have is Art Gagne. Is Mr. Gagne here? Welcome sir.

**Mr. Art Gagne, 3757 St. Andrew's Avenue, North Vancouver**

Your Worship and Councillors my name is Art Gagne. My wife and I have lived in North Vancouver for more than 50 years. I am here to support the application to rezone the above noted property to allow for the retention of the Heritage house and the creation of some new and more affordable housing on the balance of the property. Affordable housing with I understand some range of sizes and prices. If this project goes ahead it will reflect favorably on the City on the North Vancouver, the Mayor and the Councillors, the Planning Department and it will reflect favorably on the Heritage Commission, the contemplative Design Panel and the Advisory Planning Committee. Finally somebody wants to do something about affordable housing. I urge you to support this endeavour. Thank you very much.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Gagne. The next speaker I have is Mr. Alfonso Pezzente. Is Mr. Pezzente here? Welcome Mr. Pezzente.

**Mr. Alfonso Pezzente, 3746 Norwood Avenue, North Vancouver**

Good evening Your Worship, Councillors, my name is Alfonso Pezzente. I live at 3746 Norwood Avenue. I am a developer and a property owner in the City of North Vancouver. I am here this evening to support the development and there is many good reasons for it. I feel the proposed development is a natural fit and best use for the property. It is also a logical transition from the gas station on the east side and a similar use is on the south side. At a huge expense to Mr. Connolly, the developer is also retaining the Heritage building to the benefit of the community. I also know from experience because I built a similar building at 128 West 21<sup>st</sup> that there is a large demand for these types of units because the units are affordable, and the location provides many conveniences for first time buyers, the elderly and seniors. It is an easy walk to public transit, the recreation centre, the Centennial Theatre, lawn bowling, shops and medical services. We were just here just a few short weeks ago discussing the shortage of rental units in the City of North Vancouver.

Well, the chances are the 29 units, and I think to take it from Richard White, maybe up to 50% of these units might end of being rental. So, overall I feel the development is great for the community and I urge Council to approve the application. Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Pezzente. The next speaker I have is James Jarvis. I hope I pronounced it right, but probably not sir, sorry. I stand to be corrected.

**Mr. James Jarvis, 20-220 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street, North Vancouver**

Your Worship, that's quite alright. Change it to Jarvis.

**Mayor Mussatto**

I think it points to me in the need of some glasses.

**Mr. Jarvis**

My name is James Jarvis. I live at 220 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street in the City. I am fortunate in that that block has been built out into condominiums, townhouses and two more lots to be built out and a significant improvement of the neighbourhood by doing so. I have looked at these drawings. I have visited the site and I can say that this is the right project. It is in the right place and at the right time. Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Jarvis. The next speaker I have is Peter Miller. Is Mr. Miller here? Welcome Mr. Miller.

**Mr. Peter Miller, 2695 Nelson Avenue, West Vancouver**

Your Worship and Councillors, my name is Peter Miller. I am a retired architect and the President of the North Shore Heritage Preservation Society. I have written to you all on behalf of our group which comprises approximately 100 residents of the North Shore. We are interested in seeing as much of the built Heritage of the North Shore retained wherever possible. However, I wanted to take this opportunity to offer some personal comments on this application which includes a proposal to retain, relocate and restore a Heritage property.

Every Heritage building encapsulates a piece of our local community's history. As a contribution to the streetscape it acts as a pin, so to speak, fixing of a .....and enabling future generations to give context to such archival material as a newspaper story or an old photograph or even a sense of place to the returning of a notable event in the past. Although we are not here to comment on other aspects of this development proposal as a whole we commend the developer for his intention to retain the significant house and note with approval the sensitive way in which his architects have reflected the roof line, the finish, and external materials in the rest of the development.

This house can already be seen from Lonsdale Avenue and although now marred by insensitive extension it is clearly an extremely attractive house and when restored and moved to an even more prominent location facing 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, I believe it will be a very positive addition to the streetscape of that area.

For all these reasons we give our support to this application. Thank you for your attention.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Miller. The next speaker I have on the list is Paul Culling. Is Mr. Culling here? Good. Thank you. Welcome again Mr. Culling.

**Mr. Paul Culling, 2340 Chesterfield Avenue, North Vancouver**

I have two things. One of the people, Joan Elliot, gave me a letter to read so I'll read her letter as written and I will make comments myself.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Certainly and if you go over the five minutes you will have to just come back but we'll work you in.

**Mr. Culling**

Basically, like I said before, one of my main contentions was that originally in the Western Avenue Planning Study when it began and the community was involved this property was part of it. After it had started it was removed. I don't know why and now we're considering outside of the recommendations of the community. Now, I felt for the last 10 minutes that I've been part of a bit of an infomercial but I'm actually somebody from the neighbourhood. I think I represent a majority of the people in the neighbourhood. The traffic is one of my biggest concerns. The fact that there is 29 units and 34 parking stalls is a concern. The traffic on West 23<sup>rd</sup>, if you've every tried to go up West 23<sup>rd</sup>, turn left on Lonsdale to take your kids to school, to pick them up at lunch, when our children go to school above the highway, I mean, it's a nightmare. The thought that this unit would not contribute to traffic is to me a pipe dream. I think that while commendable to, you know, there has been a lot of banter like restoring a Heritage house. That is fantastic but realistically from my perspective I see the restoration of a Heritage house being the reason for giving the ability to put a larger amount of density on this property. I think that if you sit there and say, well you know if you would take out the bonus for that, it is only 1.25 FSR, I mean it is 1.55 FSR. To me it is 1.55 FSR whether it is bonused or not. Anyway I think to put a building of that size against what is already in the neighbourhood, I don't think it is realistic and I totally cannot support it. That was the other thing about it because it just came up.

There has been a lot of talk tonight and since the last meeting about affordable housing. It is going to be affordable. I want to know what that means and I want to know if there has been guarantees on the affordability because it is easy to say, well we're just going to make them really small units so it will be cheaper. That's not affordable housing. I don't know what that means. That is something if somebody could ask where that affordable housing thing comes in and if there is guarantees of it being affordable housing. I think one of the other Councillors mentioned another time, you know, what is affordable housing on the North Shore. It just doesn't exist anymore and that is just a fact. I'm okay with it because I am already in the market.

**Mayor Mussatto**

I think what we'll do is we will ask if staff have a definition of affordability. They can give us a shot at it.

**Mr. Culling**

I think they have actually, specifically said, affordable housing not affordability.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Affordable housing, we can go with that. Mr. Penway are you able to address that complex issue of affordable housing?

**Mr. Penway**

It is always an interesting subject, Your Worship, and the applicant I think will best be able to speak to the cost of these units. Affordability is an entire spectrum so there is sort of deep core kind of housing where people spend no more than 30% of their income regardless what that income is which can take you into extremely low rents usually as opposed to home ownership. In many instances people who go to affordable housing are thinking about rental units and by BCMHC or BC Housing kind of statistics would normally be thinking of about 30% of your income maximum as being a cap. You won't spend any more than that. So, there are a few number of those units around. They tend to be heavily subsidized units owned and operated by an agency like BC Housing or some other non-profit with some other kind of provincial or federal government assistance to do a rent supplement. Within the spectrum of affordability and at affordable housing then is everything over to the most expensive kind of housing which is typically single-family now somewhere in the area of \$1 Million it seems for a new single-family house. In terms of this spectrum you tend to get that as the high end cost of market units for sale. Duplexes seem to be somewhere around closer to \$800,000 currently with new units coming out. As you get more units those costs come down. From a market perspective the most affordable housing that the market seems to be able to deliver is 4-storey wood frame apartments. They maximize the efficiencies with the minimum construction costs. Concrete high rises are more expensive for example so a four-storey wood frame building like this building is proposed is about the most efficient kind of market housing that can be delivered for sale. That will not be affordable for everybody.

It will not be affordable based on BC Housing statistics but certainly from a market housing perspective it is on the lower end of the cost compared to a \$1 Million dollar single-family home or \$800,000 duplex. Maybe the applicant might have some idea of sort of the range of costs that he thinks these might come on the market at.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Does the applicant, Mr. Heaslip or anyone else wish to address that issue of affordability?

**Mr. Culling**

Can I just make one more comment and then I'll sit down.

**Mayor Mussatto**

You certainly can Mr. Culling, yes.

**Mr. Culling**

The other think I wanted to say was we heard a really nice story about attachment to community and wanting to be part of a community, well I'm attached to my community. We have friends across the street, behind us. My mother lives like three houses away. Mario's kids who are up on 23<sup>rd</sup>, his youngest kids come and do their donations drives and we love to see them in the neighbourhood and we, I think on the whole, our neighbourhood, loves our little pocket. We have a neat little pocket of a community and we love it the way it is and this will drastically change it and I think that doing this project at 1.6 FSR is throwing out what the Western Avenue Study, when they actually talked to the people in the community, that is what they said they wanted and this is completely outside that. That's all I have to say about that.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Does the applicant wish to just address that issue Mr. Culling raised in terms of affordable housing. If you could just give us your name.

**Mr. F. Connolly, Newport Consultants**

Francis Connolly. Your Worship, market affordability, what does that mean. On a project like this, wood frame, we are talking around \$320,000 plus for a one-bedroom and two-bedrooms \$380,000 to \$400,000 and something. We are not in that stage to fix prices. We don't know what construction costs are. There are no construction drawings. That's what we are looking at versus what we see with duplexes at \$800,000 these days and two-bedroom concrete high-rises are coming in around \$600,000 for small units and more for large units. That's market affordability. That was a concept. Council talks about market affordability and social housing and of course this isn't social housing but it is a response. It is not talking the talk; we're actually walking the walk, here on this one. I believe we designed this. Advisory Planning Commission wanted market sensitive affordability, consulted design, discussed it and directed us with our unit sizes so the whole project revolved around market affordability. Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you Mr. Connolly. The next speaker I have is Mr. Ian De Groot. Welcome Mr. De Groot. If I'm not mistaken I think you used to be a math teacher at Carson Graham High school. At Sutherland and Carson. I never did take math twelve because I just did okay in math eleven. Welcome to the Council Chamber this evening.

**Mr. Ian De Groot, 3852 Calder Avenue, North Vancouver**

Good evening Mr. Mayor, members of Council, my presentation is going to be very brief. I live at 3852 Calder Avenue which is in the upper Lonsdale area. I have lived there for many years and I don't have any axes to grind about this project at all but I do know, and I have gone to the site, my wife and I have visited it, we read about it, and I am very impressed with what the developers and architects are planning. I am especially taken with, of course, the Heritage building retention. It is very impressive what the plans are. The design of the development for age in place living, I think, there have made many considerations. It hasn't been mentioned. Many of the other points have been made this evening previously so I won't go over them but the consideration given to wheelchair turning radius', grab bars and the like for handicapped tenants and the environmental considerations are really tremendously impressive, I think. What we've heard here this evening I think it is going to be a model for future developments. The easy accessibility to be near public transportation goes without saying but the most important point for me is this topic of affordability which is talked about and been defined this evening. The units will be priced so that younger couples with young children will once again be able to move into our very expensive area and be close to schools and facilities and transportation so I am definitely very supportive of this project. Thank you very much.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. De Groot. The next speaker I have is Errol Olsen. Mr. Olsen is here? Welcome Mr. Olsen.

**Mr. Errol Olsen, 2349 Chesterfield Avenue, North Vancouver**

Good evening. My name is Errol Olsen. I live at 2346 Chesterfield Avenue which is one street to the west of Western Avenue. My comments on this project are first of all I think as many of the other speakers have said, the project in isolation, it looks great. I mean the Heritage building is being maintained. The pictures are very idyllic. It looks great. The problem from my perspective is that this is all in isolation. The location of it does not fit with the neighboring community. It doesn't fit with the special Study Area which we heard a lot about earlier tonight and many people have said that the final proposals of the Special Study Area were a compromise and the proposed density here is to not only is it inconsistent with the Special Study recommendations it is inconsistent, it is incompatible with it and I would say it is incompatible with it and I would say it is inappropriate. It is inappropriate because the transition or rather the lack of transition.

I don't think any of us would want to be Mr. Tancredi with a four storey building in his back yard. Western Avenue is a quite idyllic street right now and just as this picture is and really what you're taking is something that's quite idyllic and trading that for something else that somebody else gets to enjoy while everyone else is left with the density of their street, in the terms of the number of residences, tripling. I think when you look at the layout of the street there, there are about 15, maybe 16 lots and here we are adding almost 30. We are tripling the number of families on that street and what are the implications. Well, I live on Chesterfield Avenue and the implication is, the most direct implication with me is traffic. I would challenge anyone here to try and make a left turn out of Western Avenue on a Friday afternoon. Now try tripling the number of families living on that street and then add in the increased traffic on 23<sup>rd</sup> from the continuing increased density at Lower Lonsdale and Chesterfield which gets bundled up, Chesterfield, along 23<sup>rd</sup> and onto Lonsdale. It is just going to get harder and harder to get in and out of that area.

I think that the right thing to do here is to find a way to maintain that Heritage building but do it in a way that is just more compatible with what everybody says they want to do or what they are willing to live with in the Special Study Area. Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Olsen. The next speaker I have is Joseph May. Is Mr. May here? Welcome Mr. May.

**Mr. Joseph May, 2343 Western Avenue, North Vancouver**

Your Worship and Council, my name is Joseph May and I live at 2343 Western Avenue. I have been in the process from the beginning through all the consultations with Mr. Connolly and the neighbours and one thing that was always a concern was the density increase and I think with the compromise we've come too is a pretty good compromise and with this unit being taken out of that it has added some things a little bit since. In talking to Mr. Connolly throughout the process as well I consistently told him of a grave concern about the density on Western Avenue and I believe Councillor Keating at one point in the last meeting said, why don't you shift the density around, maybe keep lower density up on Western with townhouses and the majority of the density on West 23<sup>rd</sup> and that doesn't seem to have been listened to at all with these meetings apart from maybe a tentative difference of 25 feet now. So, that seems to be not been addressed at all throughout this process. Basically, just my strong opposition to the way this has been handled throughout. Thank you very much.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. May for your comments. The next speaker I have is Grant Stuart Gardiner. We did see Grant earlier this evening receiving an award. Welcome back again Grant.

**Mr. Grant Stuart Gardiner, 268 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street, North Vancouver**

Good evening Your Worship and Councillors. Thank you very much for the Heritage Advocacy Award earlier. My name is Grant Gardiner. I live at 268 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Densities are increasing everywhere in the City and we are all under pressure to accept these changes. My neighbourhood in the 200 block West 6<sup>th</sup> has increased in density over the years from single-family to duplex density at .75 FSR and now we have a 12 storey apartment building at I believe it is 4.5 FSR now under construction across the street. This mix of FSR seems to be working well in my neighbourhood and I believe the lower density mix proposed for this neighbourhood will work too.

As an advocate in support of Heritage preservation I am here to support the preservation and restoration of the Green Armitage heritage house. Built in 1909 this is one of the oldest Heritage homes in the City and one of the few surviving homes in the Tutor Revival Style. I am asking Your Worship and Councillors to please ensure this building is preserved by supporting this development. Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you Mr. Gardiner. Now we have finished the list that was signed up earlier but I am going to give an opportunity for people to speak. Yes sir, if you wouldn't mind coming down again and then we will go to the back corner and again if you wouldn't mind just giving us your name and address it would be great. Thank you.

**Mr. Ivo Van Selst, 2401 Western Avenue, North Vancouver**

Good evening again Your Worship and Councillors. My name is Ivo Van Selst, 2401 Western Avenue again in the Special Study Area. Probably foremost I have deep concerns with respect to the process in this thing and I don't think that process has been deliberately derailed but I think there were two separate, I don't know, motivations or things coming together and the Lodge property really should have been and maintained in the Special Study designation. To have pulled it out I think has created a lot of strife. I think the whole point of the process and in going through that, you know the Lodge is so integral to the area, or those Lodge properties, are so integral to the area that I really don't think they should be taken out of the Study process. So, what I would say is this is Council's opportunity to set that right and to say, listen, you know, we will put the Lodge back into the Study at a 1.0 FSR, give it the .25 FSR for the Heritage bonusing and that can be a very, you know, Francis Connolly and his team have demonstrated that they can come with some remarkably sensitive and well designed things. At a 1.25 FSR that is quite a bit to work with. I think the site itself is entirely appropriate for redevelopment but it shouldn't be a 30 unit strata on essentially a residential street where we have our kids riding their bikes. This is where the Tencredi's have lived for many, many years, and we've been there for almost a decade, it is not what we want and it is not what the process was all about. I really have some strong objections to the Lodge property having been pulled out of that process. I think that is something that just happened through misunderstanding. I don't think there was any malevolence involved. I just think it is what it is.



Looking at it, the proposal before Council right now with respect to the Lodge, triples the allowable density but one of the things to consider too, is that it is not just tripling the allowable density. The actual proposal before Council it is a significantly sized land assembly. You know, it is 3 duplex lots essentially. It is tripling the allowable density but also fully building to that density, you know, the difference between a 1.55 FSR and a 1.6 FSR, there just isn't much of a difference. So, in considering the whole thing this is a huge structure and taken as it has observed, it is a beautiful building but it is out of context. It requires setback variances on three sides. It is just a stretch and it doesn't belong. It does not fit in the neighbourhood and we really do have a neighbourhood and a community. I think this is why a lot of people are so vocal about it is that we have our kids, we are out visiting with the neighbours, we are a very active community and we don't want our community to go through something like this. At the last meeting it seems to be there was discussion about moving the density on the development south along 23<sup>rd</sup> and possibly west and looking at the density map going by the way that the setbacks or the density that is sloped that the City is shooting for by the City design all of the density should be on the southeast sides. Instead it has all been shifted northwest back towards the impact into the Tencredi's and on Western Avenue. So, there are some things like that I don't think that the development has necessarily been taken into account.

One thing that is totally unrelated to personal feelings or whatever, I actually used to live in one of the apartments on Lonsdale just northeast of the Special Study Area and I came down that lane, the lane that we're talking about here, as a commuter. One thing that has come up and we've talked about it in the Special Study, the traffic volume, which is what the study focused on, this traffic study. The traffic volume, the intersection can handle it, but, you have cars coming out of the Chevron lot, coming out of the alley, coming out of the KFC lot, the intersection itself, and then there is an alley behind the KFC. You have got basically six feeders into it. It is a very dangerous alley. I have come out of that intersection a lot of times and you know we are real careful of that alley intersection. Thank you for your time.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Van Selst. If there is anything to add you are certainly welcome to back at the end. That gentleman in the corner I think was next. Welcome sir. If we could just get your name and address. Thank you.

**Mr. Al Bergen, 240 East 18<sup>th</sup> Street, North Vancouver**

My name is Al Bergen, 240 East 18<sup>th</sup>. Your Worship, Councillors, I wish to support this application because I feel it is a well conceived project providing affordable accommodation for the City of North Vancouver. In a time where one can hardly find a new detached house for less than \$1 Million we need this sort of a development in the Central Lonsdale area. Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Bergen. Yes, Mr. Cullen had a letter to read. I had not forgotten. I made a note here. Thank you.

**Mr. Culling on behalf of Ms. Joan Elliott, 2329 Western Avenue, North Vancouver**

So, again, this is a letter from Joan Elliott. She is from 2329 Western Avenue. I believe her house faces the north end of the proposed lot sort of across from the Tancredi's as well. It says, and I have a copy I can give to you:

“To Council on procedure the United Lodge property on 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> is currently zoned Duplex .5 density. This property should **never** have been removed from the Western Avenue Study Area and in a previous Council meeting the question of who was responsible for this was bounced around the room but ultimately it was admitted to have been a mistake which still doesn't explain the special treatment that has been given. In keeping with Official Community Plan guidelines and with the recent zoning density changes recommended for the Study Area which this property once belonged too, this property should be rezoned to .75 or 1.0 maximum. On bias, transcripts reveal that some members of Council appear to be on very close terms with Mr. Connolly, the applicant, and seem to be familiar with his personal life, where his children go to school, his financial position, etc. Hopefully that won't make it too difficult for them to be impartial. In keeping with requests by at least 50 neighbouring residents this property should not be rezoned for anything higher than .75 or 1.0 maximum.

On Heritage, I can appreciate the desire of the Heritage Commission to do what it can to preserve the old house that sits on this property. There are several old houses in our neighbourhood but I don't think that any increase in density beyond .75 or 1.0 maximum should be allowed here especially when Council is being so very careful to prevent increased density for other projects in the City such as no tall cellars, no standing crawl space, no basement doors and so on. In keeping with the firm stance being taken by Council it is obvious that the zoning for this property should be no higher than .75 or 1.0 maximum. Thank you.

By Joan Elliott”.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you for reading that Mr. Culling and for reading Ms. Elliott's letter. We'll see that this copies to members of Council. Are there any other members of the gallery who wish to make comments? Yes sir, if you wouldn't mind just coming down to the microphone please. Welcome and if we could just get your name and address. Thank you.

**Mr. David Thomas, 533 Monteverdi Place, North Vancouver**

My name is David Thomas and I live at 533 Monteverdi Place and I've been a realtor very active in the North Shore for the past 26 years and one of the points that I thought that was most interesting here and I thought if I could add some statistics to it might help people in the discussion. That there has been a large topic here about affordability and affordability is purely related to market conditions and currently in North Vancouver in terms of condominium or apartment style housing which is very much at a premium and it is at a premium because it serves two or three different levels of need. It serves people coming into the market, those who are using it as the last place they live and various other needs in between. In the City of North Vancouver at this moment there are only 108 apartments for sale. If we can put this into a perspective, the town of Kelowna which is of a similar size to North Vancouver, has 310 apartments for sale, currently on the market. Richmond, a little bit bigger but not that much bigger has 544 apartments for sale. Nanaimo, much smaller than North Vancouver has 139 apartments. So, what we are facing here, is we are facing a real crisis in all of the North Shore, not just North Vancouver, but in all of the North Shore, for housing for those of us who wish to have our children grow up and live on the North Shore and as well have our parents find an alternate place for living. So, on that basis this is the right location for a building like this because it is near public transit which we're all very sensitive too global warming and the location is perfect for that kind of thing because that is what people want in condominium style of living. Thank you very much for hearing me and I very much support this project.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much Mr. Thomas. Are there other members in the gallery? Yes, please Mr. Trancredi you are welcome to come down again.

**Mr. Tancredi**

Hello again. I would just like to make some comments on some of the things I heard here tonight from the developer's side of the gallery. There are no people on the street who are against Heritage buildings. There are no people on the street who live there who are against affordability and nobody is against doing something about global warming. We are just simply trying to say that this particular development which I would say was almost parachuted on to the street. Everyone has commented about moving the density of this particular development to 23<sup>rd</sup>. Not pushing it back onto Western Avenue. There was no real opportunity for any significant change to this development proposed by the developer. I just would say that development of this site is not what people are against. It is the resulting development that we have here. People would like to see a lesser density if at all possible. They would like to see the building structures concentrated on 23<sup>rd</sup> and we would like to see some transition between this particular site and the surrounding area. I took note that I think all of the people who are proponents of this proposal who spoke here tonight, none of them live in the area.

None of them are sensitive to the people in the area, what the people in the area want and have to live with and it is fine to talk about sort of motherhood issues in terms of the goodness that this particular site could provide but all we are saying is that there are other ways to do it. This just is not the way to reach all of those lofty goals that have been spoken about here tonight.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you Mr. Tancredi. Are there any other members of the gallery that wish to make comments or ask questions? Yes, please, sir. Welcome.

**Mr. Mike Grist,**

My name is Mike Grist. I actually grew up in North Vancouver and the vacant lot that is next to the apartment block that is where I grew up. I just have one concern. The main issue here is been talking about traffic and I am very concerned about you opening the lane that everyone is talking about and over to Western. I do not want that lane opened. We went to great expense and great difficulty with the Department of Highways to get that made into a hammerhead lane. We hired lawyers and we were ready to take them to court to make sure that lane was never open and I would hope that as the scapegoat here that you never, ever open that lane. That street is a dead end street. In fact there should be proper signage at the end of the street saying it is a dead end street and I hope it always stays a dead end lane. Okay. Thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you very much for that comment. Are there other members of the gallery here wish to make any comments or ask questions just please raise your hands. Going once, twice, three times. Yes, Mr. Heaslip, are you going to wrap up or add some comments. I have you on the clock too. I hope you realize that.

**Mr. Heaslip**

Yes, Your Worship, I'll make it really brief. I just want to say that we certainly respect all of the issues that have been raised. You can see that this has been a tough site. When you consider the Chevron to the east, the 1.6 to the north, the multi-family in the 1.49 FSR range, 1.46 FSR range, to the south and southwest and accepting the Western Study which says 1.0 FSR to the north which over time will change exactly what is immediately north of the property. It is not going to likely stay a single-family and those yards will change and so forth. What we have attempted to do as a team is to take Heritage possibility and do a good job on that with the challenge of how do you pay for that because it is a significant cost. The bonusing is a helpful thing in order to have setbacks and that is what we have tried to do. Similarly with the nature of the markets we are trying to serve which are anywhere from first time buyers to aging in place for empty nesters and seniors that is the other attempt that has been made, to try and give a balanced solution. That is what we are after here. I also want to make clear that we are not trying to foist something onto the north.

I mean if you look at the solution that Dwayne and his team have come up with it is a broken up series of four small buildings that replicate the Heritage building. So, I think, again that I have to say that in combination with the landscaping and the site solution that again the attempt is for a good reasonable balance. That is the best we could do Your Worship. We did listen to everyone. We can't always agree with everyone and they have some very valid points but I think also, lastly, I'll say that the traffic study made it clear that with the number of units that we are proposing it did not drastically affect either the levels of service at the intersections or the flow into Western. In fact, of course we've isolated it. The other aspect I'll say is that it should be remembered the Study recommends certain improvements over time including the timing of the light for the left turn at the intersection in peak times and other possible improvements as the Western Avenue area evolves. So, those things would be coming as well. Anything that we can contribute as part of this development of course we will so I just wanted to make sure Your Worship that those points were covered.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you Mr. Heaslip. I'm going to ask once more now, Mr. Connolly have you got something to add. I got you on the clock Mr. Connolly so you know that.

**Mr. Connolly**

Thank you Your Worship. You know density is always an issue isn't it. It really is and as a builder you try to work with these density, and costs, and the realities. So, where are the realities on this property, I guess, Heritage retention and the fact that we need a huge underground parkade to service the 29 units. I guess the units necessitate that type of structure so what else could we do. Okay, we could look at the density of 1 and it would be ground orientated accommodation and if you look at Lower Lonsdale we see parking everywhere in regards to, I guess, families park their cars. I mean there is just a shortage of parking. If you look at the type of users for this project we are typically seeing 30% vacancies in the parkades because of the older demographics so is parking really an issue. 1.23 FSR, 1.25 FSR is our net density that we are looking at here after the Heritage. It is economics. That is why I brought forward this project to build the best project I can for the City and feel good about it and sure my neighbour to the north, he's got concerns, but I know he has spoken to several developers over the time and how long is he going to be there. As you make this decision this evening I would really like you to consider, you know, for the next 100 years. This is what this project is. If I am forced not to be able to do this development then what have we got. We got duplexes I guess and row houses. I ask you, is that a good thing. Get the cars off the street, get them underground. Thank you very much.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Are there any other members of the gallery who wish to make any comments with regards to this rezoning application? I see none, thank you. I'll go to members of Council. Councillor Keating, any questions.

**Councillor C.R. Keating**

Yes, thank you very much Your Worship. I'm glad this drawing is up here. A question Your Worship, through you to the proponents, a question was asked about public access. I see a walkway on the northern boundary here. I see a bit of a park on the 23<sup>rd</sup> Street side. Are these going to be fenced off and private use areas or are these going to be areas where the members of the public pass through.

**Mr. Dwayne Siegrist, Integra Architecture**

Through Your Worship, to Councillor Keating, I think the issue is it a private space. It is ..... space and people can use it for their own private use and that ..... maintain so it is shared use.

**Councillor Keating**

Shared use okay. Your Worship, it was noted by the developer that there is a 25 foot setback between the northern wall of the northern most units there and the property line. That is 25 feet. Is it possible, this appears to be a diagram in context, Your Worship, is it possible to estimate the distance between the property line and the structure to the north of that?

**Mr. Siegrist**

I think that has been done on the diagrams.

**Unknown Speaker**

*Not audible.*

**Councillor Keating**

54 foot separation. Thank you very much Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Councillor Perrault!

**Councillor B.W. Perrault**

I have a question for staff, particularly Engineering staff.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Certainly.

**Councillor Perrault**

With regards to the access and egress and an in particular I am concerned about the entrance of that lane onto West 23<sup>rd</sup> which I use almost daily so I know, I don't use the lane, I am one of the people that drives along West 23<sup>rd</sup>. I know how busy it is and I just want to hear from staff some kind of reassurance that if this application proceeds what are we prepared to do to make this safe.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Barber!

**Mr. T. Barber**

Your Worship, the proposed access is off the lane west of Lonsdale and we are proposing to put in left turn prohibitions both into that lane and out of the lane so that should address the present traffic conditions of that location.

**Councillor Perrault**

So the only way that people who live in this building can access that is by traveling west on West 23<sup>rd</sup> and turning north.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Barber!

**Mr. Barber**

You would have to be in the west bound direction, yes.

**Councillor Perrault**

They have to be in the west bound direction and they cannot access it from Western Avenue. That is not a given. Right.

**Mr. Barber**

That is correct as well.

**Councillor Perrault**

Is there any possibility that there could be an opportunity for the residents who live on Western Avenue, some kind of a cul-de-sac arrangement for them, for that neighbourhood.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Barber, are you clear with that.

**Mr. Barber**

I am not quite clear on where the cul de sac would be at the north end because it does connect to 24<sup>th</sup> Street now. There is a cul-de-sac up near the highway but there is a possibility to drive up Western, I believe, and along 24<sup>th</sup> to Chesterfield. No there is not.

**Councillor Perrault**

So, there is no cul-de-sac. There is no turn around there for people at the top of Western.

**Mr. Barber**

No, that is right. I was confused with Chesterfield as it connects to 24<sup>th</sup>. Western is just a cul de sac and there is no real major recommended changes in the traffic study for Western other than trying to improve the visibility as you access 23<sup>rd</sup> Street by prohibiting parking on the north side of 23<sup>rd</sup> from Western to the east.

**Councillor Perrault**

Just refresh my memory. How will people access the Chevron Station, only from Lonsdale Avenue now?

**Mr. Barber**

The transportation report recommends a right and a right out access as well off 23<sup>rd</sup> Street into the service station. There is two driveway crossings on Lonsdale as well. We would have to work with the operator of the Chevron Station to try and come up with some schemes that would be workable. There are several suggestions but it has been identified that it is very critical that they have to maintain access for trucks to continue them turning left. That is the only way they can get in and out of the site but for just cars and light duty trucks there would be no access left in or out off 23<sup>rd</sup> Street but we could also work with the operator to improve the way-finding by putting signage both perhaps on site and on the adjacent streets to get people back onto the highway both in the east bound and west bound direction.

**Councillor Perrault**

I have one more question for the developer, Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Yes, Councillor Perrault!

**Councillor Perrault**

How many of the apartments are going to have adaptable guidelines in them?

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Siegrist!

**Mr. Siegrist**

All of the units are done to Level 2.



**Councillor Perrault**

Could you just describe exactly what you mean. What level it is at, in terms of adaptability.

**Mr. Siegrist**

Sure. Level 2 is an adaptable standard given by the City of North Vancouver. It describes about entry ways to your suite being a 5 foot radius. The bathrooms have accommodations for a 5 foot circle that you need to have. Removal of vanities are part of that criteria. Also, I think the thresholds to balconies which is sort of our envelope concerns now a days we're actually lowering the thresholds so people can use wheelchairs to the balcony. Bedroom doors are a little wider. You are seeing electrical devices being installed at different heights, outlet, switches and stuffy to meet an adaptable standard. .... in place is what is doing.

**Councillor Perrault**

Okay thank you. Your Worship, do you want comments now or is this a question time.

**Mayor Mussatto**

I think we'll just do questions now. Thank you Councillor Perrault. Councillor Bookham!

**Councillor P.J. Bookham**

Thank you Your Worship. We have seen a very good rendering of the building from the front. I wonder if we could see a similar sort of profile that would show this building viewed from the west side of it so we can see it's impact on the home to the north. Do you have anything that shows the Tencredi's house.

**Mr. Siegrist**

Your Worship, through you to Councillor Bookham. These are the diagrams that were supplied.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Siegrist, if you just want to take the microphone it will allow you to go over. If you squeeze the bottom of it there it will come out. Thank you very much for that.

**Mr. Siegrist**

I think the neighbour to the north, the Tencredi's, is located here. We have done the both views from both sides but this is the elevation from the west that you were asking about.

**Councillor Bookham**

Could we go back to the other diagram for a moment please.

**Mr. Siegrist**

Sure.

**Councillor Bookham**

Thank you. So, that little building is the house. It is not a garage. The one on the left in the upper, that is a house.

**Mr. Siegrist**

Correct.

**Councillor Bookham**

Okay and did I hear you say that there was a total of 54 feet from building to building.

**Mr. Siegrist**

This dimension, from here to here.

**Councillor Bookham**

And could you estimate the width of this room. I'm just trying to get a visual impression of how much space that is.

**Mr. Siegrist**

I mean 15 feet would probably take you to about here. Others can correct me in the audience but I think you may want to double it. You are going to get 30, so you are probably pushing 35.

**Councillor Bookham**

Thirty-five, okay. That gives me an idea. Thank you. Could we hear the cost of the renovation of the Heritage house. What is that adding to the project in terms of costs.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Connolly, are you able to answer that question.

**Mr. Siegrist**

Perhaps my client can answer that question.

**Mayor Mussatto**

If you could just take the microphone. Thank you.

**Mr. Connolly**

Your Worship, to Councillor Bookham, we have not got the final costs in at this time but we are in around \$1.3 Million without the parkade. We have not gone to tender. We have not got any working drawings. We have no specifications, no seismic drawings or details.

**Councillor Bookham**

\$1.3 Million is just for the restoration of the Heritage building?

**Mr. Connolly**

To relocate it yes and to restore it.

**Councillor Bookham**

That is \$1.3 Million.

**Mr. Connolly**

Yes.

**Councillor Bookham**

And is it feasible to move that building off the site, I mean, right off the site and put in on a different site? Is that building sound enough to be able to move down the street or a block away?

**Mr. Connolly**

I am not really qualified for that but typically the lateral movements, I guess they could put steel beams in there and relocate it, but I wouldn't know.

**Councillor Bookham**

And finally, just out of curiosity, when you move the building from its current location to the front, I guess the southwest corner, how do you do that?

**Mr. Connolly**

It is jacked up physically, in place.

**Councillor Bookham**

But then how do you move it sideways?

**Mr. Connolly**

It is jacked up so it is in a vertical position four feet off of the foundation and then they build a road system and then bring in dollies, wheels, mechanical wheels and then a tractor vehicle pulls the Heritage house forward and stops and then resets and then pulls in down to the other end of the lot.

**Councillor Bookham**

And so the foundation is in place and sits then on a new foundation?

**Mr. Connolly**

Yes, that's correct. Yes.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Councillor Heywood!

**Councillor R.N.Heywood**

Thank you Your Worship.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Oh. Sir, if you are going to speak you just have to come to the microphone. Councillor Heywood, I am sorry.

**Mr. Trevor Holgate, Architect**

My name is Trevor Holgate. I am the Heritage consultant on the project. We did a similar sort of project at the Molly Nye House on Lynn Valley Road and we used Nickel Brothers and they moved the house over within the site with rolling dollies. It worked very well.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Thank you, Mr. Holgate. Councillor Heywood!

**Councillor Heywood**

Thank you, Your Worship. Just to go back to the question, I think Mr. Penway mentioned earlier, this total size of the lot that the three lots amounted to how many square feet was that roughly.

**Mr. Penway**

Your Worship, approximately 18,800 sq.ft.

**Councillor Heywood**

So, .25 bonusing is roughly 6,000 sq.ft. of build able space.

**Mr. Penway**

About 4,700 sq.ft.

**Councillor Heywood**

4,700 sq.ft. Okay, that's fine, thank you. A question for the developer. We've listened to the comments of the neighbourhood about the significance of the change in the height and the significance of this building and the comments that the building seems to be focused at the back of the lot, or at least, towards the back of the lot, the density. Is there any configuration that you could do that would result in the density focusing along the alley to the east and sloping to the west to Western Avenue and to the north in that corner so that the presence of this development isn't so erroneous on Western Avenue. Is there any other way that you could configure this site to accommodate the neighbourhood better.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Siegrist, are you able to respond to that? You are the Architect on the plan I understand. Thank you.

**Mr. Siegrist**

Thank you Mr. Mayor, through you to Councillor Heywood. I think we've really looked at many options for siting the building. It certainly was our mandate when we were initially retained by the client is to how do you orientate, how do you get an existing building retained and how do you maximize the community benefit. Looking at the elevations from Western is there is actually a very good transition. It is one that we worked hard with the City Planning Department. It reads as a three-storey townhouse on Western. The Heritage building reads as a three-storey building so I think the transition has actually been very successful. There is a very generous setback on the north. It is one we haven't used at all. I mean four storey buildings you will see as close as 20 feet and you know, I've seen them closer. If we are talking about reorganizing the site there is a huge economic structure as to how buildings are set on the site and how you would access to parking and believe me there was a lot of study and a lot of work.

**Councillor Heywood**

One last question to the owner. In looking at your pricing are you are running about \$500 of buildable square foot.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Mr. Connolly, if you can just take the microphone if you wouldn't mind. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Connolly**

No, we are looking at \$470, approximately.

**Councillor Heywood**

\$470, okay, thank you.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Okay, Councillor Heywood. Are there any further questions from members of Council? I see none then, Ms. Dowey!

**Ms. Dowey**

A motion Your Worship to conclude both Public Hearings.

**Mayor Mussatto**

Councillor Heywood!

**Councillor Heywood**

So moved, Your Worship!

**Mayor Mussatto**

Councillor Schechter!

**Councillor Schechter**

Second!

**Mayor Mussatto**

Any discussion! All those in favour! Opposed! It is Carried Unanimously! Thank you.

Moved by Councillor Heywood, seconded by Councillor Schechter.

**THAT** the Public Hearings conclude.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

The Public Hearings concluded at 9:42 p.m.

Certified a true and accurate transcript of the Public Hearings

*Sandra E. Dowey*

---

Sandra E. Dowey, City Clerk

*March 12, 2007*

---

Date